

## 2018-19 Monroe One BOCES SLS Mini Grant Evaluation Rubric

Criteria for Evaluation	3 (Exceeds)	2 (Meets)	1 (Below)	0 (Omitted)	Rating
<b>Provide a <i>detailed</i> description of the proposal to include, but not limited to, the purpose and the educational need.</b>	The description provides a big picture of the proposed program/project. The purpose and the educational need are stated clearly, with supporting information. The writer included details such as who, what, where, when and why. There are no questions as to what the program/project is about.	The description provides a general overview of the proposed program/project. More information would have been helpful to describe the program/proposed project.	The description is vague and leaves many unanswered questions for the reader. Relevant details are lacking.	The writer omitted the <i>Description of the Grant</i> from the proposal.	
<b>Evidence of Innovation</b>	The proposal is for something new or out of the ordinary.	The proposal replicates something innovative done by another grant recipient or in a previous grant received by the applicant.	The proposal replicates something innovative for which the recipient has previously received a mini-grant	The proposal provides no evidence of innovation	
<b>Teacher/Student Outcomes and NYS Learning Standards are addressed.</b>	Teacher/student outcomes and NYS Standards are identified as knowledge or behaviors that the writer wants the teacher/student to gain because of participating in the grant. The outcomes are relevant and clearly stated with details such as who, what, where, when and why. There are no questions as to what the outcomes are for teachers/ students.	Teachers/student outcomes and NYS Standards are identified and relevant but more information would have been helpful to describe outcomes.	Teacher/student outcomes are identified but do not communicate what is going to be learned because of this grant.	The writer omitted teacher/student outcomes from the narrative.	
<b>Explains the proposal's Relationship to AASL National School Library Standards (NSLS)</b>	The writer provided <i>evidence</i> in regards to how the AASL NSLS relate to the project/program and teaching and learning outcomes. The appropriate standard/s is/are cited and the relationship is explained in detail. There are no questions as to the relationship between the outcomes and the standards.	The writer gave a general answer in regards to how the AASL NSLS relate to the project/program and teacher/student outcomes. More information would have been helpful to explain the relationship.	The AASL NSLS are listed, but the writer did not explain the relationship.	The writer omitted the AASL NSLS from the project/program proposal.	

## 2018-19 Monroe One BOCES SLS Mini Grant Evaluation Rubric

Criteria for Evaluation	3 (Exceeds)	2 (Meets)	1 (Below)	0 (Omitted)	Rating
<b>Provides a detailed plan for each of the phases of the grant.</b>	The writer provided details as to how they are going to develop the program/project. A distinct timeline is proposed in an orderly fashion. There are no questions for the reader as to how the program will be developed.	The writer gave a general answer as to how they will develop the program/project. More information would have been helpful to describe the plan.	The writer provided a vague description of the development plan. There are many unanswered questions for the reader.	The writer omitted the Development Plan from the narrative.	
<b>Budget The proposal includes a detailed explanation of ALL expenditures</b>	Explains and justifies <i>all</i> expenditures. All are relevant and there are no questions regarding reason behind purchases/expenses.	The writer explains and/or justifies <i>most</i> proposed purchases/expenditures. <i>More</i> information would have been helpful.	The budget explanation is vague. It does not explain and/or justify expenditures.	The writer omitted the Budget Narrative from the narrative.	
<b>Additional supporting evidence (program/project alignment to other area and initiatives: Content Area Standards, Partnership for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills; ISTE National Standards, etc. . .</b>	Offers additional exemplar evidence, which is embedded/ aligned with supporting teacher/learner outcomes.	Offers additional information, which supports teacher/learner outcomes.	Offers additional information, but does not clearly explain connection between proposed project and teacher/learner outcomes.	The writer does not offer additional supporting evidence	
<b>Plan for sharing results of project/conference experience with the region</b>	Explained in detail how this information will be shared with the Monroe One BOCES region.	Mentions that experience will be shared with the Monroe One BOCES region.	Mentions sharing but is vague or limited to the participant's school district only.	No mention of sharing of results or experiences.	
<b>Evaluator's Name:</b>			<b>Total Score (24 Point Maximum)</b>		

**Disqualifiers:**

- Grant application includes items covered by a Monroe 1 BOCES CoSer
- Grant application includes workshop registration for individuals who are not certified School Librarians
- Application includes items prohibited in the call for proposals
- Lack of administrator signature
- Submitted after application deadline
- No final report received for previous mini-grant

**Tiebreaker:**

- Applicant has previously received mini-grants(s)