

EEI Grant Review – Scoring Rubrics

Section	Point Range	Excellent – Very Good	Good - Fair	Poor - Inadequate
Abstract (write last)	0-5	Abstract is succinct, well written and clearly understood. It details who was involved in writing the proposal, what the program will look like, how many children will be served, and why is it needed. Points: 5 or 4	Abstract includes most of the required details. It is well to adequately written. Points: 3 or 2	Abstract is poorly written or missing. It includes few of the required details. Points: 1 or 0
Introduction	0-3	Includes the partners, geographic areas to be served, and priority area addressed (if applicable). It is well written, detailed, and clearly understood. Points: 3	Includes partners, geographic areas to be served, and priority area addressed (if applicable). Can be understood. Points: 2 or 1	Does not include partners and/or geographic areas; or is missing altogether. Difficult to comprehend. Points: 0
Need for the Program	0-10	The data presented build a very compelling case for why an EEI grant is needed. Good details on number of at-risk children are included. The section is well written and clearly understood. Points: 10-8	The data provided paint a good to fair picture of why an EEI grant is needed. It includes numbers of at-risk children. The section is written well to fair. Points: 7-5	Little or no data are included which help to explain why an EEI grant is needed. Few details are included. The section is poorly written. Points: 4-0
Program Description	0-20	The goals of the proposed program are clear, appropriate, and match the identified need. The description of the delivery system is detailed and clear; the model addresses the identified needs. It is very clear that children served in this program would be in quality inclusive environments. The evaluation methods are clearly stated and appropriate. There is evidence that the program will be a quality program and staff will have opportunities for their continued growth. Points: 20-16	The goals of the proposed program are clear and connected to the need. The description of the delivery system is complete; it is clear as to what will happen and how. It appears that children served in this program will be in inclusive environments. The evaluation methods are and described and appear appropriate. Points: 15-10	The goals of the proposed program are vague or missing; they do not connect to the stated need. It's unclear as to what will happen and how. Children served in this program may not be served in inclusive environments. The evaluation methods are described, but they do not appear appropriate or understood. Points: 9-0

EEI Grant Review – Scoring Rubrics

Section	Point Range	Excellent – Very Good	Good - Fair	Poor - Inadequate
Family Involvement	0-15	Families were involved in developing the proposal and will make decisions on various aspects of the program. The program has proposed a plan to provide rich and engaging opportunities for families of children who are at risk. Points 15-12	Families were involved in developing the proposal in some manner. The program plans to provide various opportunities for families of children who are at risk. Points 11-7	It does not appear that families were involved in developing the proposal. The program's plan to provide opportunities for families of children who are at risk to be involved is lacking. Points 6-0
Collaborative Development of the Proposal	0-5	It is very clear that the proposal came out of a robust, collaborative process with various organizations (including school, if non-school lead; and/or community program, if school is lead). Points 5-4	It appears that there was good or at least some collaboration among appropriate organizations in writing this proposal. Points 3-2	It appears that one organization wrote the proposal and then partner(s) were asked to sign off on it. Collaboration is uncertain. Points 3-2
Collaboration & Coordination Implementing Proposal	0-10	Details on the partners, their roles and responsibilities, and how partners will communicate are provided in a clear and complete manner. The collaboration appears authentic. It is clear that this program will complement existing pre-K programs. Points 10-8	Details on the partners, their roles and responsibilities, and how partners will communicate are provided in a complete manner. It appears that this program will complement existing pre-K programs. Points 7-5	The description of the partners, their roles and responsibilities, and how partners will communicate is vague or incomplete. It is uncertain if this program will complement existing pre-K programs. Points 4-0
Budget	0-7	Budget includes clear explanations of line items and other funding sources. Amounts are reasonable. Points 7-6	Budget includes some explanations of line items and other funding sources. Points 5-3	Budget is missing explanations of line items and/or other funding sources. Points 2-0
Priorities <i>Develop new pre-K (20 pts)</i> <i>Safety net (15 pts)</i> <i>Pre-K for at-risk 3's (15 pts)</i> <i>Specific services (8 pts)</i> <i>Reduction to pre-K (5 pts)</i>	0-25 depending on priority Rating is based on quality of the plan	The proposal addresses the identified target priority area(s). The explanation is detailed, appropriate, well thought out, and valid. Points: (25) 25-20 (15) 15-12 (8) 8-7 (5) 5-4	The proposal partially addresses the identified priority area(s). The explanation somewhat valid but not fully convincing. Points: (25) 19-10 (15) 11-7 (8) 6-5 (5) 3-2	The proposal does not really address the identified priority area(s). The explanation is vague and not convincing. Points: (25) 9-0 (15) 6-0 (8) 4-0 (5) 1-0