



## RUBRIC FOR SOMEF GRANT APPLICATION REVIEW

Below are the criteria that are used by the SOMEF Teacher Grants Committee as they review grant proposals.  
Teachers are encouraged to consult them when writing their applications.

<b>Section of Application</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Substandard</b>
<b>Information page &amp; Signatures</b>	All required information complete <b>SIGNATURES MANDATORY</b>	One or two pieces of required information missing	More than two required pieces of information missing
<b>Objective</b>	Concise summary that highlights an original learning experience, in contrast to regular classroom instruction, and supports district goals	Has an educational component with potential, but lacks clear articulation	Vague description and unclear intent
<b>Description &amp; Timetable</b>	The proposal is thoughtful; articulates innovation and creativity; describes the process for completion, provides all support materials and an accurate timetable	Description is complete, but does not provide a strong rationale for the project; limited timetable provided	Project is not imaginative; description is vague; no or unrealistic timetable provided
<b>Classroom or School Need, Problem or Opportunity Addressed by project</b>	Clearly identifies gaps/needs that are directly addressed in the project; identifies clear educational objectives; highlights positive impact on classroom, school, and community	Need, problem, or opportunity over-generalized; application needs further evidence of supporting student achievement	Project is not related to learning objectives for grade level; is limited in scope; is not innovative
<b>Evaluation</b>	Provides well-defined assessment tools; project reflects methods for sharing outcomes	Provides some evaluative tools; expected outcomes suggested, but not fully articulated; Project can be shared, but no method provided	Provides no or only subjective assessment; expected outcomes not included; projected has limited impact
<b>Budget</b>	Clear and verifiable; itemization and accurate total provided; includes all necessary expenditures; accounts for maintenance & future departmental use of equipment purchases	Not enough cost details given or only provides estimates; necessary expenditures to support objective not clear; does not account for storage, maintenance & future use of equipment	Unclear or unrealistic; no cost details or sources provided; requests funds for items not allowable by the terms of the grant
<b>Overall Quality of Proposal</b>	Articulate and well-written; thoughtful, comprehensive and complete; makes a good case for funding; applicants reflect passion and commitment to proposal	Writing is reasonably clear and the idea proposed is good; relies too heavily on core curriculum content standards to suggest project's relevance	Poorly written; uses jargon; lack of thought; details missing; submits core curriculum content standards in lieu of describing how the project meets objectives