

Kansas Reading First State Plan Rubric

**Bob Corkins
Commissioner of Education**

**Kansas State Department of Education
120 SE 10th Avenue
Topeka, KS 66612-1182**

December 2005

**LEA APPLICATION REVIEW
SCORING RUBRIC**

Program Overview

- 10 pts. 1. Please provide a one-page description of the proposed grant program, which includes the following:
- a) The specific population of students and staff who will participate in the program.
 - b) A description of the scientifically based reading research program to be implemented.
 - c) A timeline for the implementation of the program and other major program activities.

Scoring Rubric

Marginal (0-3 pts.)	Somewhat Rigorous (4-6 pts.)	Most Rigorous (7-10 pts.)
<p>The abstract is not clear in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • describing the population to be served and the staff who will participate. • describing the scientifically based reading research program. • providing the timeline for implementation of the program and program activities that will take place. 	<p>The abstract indicates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the population to be served and vaguely describes the students and staff who will participate. • a general description of the scientifically based reading research program. • a vague timeline for implementation of the program and program activities that will take place. 	<p>The abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clearly describes the population to be served and clearly describes how the staff will participate. • clearly and concisely describes the scientifically based reading research program to be used. • provides a detailed timeline for implementation of the program and the activities that will take place.

Points Awarded _____

Comments

Needs Assessment

10 pts 2. Provide information on the level of reading achievement for the district. Data should include:

- (a) Results of state assessments,
- (b) Local assessment results,
- (c) Number/percent of students not meeting state/local indicators,
- (d) Results of Early Reading Assessment
- (e) Other data regarding the reading performance of students in the district

Scoring Rubric

Marginal (0-3 pts.)	Somewhat Rigorous (4-6 pts.)	Most Rigorous (7-10 pts.)
<p>The proposal's description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• does not justify the need for this grant.• is vague about the needs to be addressed.• has few sources of data.• has no summary of data.	<p>The proposal's description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• is weak in justifying the need for this grant.• describes the needs to be addressed.• has limited sources of data.• is not clear in summarizing the data.	<p>The proposal's description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• is strong in justifying the need for this grant.• is clear about the needs to be addressed.• has multiple sources of data.• has a concise summary of the data.

Points Awarded _____

Comments

Rank Order of Schools

10 pts. 3. Rank order all schools eligible to participate in the Reading First grant based on:

- (a) the number and percent of students not reading on grade level as documented state assessment or the Early Reading Assessment.
- (b) the number and percent of free and reduced lunch children .
- (c) the number of years the school has been on Title I school improvement.

Scoring Rubric

Marginal (0-3 pts.)	Somewhat Rigorous (4-6 pts.)	Most Rigorous (7-10 pts.)
<p>Rank order:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rank order of schools is missing. • Schools are not rank ordered according to number or percent of children reading below grade level. • Schools are not rank ordered according to number or percent of formula children. • Schools are not rank ordered according to the number of years on Title I school improvement.. 	<p>Rank order:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rank order is provided but not correct. • Rank ordering is complete but not clear on the percent of children reading below grade level. • Rank order is complete but not clear on poverty data. • Rank order is not clear for the number of years the schools have been on Title I school improvement. 	<p>Rank order:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rank order is complete, and clearly demonstrates schools where children are reading below grade level. • Clearly demonstrates schools are rank ordered according to highest number or percent of children reading below grade level. • Clearly demonstrates schools are rank ordered according to highest number or percent of formula children. • Clearly demonstrates schools are rank ordered according to the number of years on Title I school improvement.

Points Awarded _____

Comments

Selection of Schools

- 10 pts. 4. For the schools selected provide data that would give a clear picture of the reading achievement level of the school along with other supporting data.
- (a) Results of state assessments.
 - (b) Local assessment results,
 - (c) Number/percent of students not meeting state/local indicators,
 - (d) Results of Early Reading Assessment,
 - (e) Other data regarding the reading performance of students in the district, and
 - (f) Title I School Improvement status.

Scoring Rubric

Marginal (0-3 pts.)	Somewhat Rigorous (4-6 pts.)	Most Rigorous (7-10 pts.)
<p>The description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has few sources of data. • has no summary of data. • does not select specific schools. 	<p>The description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has limited sources of data. • is not clear in summarizing data. • is not clear in which schools were selected. 	<p>The description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has multiple sources of data. • has a concise summary of data. • has selected schools most clearly in need of Reading First.

Points Awarded _____

Comments

Scientifically Based Reading Research

50 pts. 5. Describe how the Reading First Program proposed for implementation meets all of the following criteria:

SCIENTIFICALLY BASED READING RESEARCH—

(A) meets the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain valid knowledge relevant to reading development, reading instruction, and reading difficulties; and

(B) shall include research that—

- (i) employs systematic, empirical methods that draw an observation or experiment;
- (ii) involves rigorous data analyses that are adequate to test the stated hypotheses and justify the general conclusions drawn;
- (iii) relies on measurements or observational methods that provide valid data across evaluators and observers and across multiple measurements and observations; and
- (iv) has been accepted by a peer-reviewed journal or approved by a panel of independent experts through a comparably rigorous, objective, and scientific review.

Scoring Rubric

Marginal (0-15 pts.)	Somewhat Rigorous (16-30 pts.)	Most Rigorous (31-50 pts.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal describes implementing instructional strategies not based on scientifically based reading research. • Proposal includes a vague, overly general explanation of the proposed project’s alignment with the <i>Kansas Curriculum Standards for Reading and Writing</i>. • Proposal provides a discussion of the program that will result in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. selecting and implementing reading programs that lack a scientific research base that meets rigorous and clearly defined standards; b. selecting and implementing reading programs that are not complete for use as a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal includes a detailed description of how the proposed initiative is supported by a rigorous, validated research base that reflects the current view of the five essential components of reading instruction. • Proposal includes an explanation of how the proposed initiative’s learning resources are aligned with the <i>Kansas Curriculum Standards for Reading and Writing</i>. • Proposal provides a detailed description of how the Reading First program will be structured, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. using instructional strategies and programs that provide instruction to all K-3 students; b. scheduling of uninterrupted 90 minute plus blocks of time for literacy instruction; c. implementing a clear and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal meets all conditions listed under “Somewhat Rigorous”. • Proposal includes an explanation of how the scientifically based reading program is aligned with the <i>Kansas Curriculum Standards for Reading and Writing</i> to ensure that students reach the proficient level. • Proposal demonstrates how LEA and schools will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. use instructional strategies and programs that teach the five components of reading, include explicit and systematic instructional strategies, have a coordinated instructional sequence, are aligned with instructional materials, and allow ample practice opportunities;

<p>comprehensive instructional program;</p> <p>c. selecting and implementing reading programs that meet instructional needs of only some students, leaving the needs of other to be met elsewhere or at other times;</p> <p>d. using instructional strategies and programs that do not teach the five essential components of reading;</p> <p>e. using instructional strategies that teach students to use context or picture cues as primary means for word identification; and</p> <p>f. relying primarily on instructional strategies that engage students in independent, silent reading with minimal guidance and feedback.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal provides a limited description of the plan for serving all of the students. • Proposal provides an unclear or vague description of differentiated instruction. 	<p>specific plan to use scientifically based instructional strategies to accelerate performance and monitor progress of students who are reading below grade level;</p> <p>d. methods for coordinating the Reading First initiative with Title I, special education, extended day learning opportunities, preschool programs and other programs available in the building; and</p> <p>e. evidence that the Reading First program is a comprehensive program and does not layer selected programs on top of non-research based programs already in use for services to students identified as at risk of reading failure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal provides a clear description of the diverse children to be served (low income, major racial/ethnic, limited English proficient, and children with disabilities) and a work-able plan that will enable all K-3 students to reach the level of reading proficiency. • Proposal provides a concise description of how instruction will be differentiated for all students based on assessment. 	<p>b. schedule uninterrupted two hour blocks of time for literacy instruction; and</p> <p>c. offer students explicit, systematic instruction in phonemic awareness (e.g., isolating and manipulating the sounds in words); phonics (e.g. blending sounds, using texts that allow students to practice their phonics knowledge); fluency (e.g., assisted, repeated oral reading); comprehension (e.g., summarizing text, graphic and semantic organizers, asking and answering questions, summarization); and vocabulary (e.g. repeated exposure to the meanings of words in varieties of contexts).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal provides a clear plan for the organization in the classroom and how instruction will be differentiated for all students based on assessment.
---	--	---

Scoring Rubric: (continued)

Points Awarded _____

Comments

Instructional Assessments

- 20 pts. 6. Provide the following information:
- a) A description of how the assessment process that will be used for screening, diagnostic and monitoring of K-3 students achievement.
 - b) A timeline of when assessments will be administered.
 - c) A description of how the assessment process is aligned with the instructional program.

Scoring Rubric

Marginal (0-7 pts.)	Somewhat Rigorous (8-14 pts.)	Most Rigorous (15-20 pts.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of how the assessment process will be used for screening diagnosing and monitoring is missing. • A timeline for the administration of the assessments is not provided. • A description of how the assessments are aligned with the instructional program is not given. • A description for using only the assessment system for reporting, without linking assessment to instruction, or without aligning to instruction is given. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is limited information on how the assessment process will be used to screen, diagnose and monitor student progress. • The timeline is not specific for the administration of the assessments. • There is limited information on how the assessments are aligned to the instructional program. • An explanation of how the assessment system will inform and modify instruction for all students is provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a detailed description of how the assessment process will be used to screen, diagnose and monitor student achievement. • The timeline specifically lists when the assessments will be administered. • There is a detailed description on how the assessments are aligned to the instructional program • There is a detailed description of how information from the assessments will be used to make instructional decisions for K-3 students and to inform decisions about appropriate interventions.

Points Awarded _____

Comments

Instructional Strategies and Programs

20 pts. 7. Describe:

- (a) How the local educational agency will assist eligible schools in selecting one or more programs of reading instruction developed using scientifically based reading research,
- (b) How the instructional programs or strategies to be implemented are based on SBRR.
- (c) How the comprehensive reading programs based on SBRR to be implemented provides instruction for *all* K-3 students;
- (d) How the instructional programs and strategies to be implemented will teach the five essential components of reading;
- (e) How the instructional programs and strategies to be implemented will enable students to be proficient readers;
- (f) How the instructional programs and strategies to be implemented will be used to accelerate performance and monitor progress of students who are reading below grade level; and
- (g) How the instructional programs and strategies to be implemented **will not layer** selected programs on non-research based programs already in use.

Scoring Rubric

Marginal (0-7 pts.)	Somewhat Rigorous (8-14pts.)	Most Rigorous (15-20 pts.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unclear as to how the district will assist schools in the selection of specific instructional strategies or programs. • The proposed strategies and programs do not teach the five essential components of reading. • The proposed instructional strategies are not based on SBRR. • The proposed process for selecting and implementing reading program lacks basis in SBRR. • The proposed program is not complete for use as a comprehensive instructional program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is limited information on how the district will assist schools in the selection of specific instructional strategies or programs. • The proposal describes how instructional strategies and programs will address the five essential components of reading. • The proposal describes how the instructional strategies and programs will enable students to be proficient readers. • The proposal describes how instructional strategies are based on SBRR. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a specific description on how the district will provide technical assistance to the school on the selection of instructional strategies or programs. • The proposal describes how the instructional strategies will include explicit and systematic instructional strategies related to the five components of reading, coordinated instructional sequence, alignment with instructional materials, and ample practice opportunities. • The proposal describes how instructional strategies based on SBRR will be used to accelerate performance and monitor progress of students who are reading below grade level.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposal describes how comprehensive reading programs based on SBRR will be implemented without layering selected programs on top of non-research based programs already in use.
--	--	--

Points Awarded _____

Comments

Instructional Materials

- 15 pts. 8. Describe:
- a) How the materials are integrated into the instructional sequence for each grade K-3.
 - b) How the materials will increase the effectiveness of the program in teaching the five essential components of reading.
 - c) What purpose the materials serve in terms of meeting the needs of all students.

Scoring Rubric

Marginal (0-5 pts.)	Somewhat Rigorous (6-10 pts.)	Most Rigorous (11-15 pts.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal fails to provide information that describes how the supplemental and intervention materials support the teaching of the essential components of reading. • The proposal fails to show the coordination of the supplemental and intervention materials with the comprehensive reading program. • The proposal fails to show how the material will meet the needs of the students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal provides limited information on how the supplemental and intervention materials will support the teaching of the essential components of reading. • The proposal shows limited coordination between the supplemental and intervention materials and the comprehensive reading program. • The proposal vaguely shows how the material may meet the needs of the students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal clearly describes implementation of instructional materials based on SBRR, including supplemental and intervention programs and materials, which are integrated and coordinated with the comprehensive reading program. • The proposal clearly describes how the materials will meet the needs of the students.

Points Awarded _____

Comments

Instructional Leadership

10pts. 9. Describe

- (a) How the local education agency will provide the leadership to align the reading curriculum to State standards, evaluate schools, evaluate reading progress, and monitor student achievement in reading.
- (b) How the local education agency will provide training for principals and building leaders in the essential components of reading, and their application to instructional program materials used.
- (c) Who would provide the leadership for the Reading First program and provide their qualifications.

Scoring Rubric:

Marginal (0-3 pts.)	Somewhat Rigorous (4-6 pts.)	Most Rigorous (7-10 pts.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unclear how the LEA will provide leadership in assisting the school in aligning the reading curriculum to the state standards. • It is unclear how the LEA will evaluate the success of the Reading First program and monitor student achievement. • The proposal fails to describe how the LEA will support building leaders in the training and implementation of the Reading First program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a limited description on how the LEA will provide leadership in assisting the schools in aligning the reading curriculum to the state standards. • There is limited information on how the LEA will evaluate the success of the Reading First program and monitor student achievement. • The proposal provides limited information on how the LEA will support building leaders in the training and implementation of the Reading First program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal identifies a district leader with sufficient authority and qualifications who has responsibility for aligning the reading curriculum to the Kansas Standards, evaluating district and school reading progress, analyzing achievement data, and making school and classroom decisions based on continuous progress monitoring of student and teacher data. • The proposal provides for required training for principals and building leaders in the essential components of reading and the specific instructional programs and materials in use in their buildings, including the scientific based, implementation process and progress monitoring related to these programs and materials.

Comments _____

Points Awarded _____

District Based Technical Assistance

10 pts. 10. Describe

- (a) How the local education agency will provide high quality technical assistance to selected schools as they implement Reading First.
- (b) How the local education agency will provide assistance to selected schools in the areas setting goals, benchmarks, and evaluating progress.
- (c) How the local education agency will ensure that funds available under this part, and funds available for reading instruction from kindergarten through grade 3 and special education and from other appropriate sources, are effectively coordinated.
- (d) How the LEA will ensure that the Reading First program will be coordinated with the School Improvement Plan and the Title I School Wide Plan if applicable.

Scoring Rubric:

Marginal (0-3 pts.)	Somewhat Rigorous (4-6 pts.)	Most Rigorous (7-10 pts.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal fails to describe adequate plans to provide technical assistance to participating schools. • The proposal fails to describe how the district will provide assistance to selected schools in setting goals, benchmarks, and evaluating progress. • The proposal fails to describe how Reading First will be coordinated with the School Improvement Plan, and the Title I Schoolwide Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal describes how the district will provide technical assistance to participating schools. • The proposal provides limited information on the technical assistance that will be provided to selected schools in the area of setting goals, benchmarks, and evaluating progress. • The proposal provides limited information on the coordination of Reading First activities and other professional development activities. • The proposal provides a limited description of how Reading First, the School Improvement, and the Title I Schoolwide Plan will be coordinated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal describes how high quality technical assistance will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identifying professional development needs; ▪ Implementing professional development; ▪ Budgeting; ▪ Managing data. • The proposal clearly describes the assistance that will be provided to selected schools in the area of setting goals, benchmarks, and evaluating progress. • The proposal clearly describes a strong coordination among Reading First activities and other district professional development activities. • The proposal clearly describes how Reading First, the School Improvement and the Title I Schoolwide Plan will be coordinated.

Comments

Points Awarded _____

Professional Development

50 pts. 11. Provide the following information:

- (a) A description of the professional development activities that will take place for K-third grade classroom teachers and special education staff in the eligible schools on the essential components of reading instruction; and how professional development will assist staff to implement scientifically-based instructional materials, programs, and strategies, as well as screening, diagnostic, and class room based instructional assessments.
- (b) Explain how this professional development will be of high quality and results-based, and sustained to equal a total of at least 50 hours and will result in continuous improvement of the instructional staff.
- (c) Explain how the professional development will be coordinated with other LEA activities.
- (d) The qualifications of the individuals who will provide the continuous professional development services.
- (e) Include a timeline of the professional development activities that will take place, and
- (f) Describe how literacy coaches will be used in providing at least two coaching session per month.

Scoring Rubric:

Marginal (0-15 pts.)	Somewhat Rigorous (16-30 pts.)	Most Rigorous (31-50 pts.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed professional development plan is inadequate or not adequately coordinated with classroom instruction. • The description of the professional development activities is incomplete. • The professional development activities are not continuous and total below 40 hours. • There is no evidence presented that any method will be used to measure changes in teacher effectiveness. • Proposed plan relies on single-event workshops as the main delivery mechanism for professional development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The description of the professional development activities is not specific. • There is some alignment of the professional development activities and the scientifically based reading research. • Professional development activities are continuous but not frequent and total between 40-50 hours. • Little evidence is presented that changes in teacher effectiveness will be measured. • It is difficult to determine if the professional development activities are results-based. • The proposal provides limited information on how literacy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal describes how results-based professional development of K-3 teachers and K-12 special education teachers will be provided, including use of literacy coaches (minimum one for every 30 teachers) who will provide at least one coaching session per month to participating teachers. • Proposal describes how the results-based professional development will include intensive and focused attention to (1) essential components of reading instruction, (2) implementing programs, and strategies based on SBRR that utilize appropriate materials in the classroom and library, and (3) screening, diagnostic, and

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identified professional development providers have inadequate expertise and knowledge of SBRR instruction. Proposed plan is not aligned with state's professional development plan or will lead to duplication of efforts. 	<p>coaches will be used.</p>	<p>classroom-based instructional assessments using a variety of delivery methods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional development activities are continuous and on going and total to more than 50 hours. The proposal identifies the qualifications (related to SBRR) of the individuals who will provide professional development. The proposal describes how ongoing support for trainers and coaches will be provided. The proposal describes how the use of Kansas' reading content and performance standards will be included in professional development activities. The proposal describes how targeted professional development will be provided for teachers who need additional assistance.
---	------------------------------	---

Points Awarded _____

Comments

50 pts. 12. Accountability/Evaluation/Impact

The State Department of Education places a priority on schools that set high expectations on increasing student performance as a result of receiving grant funds. Applicants are expected to establish a fast pace movement of the schools and students toward the “Standard of Excellence.”

Describe the expected impact of the program, such as:

- Identify goals/objectives consistent with the desired outcomes and required activities of the Reading First program. (These must be specific, measurable, attainable, research-based, and time-phased.);
- Describe how the evaluation plan will document the effectiveness of Reading First activities within identified schools and district as a whole;
- Describe how the LEA will disaggregate and report performance of all K-3 students in schools that qualify for the program (post-assessment data);
- Describe how the district will use school evaluation data to determine need for intervention and/or discontinuation of grant funds based on performance; and
- Incorporate valid and reliable measures that will be used to document the effectiveness of the Reading First activities within individual schools and the district as a whole.

Scoring Rubric:

Marginal (0-15 pts.)	Somewhat Rigorous (16-30 pts.)	Most Rigorous (31-50 pts.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal lacks a clear plan to document the effectiveness of local Reading First activities for individual schools and the LEA as a whole. • The proposal lacks a clear plan to make decisions based on evaluation outcomes, including interventions with and/or discontinuation of schools not making significant progress. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal establishes overall minimum achievement expectations. • The proposal provides a vague evaluation plan, which would document the effectiveness of Reading First. • The proposal did not clearly describe how the district will report performance of K-3 students. • The proposal provides a vague plan on how evaluation data will be used to determine need for intervention and/or discontinuation of grant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal identifies goals/objectives, which are consistent with the desired outcomes and required activities of the Reading First program (specific, measurable, attainable, research-based, and time-phased). • The proposal describes how evaluation plan will document effectiveness of Reading First activities within identified schools and district as a whole. • The proposal describes how district will report performance of all K-3 students in schools that qualify for the program (post-assessment data). Expected results will be disaggregated

		<p>to reflect the population of students participating within the school(s).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal describes how the district will use school evaluation data to determine need for intervention and/or discontinuation of grant funds based on performance.
--	--	---

Points Awarded _____

Comments

10 pts. 13. Private School Participation

Describe how the LEA will consult with appropriate private school officials during the design and development of the program, on such issues as how the children's needs will be identified, what services will be offered, how and where the services will be provided, and how the services will be accessed. Also, describe how the district will ensure that the expenditures are equitable and the services are secular, neutral, and non-ideological.

Scoring Rubric:

Marginal (0-3 pts.)	Somewhat Rigorous (4-6 pts.)	Most Rigorous (7-10 pts.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal does not list expenditures for services to private school children and their teachers. • The proposal does not describe who will provide the services or where they will be provided. • There is no evidence that private school officials were consulted on the design and development of the programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed expenditures for private school children and their teachers are not equitable. • The proposal does not provide enough information to determine who will provide the services or where they will take place. • The information provided is not clear if private school officials were consulted in the design and development of the programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal offers a detailed list of expenditures for services to private school children and their teachers which are equitable. • The proposal provides a detailed list of who will provide the services and where they will be provided and how they will be accessed. • There is detailed information on private school official's involvement in the design and development of the program.

Points Awarded _____

Comments

10 pts. 14

Access to Print Materials

Describe:

(a) How reading and library programs that provide student access to engaging reading materials will be promoted; and

(b) How the LEA and selected schools will promote reading and library programs that provide student access to a wide array of engaging reading materials, including both expository and narrative texts.

Marginal (0-3 pts.)	Somewhat Rigorous (4-6 pts.)	Most Rigorous (7-10 pts.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal fails to promote reading library programs that provide students with access to engaging reading materials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal provides a brief description of how reading and library programs will be promoted that provide student access to engaging reading materials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal describes how districts and selected schools will promote reading and library programs that provide student access to a wide array of engaging reading materials, including both expository and narrative texts.

Points Awarded _____

Comments

15 pts. 15. Budget Pages and Narrative

Districts must provide a cost-effective budget and narrative justifying expenditures.

Marginal (0-5 pts.)	Somewhat Rigorous (6-10 pts.)	Most Rigorous (11-15 pts.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed budget is not cost-effective. • The proposed budget lacks the necessary detail to allow readers to evaluate its cost-effectiveness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal provided a budget but failed to detail costs. • The proposal includes a budget narrative that describes resources, but does not include supporting documentation for research based programs and materials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal includes a cost-effective budget, both a line item and narrative description, <u>in addition</u> to using the attached budget summary form. • The budget narrative and line items contain specifics for each year of the three-year grant.

Points Awarded _____

Comments
