CCEF Teacher Grant Scoring Rubric

The following will be included on the scoring document/form: Grant name, grant submission #, Teacher/Faculty name, Campus/Location, and CCEF Evaluator

CCEF
CLEAR CREEK EDUCATION FOUNDATION
"Elevating Education"

Elevating Education Grants: Updated Scoring Rubric

Criteria	5	4	3	2	1	0
Purpose	Purpose is clearly stated, aligned with the CCISD Strategic Plan and curriculum, and includes measurable goals directly linked to student learning.	Purpose is clearly stated with some alignment to Strategic Plan and curriculum, and measurable goals are mentioned.	Purpose is mostly defined but lacks clarity or strong goal alignment.	Purpose is present but vague, and goals are weakly connected or unclear.	Purpose is ambiguous or missing important elements of alignment or measurability.	No purpose defined or alignment/goals missing entirely.
Impact	Impacts 500+ students or district-wide/"at-risk" population across multiple campuses.	Impacts 100–500 students, full grade levels, or large subject groups.	Impacts 25–100 students within a specific grade level or team.	Impacts 5–25 students, likely a single class or elective group.	Impacts 1–5 students in a niche or targeted group.	No measurable impact described.
Financial	Budget is itemized, realistic, aligns with district guidelines, and includes potential for partial or external funding.	Budget is itemized and aligns with guidelines but lacks external funding consideration.	Budget is reasonable but lacks itemization or clarity.	Budget is vague or overestimated per student.	Budget is unreasonable or poorly justified.	No budget or unclear costs.
Implementation	Fully implementable within one school year with a detailed timeline and curriculum alignment.	Timeline mostly clear, implementation plan is feasible.	Timeline is general; curriculum alignment is referenced.	Implementation lacks clarity or feasibility.	Unclear how implementation would occur in timeframe.	No implementation plan.
Evaluation	Includes specific, measurable, non-standardized metrics for assessing success; aligns with project goals.	Measurable metrics included but need stronger alignment or clarity.	Metrics included but too general or lack	Metrics are vague, minimal, or hard to assess.	Evaluation strategy weak or missing key components.	No evaluation metrics provided.

			measurability.			
Sustainability	Project is sustainable 5+ years with minimal support; materials reusable and integration likely.	Sustainable 3–5 years with low-to-moderate maintenance.	Potential sustainability with some future support.	Sustainability questionable or not well addressed.	Likely unsustainable beyond initial year.	No mention of sustainability.
Innovation & Elevating Education	Clearly demonstrates an innovative concept or approach that elevates learning. The idea creatively transforms teaching or learning practices, regardless of the specific item requested.	Concept is innovative and aims to elevate learning, but clarity or depth could be improved.	Shows a somewhat innovative approach or unique instructional angle.	Attempts innovation, but application or impact is unclear.	Minimal innovation; lacks clear educational elevation.	No innovation or elevation of education described.

Scoring Notes:

- Each proposal can score a max of 35 points.
- Reviewers should use scoring definitions and rubric as objective benchmarks.
- Top scoring applications will be prioritized for funding based on merit and available funds.