



Elevating Education Teacher 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, serves multiple campuses, supports a district-wide initiative, or demonstrates exceptional value through a low cost-per-student ratio.	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 & Procurement Readiness?)	Itemized budget, Amazon Wishlist or approved vendor documentation provided, aligned with district guidelines, and partial/alternate funding considered	Itemized budget, Amazon Wishlist or approved vendor documentation provided, aligned with district guidelines. Partial/alternate funding <i>not</i> considered	Itemized budget provided, but Wishlist, vendor documentation, or vendor verification is incomplete.	Budget provided with limited detail, incomplete documentation, or unresolved vendor verification.	Budget poorly justified, lacks required documentation, or costs appear unreasonable.	No Budget or Purchasing documentation
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 measurability.	Metrics are vague, minimal, or hard to assess.	Evaluation strategy weak or missing key components.	No evaluation metrics provided.



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.
CCEF Mission Alignment	Strongly advances the mission of elevating education in CCISD and demonstrates clear potential for improved student outcomes.	Clearly supports the mission and is likely to positively impact student learning.	Generally aligns with the mission and provides some educational benefit.	Limited connection to the mission or student outcomes.	Weak alignment with the mission.	No evident alignment with the mission.
	10	8	6	4	2	0
Transformative Outcomes & Educational Excellence	Demonstrates a highly innovative or transformative approach that significantly elevates teaching and learning. Has potential to create lasting change, inspire broader adoption, or serve as a model for other classrooms, campuses, or programs.	Clearly enhances educational experiences through innovative practices, resources, or instructional approaches that extend beyond current opportunities.	Provides meaningful improvements to student learning and includes some innovative or transformative elements.	Offers modest enhancement to existing practices but limited evidence of transformational impact.	Minimal innovation or educational advancement beyond current classroom activities.	No clear innovation, educational elevation, or transformative impact described.

Scoring Notes:

- Each proposal can score a max of 45 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.