

FY25 (2024-2025) Technology Center Lottery Grant Reviewer's Rubric

Program Area (check all that apply): AGED BMITE FACSED HEALTH STEM T & I WED

Applicant Name:

Technology Center:

Proposal Title:

Grant Amount Requested on Budget Request Form:

Grant Type: Competitive Noncompetitive

Reviewer Number:

Criteria	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Incomplete	Rating	Comments
A. Technology Description: Clearly and thoroughly details the technology requested, and project size, scope, and goals for implementation of this technology.	Provides clear & thorough details of requested technology and appropriate and valid project size, scope, and goals for implementation of this technology.	Provides adequate description and details of requested technology and lists project size, scope, and goals for implementation of this technology.	Provides few details of requested technology and weakly or partially addresses project size, scope, and/or goals for implementation of this technology.	Does not address description and details of requested technology and project size, scope, and goals for implementation.	0	Reviewer: if you rank this category 2 or less, please explain why here.
	6-5	4-3	2-1			
B. Justification: Clearly Identify why this technology is being requested and how it fits in the program's long-term plan.	Clearly identified why this technology is being requested and how it fits in the program's long-term plan.	Adequately identified why this technology is being requested and how it fits in the program's long-term plan.	Poorly identified why this technology is being requested and how it fits in the program's long-term plan.	Does not identify why this technology is being requested and how it fits in the program's long-term plan.	0	Reviewer: if you rank this category 2 or less, please explain why here.
	8-6	5-3	2-1			
C. Instructional Delivery: Clearly define the mode of instructional delivery, potential to involve many students/clients in multiple age groups and demographics, and method of long-term project sustainability.	Clearly defined the mode of instructional delivery, potential to involve many students/clients in multiple age groups and demographics, and method of long-term project sustainability (must describe all three).	Adequately defined the mode of instructional delivery, potential to involve many students/clients in multiple age groups and demographics, and method of long-term project sustainability (must describe all three).	Poorly defined the mode of instructional delivery, potential to involve many students/clients in multiple age groups and demographics, and method of long-term project sustainability.	Did not define either the mode of instructional delivery, potential to involve many students/clients in multiple age groups and demographics, and/or method of long-term project sustainability.	0	Reviewer: if you rank this category 2 or less, please explain why here.
	6-5	4-3	2-1			
D. Student/Client Success: Clearly describe assessments, evaluations and reporting tools that are relevant to the technology, and appropriately measure student/client success.	Clearly described assessments, evaluations and reporting tools that are relevant to the technology, and appropriately measure student/client success.	Adequately described assessments, evaluations and reporting tools that are relevant to the technology, and appropriately measure student/client success.	Weakly described assessments, evaluations and reporting tools that are relevant to the technology, and appropriately measure student/client success.	Did not describe either assessments, evaluations and/or reporting tools that are relevant to the technology, and appropriately measure student/client success.	0	Reviewer: if you rank this category 2 or less, please explain why here.
	6-5	4-3	2-1			

E. Budget: Budget is itemized on the Budget Template and meets RFP requirements.	Budget is realistic considering project size, scope and stated goals (<i>see A. Technology Description</i>); budget items are itemized with very detailed descriptions, including equipment specifications; shipping, handling, and/or installation amounts are shown and do not exceed 5% of the budget; letters with dollar amounts from those agreeing to match funds for amounts over \$50k or for shipping, handling and/or installation are attached.	Budget does not exceed \$50k; budget is realistic considering project size, scope and stated goals (<i>see A. Technology Description</i>); budget items are itemized; shipping, handling, and/or installation amounts are shown and do not exceed 5% of the budget; letters with dollar amounts from those agreeing to match funds for amounts over \$50k or for shipping, handling and/or installation are attached.	Budget is documented on spreadsheet.	Budget is incomplete or not addressed.		Reviewer: if you rank this category 2 or less, please explain why here.
	6-5	4-3	2-1	0		
F. Grammar and Punctuation: Uses correct format, grammar and punctuation throughout the proposal and budget.	Uses correct format, grammar and punctuation throughout the proposal and budget (0-1 errors).	Uses adequate format, grammar and punctuation throughout the proposal and budget (2-3 errors).	Weakly uses format, grammar and punctuation throughout the proposal and budget (4-5 errors).	Serious format, grammar and punctuation flaws throughout the proposal and budget (>5 errors).		Reviewer: if you rank this category 2 or less, please explain why here.
	6-5	4-3	2-1	0		
G. Letter of Support and Sustainability: Letter is included and meets RFP requirements.		Letter provided on school letterhead and signed by the superintendent; addresses project support and project sustainability commitment and methods.	Letter provided on school letterhead and signed by the superintendent; support and sustainability not addressed.	Letter of Commitment not signed, not on school letterhead, or not provided.		Reviewer: if you rank this category 2 or less, please explain why here.
		2	1	0		
Total Points:					0	40 Points Possible

Additional Comments: