

**Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program-Title X, Part C
McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Subtitle VII-B**

Scoring Rubric—2 Year Grant Cycle 2014-2016

Reader Number: _____

Date Reviewed: _____

School District: _____

County-District Code: _____

Homeless Grant Example

<i>Rubric</i>	<i>Points Earned/ Point Possible</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Max. % Possible</i>
McKinney-Vento	70/100	= 70	X .8 = 56	80
Homeless Assistance Act				
<i>Department's Goals</i>	20/40	= 50	X .2 = 10	20
	Grand Total		<u>66</u>	<u>100</u>

Rubric	Points Earned/ Point Possible	%	%	Max. % Possible
McKinney-Vento	_____/100	= ____	X .8 = ____	80
Homeless Assistance Act				
**Department's Goals	_____/40	= ____	X .2 = + ____	20
	Grand Total		<u>_____</u>	<u>100</u>

**Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program-Title X, Part C
McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Subtitle VII-B**

Scoring Rubric—2014-2016

****Note: Grants receiving a zero in any “scored” category will not be considered for funding****

Summary of Points-100 points possible POINTS

Section I and II—Grant Cover Sheet—No Points Awarded 0

Grant application-- Page 1-- Total budgets by Program (Year 1) and District and Program Information

Section III—Assurances and Certification—No Points Awarded 0

Grant Application-- Page 2--Signed and Dated

Section IV—Program Status—40 possible points _____

Grant Application Page 2 and 3--Submitted and complete

1. Indicators of Need—15 points possible (Scoring Rubric--Pg 3)
2. Free/Reduced Lunch Percentage—5 points possible (Scoring Rubric--Pg 3)
3. County Poverty —10 points possible (Scoring Rubric--Pg 3)
4. 2012 Graduation Rate & Attendance Rate —10 points possible (Scoring Rubric--Pg 3)

Section V—Program Development and Planning—No Points Awarded 0

Grant Application Page 4-- Submitted and complete

Section VI—Grant Needs Assessment Narrative— 10 possible points _____

Grant Application Page 4-- Submitted and complete

*Homeless Needs Assessment Narrative—10 points possible (Narrative not to exceed 3 pages)
(Scoring Rubric—Pg 4)*

Section VII—Program Description— 25 possible points _____

Grant Application-- Pages 5 and 6

- A. Program Description Narrative—10 points possible (Narrative not to exceed 3 pages) (Scoring Rubric-Pg 5)
- B. Title I and McKinney-Vento Coordination—5 points possible (Scoring Rubric-Pg 6)
- C. Collaborations in the Community—5 points possible (Scoring Rubric-Pg 7)
- D. Collaborations within the LEA—5 points possible (Scoring Rubric-Pg 8)

Section VIII—Program Evaluation Narrative—20 possible points _____

Grant Application-- Pages 7, 8, and 9

- A. Program Evaluation Narrative—10 points possible (Narrative not to exceed 3 pages) (Scoring Rubric-Pg 9)
- B. Objectives, Activities, Measures, and Data Source—10 points possible (Scoring Rubric-Pg 10)

Section IX—Program Supporting Data Page—No Points Awarded 0

Section X – A and B —Grant Budget—5 possible points _____ (Scoring Rubric-Pg 11)

Grant Application-- Pages 11 and 12

1. Budget Itemization—5 points possible

Total Points Received _____

RANKED _____ / _____

1. Indicators of Need—15 points possible

Homeless Count _____ / District Student Enrollment _____ = Homeless Percentage _____%

<1%	1% - 2.99%	3% - 4.99%	5% - 6%	> 6%
3 point	6 points	9 points	12 points	15 points

2. Free/Reduced Lunch Percentage—5 points possible

<http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/profile/>

<19%	20%-39%	40%-59%	60%-79%	80%-100%
1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points

3. County Poverty—10 points possible

<http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/county-level-data-sets/poverty.aspx>

<5%	6%-10%	11%-13%	14%-16%	> 17%
2point	4 points	6 points	8 points	10 points

4. 2013 LEA Annual Performance Report (APR) Graduation Rate & Attendance Rate—10 points possible

<http://dese.mo.gov/index.html>

1. Click and enter into the MCDC Portal
2. Click on the Accountability Link
3. Click on the Guided Inquiry (Accountability Reports)
4. Click on the MSIP 5 Annual Performance Report (APR)—in the drop-down box choose your LEA
5. Then select MSIP 5 Reports—Level 2 and 3 – Supporting Data Reports, (MSIP 5 Supporting Data Report-LEA)
6. Go to the separate hyperlinks for Attendance and Graduation Rate.
7. We will use the highest ranking for your LEA to determine points.

MSIP 5 Performance Standard	<u>Exceeding or On Track</u> 5 points	<u>Approaching or Floor</u> 0 points
4. Attendance Rate		
5. Graduation Rate		
Total Number of Points		

Section VI—Grant Needs Assessment—10 points

Points Awarded _____

Homeless Needs Assessment Narrative—10 points possible

Choose only one:

Needs are clearly defined and the narrative provides the reader with a clear and compelling need associated with the LEAs homeless population. In addition, the narrative has outlined clear examples of additional resources and how they complement the McKinney-Vento subgrant. (8-10 points) _____

Needs are clearly defined and the narrative provides the reader with evidence explaining the needs associated with the LEAs homeless population. In addition, the narrative has outlined clear examples of additional resources other than the McKinney-Vento subgrant. (5-7 points) _____

Needs may or may not be clearly defined and the narrative does not provide the reader with sufficient evidence to explain the need associated with the LEAs homeless population. In addition, the narrative shows little or poor evidence of additional resources. (3-4 points) _____

Needs are not clearly defined and the narrative does not provide the reader with sufficient evidence to explain the need associated with the LEAs homeless population. In addition, the narrative does not provide evidence of additional resources. (0-2 points) _____

Poor Needs and Evidence	Weak Needs and Evidence	Sufficient Evidence	Superior Evidence	Outstanding Evidence
0-2 points	3-4 points	5-7 points	8-9 points	10 points

Reader Comments and/or Suggestions:

Section VII—Program Description (A-D) —25 total points possible

Points Awarded (A-D)_____

A. Program Description Narrative—10 points possible

Choose only one:

The narrative clearly explains and correctly identifies all of the following: the program is consistent with the purpose and encompasses all aspects of the McKinney-Vento Act, services and programs are aligned with the needs identified in the programs needs assessment, it identifies the coordination with other service providers/agencies, and the LEA has outlined its policies and procedures consistent with the McKinney-Vento Act. (8-10 points) _____

The narrative explains and identifies all of the following: the program is consistent with the purpose and encompasses all aspects of the McKinney-Vento Act, services and programs are aligned with the needs identified in the programs needs assessment, it identifies the coordination with other service providers/agencies, and the LEA has outlined its policies and procedures consistent with the McKinney-Vento Act. (5-7 points) _____

The narrative does not clearly explain nor clearly identifies all of the following: the program is consistent with the purpose and encompasses all aspects of the McKinney-Vento Act, services and programs are aligned with the needs identified in the programs needs assessment, it identifies the coordination with other service providers/agencies, and the LEA has outlined its policies and procedures consistent with the McKinney-Vento Act. (3-4 points) _____

The narrative does not explain nor identifies all of the following: how the program is consistent with the purpose and encompasses all aspects of the McKinney-Vento Act, services and programs are not aligned with the needs identified in the programs needs assessment, nor identifies the coordination with other service providers/agencies, and does not outline the LEA’s policies and procedures consistent with the McKinney-Vento Act. (0-2 points) _____

Poor Program Description	Weak Program Description	Sufficient Program Description	Superior Program Description	Outstanding Program Description
0-2 points	3-4 points	5-7 points	8-9 points	10 points

Reader Comments and/or Suggestions:

B. Title I & McKinney-Vento Coordination —5 points possible

Choose only one:

The description clearly details and describes the coordination and collaboration between the Title I and McKinney-Vento programs. It also clearly describes the set-aside funding activities, the process used to determine the set-aside, and describes the ongoing coordination between the two programs. The description provided shows vigor has gone into the collaboration. There is evidence the collaboration and coordination of the two programs has previously existed and has shown sustainability. (4-5 points) _____

The description identifies the coordination and collaboration between the Title I and McKinney-Vento programs. It also provides a description of the set-aside funding activities, the process used to determine the set-aside, and describes the ongoing coordination between the two programs. The description identifies the collaboration and coordination between the programs. However, the implementation and sustainability while not newly implemented are still being developed. (3 points) _____

The description does not clearly explain nor clearly identifies the coordination and collaboration between the Title I and McKinney-Vento programs. It also does not provide a clear description of the set-aside funding activities, the determiner for the set-aside or the ongoing coordination between the two programs. The coordination and collaboration between the two programs is in its earliest stages of development. (2 points) _____

The description does not explain nor is there enough detail given to describe the coordination and collaboration between the Title I and McKinney-Vento programs. It also does not provide a clear description nor gives enough detail to describe the set-aside funding activities, the determiner for the set-aside or the ongoing coordination between the two programs. No previous implementation of collaboration and coordination is evident and efforts to implement new collaborations are not given enough detail. (0-1 point) _____

Poor Coordination and Collaboration	Weak Coordination and Collaboration	Sufficient Coordination and Collaboration	Superior Coordination and Collaboration	Outstanding Coordination and Collaboration
0-1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points

Reader Comments and/or Suggestions:

C. Collaborations in the Community—5 points possible

Choose only one:

The description clearly and in detail describes the coordination and collaboration between the community and the LEA’s McKinney-Vento program. Services and resources provided by the collaboration ensure a superior to outstanding collaborative effort. The description provided shows vigor has gone into the collaboration. There is evidence that the collaboration has previously existed and it has shown its sustainability. (4-5 points) _____

The description identifies the coordination and collaboration between the community and the LEA’s McKinney-Vento program. However, the services and resources provided by the collaboration do not necessarily point to a superior or outstanding collaborative effort. The description clearly identifies the collaboration and coordination between the programs and while its implementation and sustainability are not newly implemented, they have been developed. (3 points) _____

The description does not clearly explain nor clearly identify the coordination and collaboration between the community and the LEA’s McKinney-Vento program. The services and resources provided by the collaboration show little if any planning and do not necessarily improve the LEAs homeless program. Little, if any, implementation and sustainability is evident. (2 points) _____

The description does not clearly explain nor is enough detail given to understand or clearly define the coordination and collaboration between the community and McKinney-Vento program. The services and resources provided by the collaboration show little or no planning was put into the collaboration. The collaboration provides little if any support to the LEA’s homeless program. No evidence of previous collaboration and coordination is described. (0-1 points) _____

Poor Coordination and Collaboration	Weak Coordination and Collaboration	Sufficient Coordination and Collaboration	Superior Coordination and Collaboration	Outstanding Coordination and Collaboration
0-1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points

Reader Comments and/or Suggestions:

D. Collaborations within the LEA—5 points possible

Choose only one:

The description clearly and in detail describes the coordination and collaboration between the LEA’s McKinney-Vento program and other programs within the LEA. Services and resources provided by the collaboration ensure a superior to outstanding collaborative effort. The description provided shows vigor has gone into the collaboration and that the collaboration has previously existed and has shown its sustainability. (4-5 points) _____

The description identifies the coordination and collaboration between the LEA’s McKinney-Vento program and other programs within the LEA. The services and resources provided by the collaboration do not necessarily point to a superior or outstanding collaborative effort. The description clearly identifies the collaboration and coordination between the programs and while its implementation and sustainability are not newly implemented, they have been developed. (3 points) _____

The description does not clearly explain nor clearly identifies the coordination and collaboration between the LEA’s McKinney-Vento program and other programs within the LEA. The services and resources provided by the collaboration show little, if any, planning and do not necessarily improve the LEAs homeless program. Little, if any, implementation and sustainability is evident. (2 points) _____

The description does not clearly explain nor is enough detail given to understand or clearly define the coordination and collaboration between the LEA’s McKinney-Vento program and other programs within the LEA. The services and resources provided by the collaboration show little or no planning was put into the collaboration. The collaboration provides little, if any, support to the LEAs homeless program. No evidence of previous collaboration and coordination is described. (0-1 point) _____

Poor Coordination and Collaboration	Weak Coordination and Collaboration	Sufficient Coordination and Collaboration	Superior Coordination and Collaboration	Outstanding Coordination and Collaboration
0-1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points

Reader Comments and/or Suggestions:

Section VIII—Program Evaluation Narrative (A-B)—20 total points possible

Points Awarded (A-B) _____

A. Program Evaluation Narrative—10 points possible

Choose only one:

The narrative clearly explains and provides a description of the grant activities and how they will be monitored. In addition, the narrative explains how feedback data will be used to guide the grant process throughout the term of the grant and includes what criteria will be used to gauge the success of the grant. The narrative demonstrates planning and attention has been given to the monitoring process. (8-10 points) _____

The narrative explains and identifies a description of the grant activities and how they will be monitored. It includes how feedback data will be used to guide the grant process throughout the term of the grant and includes what criteria will be used to gauge the success of the grant. While the narrative demonstrates planning and attention has been given to the monitoring process, it appears the process is still being developed or is missing one or two key components. (5-7 points) _____

The narrative does not clearly explain nor clearly identifies a description of the grant activities and how they will be monitored. It also does not include enough description to explain how the feedback data will be used to guide the grant process throughout the term of the grant and does not describe the criteria used to gauge the success of the grant. The narrative does not demonstrate sufficient planning or attention have been given to the monitoring process; further developed is needed. (3-4 points) _____

The narrative does not explain nor clearly identifies a description of the grant activities and how they will be monitored. It does not include enough description to explain how the feedback data will be used to guide the grant process throughout the term of the grant nor does it describe the criteria used to gauge the success of the grant. The narrative demonstrates that insufficient planning or attention was given to the monitoring process which is critical in the development of a quality grant evaluation component. (0-2 points) _____

Poor Monitoring and Evaluation	Weak Monitoring and Evaluation	Sufficient Monitoring and Evaluation	Superior Monitoring and Evaluation	Outstanding Monitoring and Evaluation
0-2 points	3-4 points	5-7 points	8-9 points	10 points

Reader Comments and/or Suggestions:

B. Objectives, Activities, Measures, and Data Source—10 points possible

Choose only one:

The descriptions of all the proposed objectives are clearly explained and provide a clear description of how activities will achieve their objectives through this grant. In addition, it explains and demonstrates how feedback data will be used to guide the grant process throughout the term of the grant and includes what criteria will be used to gauge the success of the grant. The narrative demonstrates planning and attention have been given to the evaluation process. (8-10 points) _____

The objectives explain and identify how activities will achieve their objectives through this grant. In addition, it explains and demonstrates how feedback data will be used to guide the grant process throughout the term of the grant and includes what criteria will be used to gauge the success of the grant. The narrative demonstrates planning and attention has been given to the evaluation process; however, the process is still in need of development or is missing components. (5-7 points) _____

The objectives do not clearly explain nor clearly identifies how activities will achieve their objectives through this grant. In addition, the explanation of how feedback data will be used to guide the grant process, including the criteria used to gauge the success of the grant, was not clearly explained. The narrative demonstrates some planning has been given to the evaluation process; however, the process is still in need of development or is missing components. (3-4 points) _____

The objectives do not explain nor clearly identify how activities will achieve their objectives through this grant. In addition, the explanation of how feedback data will be used to guide the grant process, including the criteria used to gauge the success of the grant, was not clearly explained. The narrative demonstrates little planning has been given to the evaluation process and is missing components. (0-2 points) _____

Poor Evaluation	Weak Evaluation	Sufficient Evaluation	Superior Evaluation	Outstanding Evaluation
0-2 points	3-4 points	5-7 points	8-9 points	10 points

Reader Comments and/or Suggestions:

Section X – A and B —Grant Budget—5 points possible

Points Awarded_____

1. Budget Itemization and Justification—5 points possible

Choose only one:

Budgeted items or services are:

- directly related to and support the goals, objectives, and activities of the proposed program;
 - of high quality to support the goals, objectives, and activities of the proposed program;
 - improving student achievement through a variety of quality expenditures;
 - NOT seen as an “opportunistic” approach to securing materials and supplies.
- (4-5 points)_____

Budgeted items or services are:

- related to the goals, objectives, and activities of the proposed program;
 - support the goals, objectives, and activities of the proposed program;
 - improving student achievement;
 - perhaps an “opportunistic” approach to securing materials and supplies.
- (3 points)_____

Budgeted items or services are:

- indirectly related to the goals, objectives, and/or activities of the proposed program;
 - marginally support the goals, objectives, and activities of the proposed program;
 - marginally based on the district’s plan for improving student achievement;
 - an “opportunistic” approach to securing materials and supplies.
- (0-2 points)_____

Poor Itemization/ Justification	Weak Itemization/ Justification	Sufficient Itemization/ Justification	Superior Itemization/ Justification	Outstanding Itemization/ Justification
0-1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points

Reader Comments and/or Suggestions:



MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
 PO BOX 480, JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65102-0480
DEPARTMENT'S GOALS ALIGNMENT RUBRIC FOR COMPETITIVE GRANTS

SECTION I. REWARD, PRIORITY, AND FOCUS LEVEL STATUS

Directions: Select only one Level Status per application. Only one building within a district, consortium or service area needs to be classified in the lowest level to generate the lowest possible level ranking for the district or consortium. The proposal must address an area or areas of needed improvement in the building or district that earned the designation to be awarded maximum points in this section. **The status of a building or district will be determined by the Department.** <http://dese.mo.gov/qs/documents/ESEA-School-Designation.pdf>

	Points Earned	Priority Level Description
Priority Schools (20 points possible)		Persistently Low-Achieving: Districts that qualify for Priority School Status have one or more buildings designated as a Priority School in the ESEA Flexibility Waiver. And/or their two most recent Annual Performance Reports (APR) are at an unaccredited or provisionally accredited status.
Focus Schools (10 points possible)		Struggling With Consistency: K-12 Districts that qualify for Focus School Status have one or more buildings designated as a Focus School in the ESEA Flexibility Waiver. And/or met fewer than 12 Standards on their two most recent Annual Performance Reports (APRs). K-8 districts that qualify for Focus School Status have one building designated as a Focus Status School and/or met fewer than 5 Standards on their two most recent Annual Performance Reports (APRs).
Reward Schools (0 points possible)		K-12 Districts that qualify for Reward Status have no designated Priority or Focus schools and met greater than 11 Standards on their two most recent Annual Performance Reports (APRs). K-8 districts that qualify for Reward Status have no designated Priority or Focus Schools and met greater than 5 Standards on their two most recent Annual Performance Reports (APRs).
Section I. Total Points Earned (20 points possible)		<i>Transfer total to SECTION III of this section.</i>

SECTION II. PROJECT ALIGNMENT TO THE DEPARTMENT'S GOALS

Directions: Within the narrative of the proposal, applicants are anticipated to demonstrate alignment with the Department's Goals through one or more planned LEA actions. The reviewer must note the specific location of the LEA action for all scored items. If the reviewer finds multiple LEA actions which qualify for an awarded point, note the location of the first reference. Each LEA action can only receive a maximum of five points. The reviewer is not responsible in this section to determine the anticipated effectiveness or quality of the proposed LEA action, only to identify its inclusion in the application. A "No" designation scores zero points for that LEA action.

Application Location of LEA Action	Demonstrated Alignment	Points Earned	Goal
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		Missouri public education will rank in the top ten on national and international measures of performance. (10 points possible)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		Missouri will provide high quality early educational opportunities to all young children and their families. (10 points possible)

SECTION III. POINT TOTALS

Section I. Total Points Earned (20 points possible)	
Section II. Total Points Earned (20 points possible)	
GRAND TOTAL POINTS EARNED (40 points possible)	