	Excellent *(3 POINTS)*	Acceptable *(2 POINTS)*	Emerging *(1 POINTS)*	Insufficient *(0 POINTS)*	SCORE
Project Description	Project description is clear with strong evidence of careful planning, thought and research.	Project description is general, but it is still a good project/idea that can be understood.	Project description needs clarity and further planning. Still, it is possible to understand what the project/idea is.	Unclear project description or lacks planning and research.	
Population Served	Population is clearly identified and expounded upon	Population served is briefly mentioned	Population served assumed	Population served not mentioned	
Background/Need	Description is very clear, concise, and easy to understand. Information and data is attached clearly supports need. Additional data or information complete a big picture explanation for need.	Description depicts the need for the project well and language clearly describes current status. Data or additional information supports narrative and shows clear need.	Description depicting the need is somewhat clear and minimally explains why funding is needed. Data or information to support need in addition to antidotal descriptions of current status are shared.	Description of need is hard to understand, verbose, or uses educational jargon. It is not clear what is the specific need and no data or information is included to support justifying need.	
Solution	Resources for funding and support are clearly identified.	Resources for funding and support are briefly mentioned	Resources for funding and support are alluded to but not mentioned	Resources for funding and support not identified or mentioned at all.	
Goals/Objective	Included detailed description of major steps desired towards goal; thorough description of strengths, weaknesses, and critical attributes. High level of specificity about objective.	Includes a description of goal/objective. Strengths, weaknesses, and critical attributes may be vaguely addressed.	Descriptions lacked detail or depth of goal. May have been missing descriptions for some aspects of steps needed.	Only listed information rather than described or explained desired goal. May have been essential aspects resulting in confusion for the reader.	
Evaluation	There is a detailed and clearly defined and outlined plan for documenting and evaluating the success of the grant.	There is an outlined plan for documenting and evaluating the success of the grant.	Plan for documenting and evaluating the success of the grant is present but not extensive.	No plans for documenting and/or evaluating the success of the grant, or plans are limited or unclear.	
Student Impact	Potential to profoundly impact the learning of a significant number of students (grade level or schoolwide). Links to enrichment identified and number of benefactors clearly shared.	Potential for impact on learning of a group of students (class or small group). Links to enrichment identified. Number of benefactors not shared.	Potential for some impact on student learning. Lacks clear link to student enrichment. Benefactors not mentioned.	Lacks potential to impact student learning or how it would influence learning is unclear.	

Budget	Budget outlines in detail how the money will be spent including where funds are going, prices, quantity of materials purchased, titles of specific materials and shipping.	Budget gives information about what is purchased, from where and how much, but lacks specifics.	Budget is defined only in general terms and is missing specific information.	Budget is missing or does not align with the proposed project.	
Cost Effective	This grant seems like a good financial investment. Excellent benefit for cost.	This grant seems like a solid financial investment. Very good benefit for cost.	This grant seems like an OK financial investment. Average benefit for cost.	This grant seems like a poor financial investment. Low benefit for cost.	
Innovation/Creativity	Idea distinguishes itself from others. It is original, innovative and creative. Demonstrates a new way of thinking and meets a current or emerging need within a school or the district. Enriches the learning experience of students.	An engaging and interesting idea. Somewhat creative or innovative. Student learning experience would be positive.	A good idea but not very creative or innovative. Students would find the idea enjoyable.	Not creative, not innovative, not enriching to the students.	
Grammar, Punctuation, etc.	Punctuation is accurate, even creative. Spelling is correct. Proper grammar and usage enhance writing clarity with strong varied and purposeful sentences.	Punctuation is somewhat accurate, shows good command for readability. Grammar usage is good. Sentences get job done. Sentence structures attempt to vary.	Spelling errors are frequent and repeated. Random punctuation. Problems with grammar and usage. Sentence structures are simplistic and monotonous.	Spelling gets in way of content. Lack of punctuation or numerous errors. Sentences lack clarity, ramble, begin the same way, endlessly connect to others.	

Duration: While longer lasting impact does not necessarily give a grant greater merit, looking at duration can be a useful tool in measuring overall value. For discussion purposes, how would you categorize the duration of impact on students of this grant?

Please choose one:

☐ Short Term Impact (S) ~ one year or less
☐ Medium Term Impact (M) ~ 2-4 years
☐ Long Term Impact (L) ~ more than 4 years

Technology: Would you categorize this as a technology ask? Yes/No/Maybe

TFEF Policy: TFEF has a policy not to fund items that should be part of the regular school budget. Regarding this policy, do you have any concerns about this project? Yes/No (If yes, please detail your concerns.

Overall rank/recommendation for this grant:

☐ Fully Fund
☐ Partially Fund
☐ Do Not Fund