CONNECTIONS FOR CLASSROOMS GRANT TECHNICAL REVIEWER RUBRIC

Each application will be reviewed by at least two educational impact reviewers and two technical reviewers. Each reviewer type has a rubric that totals 50 possible points. The following rubric shows the technical reviewer rubric.

Criteria	Exemplary	Satisfactory	Poor	Unsatisfactory
Supplemental Funding (LEA Investment & E-Rate Participation) **(5 points)** *Application Section 2*	*Applicant provides complete supplemental funding data for both E-Rate participation and LEA investment. In addition, the LEA is maximizing its E-Rate 2013 and 2014 participation. The narrative demonstrates a strong commitment to investment in network and server infrastructure and how equipment/services requested in the application align with that commitment.* **(5 points)**	*Applicant provides complete supplemental funding data for E-Rate participation and LEA investment. However, the LEA is either not using E-Rate funding to its maximum potential, or its investment in network and server infrastructure is limited.* **(3 points)**	*Applicant only provides partial supplemental funding data and E-Rate participation. The LEA is not using E-Rate funding to its maximum potential, and its investment in network and server infrastructure is limited.* **(1 points)**	*The Applicant provides no supplemental funding information for either E-Rate participation or LEA investment, or the information presented demonstrates little or no E-Rate utilization and local investment.* **(0 points)**
Project Readiness (15 points) Application Section 1 *Application Uploads:* -Technical Design Validation Letter -Cost Validation Documents -LEA Inventory/Gap Planning Spreadsheet	*Technical designs are validated in line with Grant Guidelines document. Project costs are validated with vendor quotes, RFI responses, and/or other cost validation. The LEA Inventory/GAP Planning Spreadsheet provides complete information on comprehensive broadband network planning and project readiness, and the information provided is aligned with the requested grant amount.* **(15 points)**	*Two of the three elements evaluated in this criterion meet the "Exemplary" description (Technical Design Validation Letter, Cost Validation documents, and LEA Inventory/Gap Planning Spreadsheet). However, one element lacks clear or complete information. Or, the information on all three elements is complete and clear, but it does not directly align with the requested grant amount.* **(10 points)**	*One of the three elements evaluated in this criterion meets the "Exemplary" description (Technical Design Validation Letter, Cost Validation documents, and LEA Inventory/Gap Planning Spreadsheet). However, two elements lack clear or complete information. Or, the information on all three elements mostly complete but critical details are lacking. In addition, the information does not directly align with the requested grant amount.* **(5 points)**	*All three elements lack sufficient information and detail required to demonstrate project readiness or provide justification for requested grant amount.* **(0 points)**

CONNECTIONS FOR CLASSROOMS GRANT TECHNICAL REVIEWER RUBRIC

Criteria	Exemplary	Satisfactory	Poor	Unsatisfactory
Project Implementation Plan & Budget **(20 points)** *Application Uploads:* -Project Implementation Plan -Grant Request Budget Table	Applicant provides a project implementation plan that is aligned with the Grant Guidelines document. The plan clearly outlines how objectives will be achieved in a timely manner within its outlined budget. It also includes clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, milestones, and sustainability plans. Budget figures are clear, easily interpretable, and reasonable for the proposed project. *(20 points)*	Applicant provides a project implementation plan that is aligned with the Grant Guidelines document. The plan outlines how objectives will be achieved in a timely manner within its outlined budget. However, some details are missing on defined responsibilities, timelines, milestones, and sustainability plans. Budget figures are clear, easily interpretable, and reasonable for the proposed project. *(14 points)*	Applicant provides a project implementation plan that does not align with the Grant Guidelines document. The plan does not clearly show how the project will be achieved in a timely manner within its outlined budget. While the plan has information on defined responsibilities, timelines, milestones, and sustainability plans, it lacks significant details that are critical for successful implementation. Budget figures are unclear or are not reasonable for the proposed project. *(8 points)*	Applicant provides a project implementation plan that does not align with the Grant Guidelines document. The plan does not clearly show how the project will be achieved in a timely manner within its outlined budget. The plan lacks significant details throughout the defined responsibilities, timelines, milestones, and sustainability plans. Budget figures are missing or unclear, or the figures are not reasonable for the proposed project. *(0 points)*
Team Roster **(5 points)** *Application Section 4*	Applicant provides a complete team roster inclusive of the project lead and at least one additional LEA staff member. The roster includes names, contact information, and project titles indicating responsibilities for all involved LEA staff. The roster aligns with the responsibilities listed in the Project Implementation Plan. *(5 points)*	Applicant provides a complete team roster inclusive of the project lead and at least one additional LEA staff member. The roster includes names, contact information, and project titles indicating responsibilities for all involved LEA staff. However, the roster does not consistently align with the responsibilities listed in the Project Implementation Plan. *(3 points)*	Applicant provides information only for a project lead/manager. The roster does not align with the Project Implementation Plan. *(1 point)*	Applicant does not provide a team roster. *(0 points)*
Tier 4 Information **(5 points)** *Application Section 5*	Applicant provides a clear strategy for Tier 4 implementation that includes its intended approach for implementation (One-to-one, BYOD, Hybrid, or Other) and cost estimates. Or, the Applicant indicates that it does not plan to apply for future Tier 4 funding. *(5 points)*	Applicant provides a strategy for Tier 4 implementation that includes its intended approach for implementation (One-to-one, BYOD, Hybrid, or Other) and cost estimates. However, some details or cost estimates are missing. *(3 points)*	Applicant provides some strategy information for Tier 4 implementation. The information on the intended approach for implementation (One-to-one, BYOD, Hybrid, or Other) and cost estimates is either missing or incomplete. *(1 point)*	Applicant indicates that the LEA plans to apply for Tier 4 funding but does not provide any further information. *(0 points)*
				Total Points (out of 50)