Connections for Classrooms Round 5
Application Scoring Rubric

Round 5 applications will be evaluated for their ability to achieve the objectives of the Connections for Classrooms program. Independent reviewers will evaluate applications using the scoring rubric outlined below. The total points possible are 100.

The same rubric is used regardless of priority area or whether the applicant is a school or district.

Scoring Rubric Points Possible by Application Section	
Section 1: Applicant Information	0
Section 2: Grant Funding Request Amounts	0
Section 3: Description of Network/Device Inventory and Statement of Need	20
Section 4: Equipment Selection/Deployment/Maintenance Plans	15
Section 5: Incremental Investment Tie-In	10
Section 6: Digital Learning Plans	35
Section 7: Instructional Staff Readiness Plans	20
Section 8: Binding Authority and Assurances	0
TOTAL	100

Section 3: Description of Network/Device Inventory and Statement of Need (20 points)		
Evaluation	**Description**	**Points**
Exemplary	The applicant clearly describes the schools' current network capacity, inventory of devices used in instruction, and how the requested equipment is the most critical next step for the district/school. The application includes clear descriptions of prior network/device investment, the leveraging of available local options (SPLOST, BYOD, Title funds, QBE funds, other funds, and local partnerships), and why these other options are not enough. The description aligns with the data submitted in the GaDOE's annual technology survey.	20
Satisfactory	The applicant provides sufficient description of the schools' current network capacity, inventory of devices used in instruction, and how the requested equipment is the most critical next step for the district/school. The application includes descriptions of prior network/device investment, the leveraging of available local options (SPLOST, BYOD, Title funds, QBE funds, other funds, and local partnerships), and why these other options are not enough. However, the application lacks some details, it may be unclear whether all other funding options have been exhausted or that the requested equipment is the most critical next step for the district/school. The description at least mostly aligns with the data submitted in the GaDOE's annual technology survey.	14
Poor	The applicant's description of the schools' current network capacity, inventory of devices used in instruction, and how the requested equipment is the most critical next step for the district/school has inconsistencies or lacks details. In addition, the application's descriptions of prior network/device investment, the leveraging of available local options (SPLOST, BYOD, Title funds, QBE funds, other funds, and local partnerships), and why these other options are not enough do not provide compelling evidence of local investment or commitment and the exhausting of other funding options. The description has inconsistencies with the data submitted in the GaDOE's annual technology survey or is not complete enough to determine alignment.	8
Unsatisfactory	The applicant's description of the schools' current network capacity, inventory of devices used in instruction, and how the requested equipment is the most critical next step for the district/school is missing or very incomplete. In addition, the application's descriptions of prior network/device investment, the leveraging of available local options, and why these other options are insufficient are missing or demonstrate a lack of local commitment. The description does not align with the data submitted in the GaDOE's annual technology survey or is not complete enough to determine alignment.	0

Section 4: Equipment Selection/Deployment/Maintenance Plans (15 points)		
Evaluation	**Description**	**Points**
Exemplary	The LEA demonstrates clear and detailed planning for equipment procurement tailored to their needs outlined in Section 3 and subsequent deployment and management. The applicant clearly describes how the equipment was selected or will be selected through procurement to best fit the LEA's digital learning plans outlined in Section 6, including the steps that have been or will be taken to ensure competitive pricing. The plan also outlines clear chain of custody processes (applicable only for digital devices), maintenance during and between school years, and the expected equipment life. The budget information is complete and aligns with the requested total funds.	15
Satisfactory	The LEA demonstrates sufficient planning for equipment procurement tailored to their needs outlined in Section 3 as well as subsequent deployment and management. The applicant describes how the equipment was selected or will be selected through procurement to best fit the LEA's digital learning plans outlined in Section 6, including the steps that have been or will be taken to ensure competitive pricing. The plan also outlines clear chain of custody processes (applicable only for digital devices), maintenance during and between school years, and the expected equipment life. However, the description lacks details or has inconsistences in some places. The budget information is complete and aligns with the requested total funds.	10
Poor	The LEA demonstrates incomplete planning for equipment procurement that does not align with needs outlined in Section 3 as well as subsequent deployment and management. The applicant does not fully describe how the equipment was selected or will be selected through procurement to best fit the LEA's digital learning plans outlined in Section 6, and it may also lack a description of the steps that have been or will be taken to ensure competitive pricing. The plan lacks clarity in terms of the chain of custody processes (applicable only for digital devices), maintenance during and between school years, and the expected equipment life, casting doubt on whether equipment would be managed appropriately. The budget information is not fully complete or does not align with the requested total funds.	5
Unsatisfactory	The LEA demonstrates little to no planning for equipment procurement, deployment and management. The applicant includes little or no description of how the equipment was selected or will be selected through procurement, steps taken to ensure competitive pricing, chain of custody (applicable only for digital devices), maintenance, and equipment life. The budget information is incomplete and does not align with the requested total funds.	0

Section 5: Incremental Investment Tie-In (10 points)

Evaluation	Description	Points
Exemplary	Requests for network equipment (Priorities 1 or 2) clearly describe what steps have been taken or will be taken to ensure the network can accommodate requested equipment, included sufficient bandwidth capacity and surrounding wiring/equipment necessary for full equipment utilization. Requests for digital devices (Priority 3) clearly describe what steps have been taken or will be taken to ensure the network can accommodate devices for simultaneous usage, including sufficient bandwidth capacity, internal fiber/wiring, switch capacity, and wireless access point (WAP) deployment. The applicant clearly describes how this application aligns with the district or school's technology plan. If the applicant received a prior CFC grant award, the application clearly describes how a Round 5 grant will complement that initial investment. If the applicant did not apply for prior CFC grant awards, the application clearly describes why the LEA did not apply for prior funds and how a Round 5 grant will complement its current network efforts.	10
Satisfactory	Requests for network equipment (Priorities 1 or 2) describe what steps have been taken or will be taken to ensure the network can accommodate requested equipment, included sufficient bandwidth capacity and surrounding wiring/equipment necessary for full equipment utilization. Requests for digital devices (Priority 3) describe what steps have been taken or will be taken to ensure the network can accommodate devices for simultaneous usage, including sufficient bandwidth capacity, internal fiber/wiring, switch capacity, and wireless access point (WAP) deployment. The applicant describes how this application aligns with the district or school's technology plan. However, some details are lacking that may cast doubt on whether the requested equipment will be fully utilized. If the applicant received a prior CFC grant award, the application describes how a Round 5 grant will complement that initial investment. If the applicant did not apply for prior CFC grant awards, the application describes why the LEA did not apply for prior funds and how a Round 5 grant will complement its current network efforts.	7
Poor	The applicant has made some network preparations, but the incomplete description casts doubt on its network readiness when equipment or devices are deployed. The applicant includes a general discussion of what steps have been taken or will be taken to ensure the schools' networks are prepared to accommodate the equipment or devices. However, the plan lacks significant details on several required components (bandwidth capacity, internal fiber/wiring, switch capacity, and wireless access point (WAP) deployment) or alignment with its district/school technology plan, indicating that the network may not be prepared to fully leverage the requested equipment or devices. If the applicant received a prior CFC grant award, there is some description, but it lacks details. If the applicant did not apply for prior CFC grant awards, the application has limited or no description of why the LEA did not apply for prior funds and a general description for how a Round 5 grant will complement its current network efforts.	4
Unsatisfactory	The applicant's network is not prepared to accommodate requested equipment. The applicant provides little or no description of what steps have been taken or will be taken to ensure the schools' networks are prepared to accommodate the additional devices for simultaneous usage. There is limited or no description of alignment with its district or school technology plan and how past Connections for Classrooms or other network efforts compliment this grant application.	0

Section 6: Digital Learning Plans (35 points)		
Evaluation	**Description**	**Points**
Exemplary	The applicant clearly describes its strategy to change instruction to implement digital learning as a result of receiving this grant, specifically facilitating learning with technology that gives students some control over time, place, path, and/or pace. Applicant provides a clear link to improved student outcomes. Applicant clearly describes what this grant will enable that is not possible under the district's/school's current device inventory.	35
Satisfactory	The applicant clearly describes its strategy to change instruction to implement digital learning as a result of receiving this grant, specifically facilitating learning with technology that gives students some control over time, place, path, and/or pace. However, the applicant either does not provide a clear link to improved student outcomes or does not clearly describe what this grant will enable that is not possible under the district's/school's current infrastructure.	25
Poor	The applicant does not clearly describe its strategy to change instruction to implement digital learning as a result of receiving this grant, specifically facilitating learning with technology that gives students some control over time, place, path, and/or pace. These terms may be described in the narrative, but in general terms that lack clarity on how instruction will actually be changed. While the applicant may mention student outcomes, the narrative seems to focus mostly on the device integration rather than how that integration will change instruction and increase student outcomes.	15
Unsatisfactory	The applicant does not demonstrate how this grant will facilitate learning with technology that gives students some control over time, place, path, and/or pace. The narrative lacks details or focuses strictly on the device integration rather than how that integration will change instruction and increase student outcomes. Any discussion of students is not clearly linked to improved outcomes.	5

Section 7: Instructional Staff Readiness Plans (20 points)		
Evaluation	**Description**	**Points**
Exemplary	The school/district demonstrates clear capacity to ensure that instructional staff members are able to successfully integrate increased connectivity or additional devices into their instruction and allow students to have a measure of control over the time, path, place, and/or pace of learning. The plan clearly articulates how the school/district will diagnose and address instructional staff learning needs. The plan has specific and attainable measures to gauge success of the support provided.	20
Satisfactory	The school/district demonstrates sufficient capacity to ensure that instructional staff members are able to successfully integrate increased connectivity or additional devices into their instruction and allow students to have a measure of control over the time, path, place, and/or pace of learning. The plan articulates how the school/district will diagnose and address instructional staff learning needs, but some details on diagnosing need or follow up based upon needs are either lacking or unclear. The plan includes attainable measures to gauge success of the support provided, but they may lack some specificity.	14
Poor	The school/district does not clearly demonstrate that instructional staff members will be able to integrate increased connectivity or additional devices into their instruction and allow students to have a measure of control over the time, path, place, and/or pace of learning. It does not clearly describe how the school/district will diagnose and address instructional staff learning needs. Or, the plan generically describes school- or district-wide professional development efforts that may diagnose and address learning needs but that are not directly related to technology integration and digital learning. The plan includes measures to gauge success of the support provided, but they lack specificity or are not measurable.	8
Unsatisfactory	The school/district does not appear prepared to ensure that instructional staff members will be able to integrate increased connectivity or additional devices into their instruction and allow students to have a measure of control over the time, path, place, and/or pace of learning. Significant details are missing or incomplete. Or, the plan generically describes school- or district-wide professional development efforts that do not clearly diagnose and address learning needs and are not directly related to technology integration and digital learning. The plan does not include measures of success of the support provided.	0