

Connections for Classrooms Digital Learning Device Rural Grant Program Application Scoring Rubric

Posted July 21, 2016

Applications for the Digital Learning Device Rural Grant Program 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.

Scoring Rubric Points Possible by Application Section	
Section 1: Applicant Information	0
Section 2: Grant Funding Request Amounts	0
Section 3: Description of Current Device Inventory and Statement of Need	15
Section 4: Device Selection/Deployment/Maintenance Plans	20
Section 5: Assurance of Network Preparedness for Effective Device Usage	15
Section 6: Digital Learning Plans	35
Section 7: Instructional Staff Readiness Plans	15
Section 8: Binding Authority and Assurances	0
TOTAL	100

Connections for Classrooms Grant Program
Digital Learning Device Rural Grant Program Application Scoring Rubric

Section 3: Description of Current Device Inventory and Statement of Need (15 points)		
Evaluation	Description	Points
Exemplary	The LEA has a clear need for devices and has exhausted other funding options. The applicant clearly describes the schools' current inventory of devices (laptops, tablets, or other mobile devices) that meet minimum Georgia Milestones requirements and are used in instruction. It includes clear descriptions of prior 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 inventory.	15
Satisfactory	The LEA has a clear need for devices and has exhausted some other funding options. The applicant clearly describes the schools' current inventory of devices (laptops, tablets, or other mobile devices) that meet minimum Georgia Milestones requirements and are used in instruction. The application includes sufficient descriptions of prior 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 or it may be unclear whether all other funding options have been exhausted or fully considered. The description aligns with the data submitted in the GaDOE's annual technology inventory.	10
Poor	The LEA has a need for devices, but the need is not clearly articulated and other funding options have not been exhausted. The applicant's description of the schools' current inventory of devices (laptops, tablets, or other mobile devices) that meet minimum Georgia Milestones requirements and are used in instruction has inconsistencies or lacks details. In addition, the application's descriptions of prior 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 does not align with or is not complete enough to determine alignment with the data submitted in the GaDOE's annual technology inventory.	5
Unsatisfactory	The LEA's need for devices is unclear and other funding options have not been exhausted. The applicant's description of the schools' current inventory of devices is missing or very incomplete. In addition, the application's descriptions of prior 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 or is not complete enough to determine alignment with the data submitted in the GaDOE's annual technology inventory.	0

Connections for Classrooms Grant Program
Digital Learning Device Rural Grant Program Application Scoring Rubric

Section 4: Device Selection/Deployment/Maintenance/Technical Support Plans (20 points)		
Evaluation	Description	Points
Exemplary	The LEA demonstrates clear and detailed planning for device procurement tailored to their needs outlined in Section 3 and subsequent deployment and management of the devices. All requested devices are compliant with Georgia Milestones requirements. The applicant clearly describes how the devices were 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, maintenance during and between school years, how technical support will be provided during instructional time, and the expected device life. The budget information is complete and aligns with the requested total funds.	20
Satisfactory	The LEA demonstrates sufficient planning for device procurement tailored to their needs outlined in Section 3 as well as subsequent deployment and management of the devices. All requested devices are compliant with Georgia Milestones requirements. The applicant describes how the devices were 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, maintenance during and between school years, how technical support will be provided during instructional time, and the expected device life. However, the description lacks details or has inconsistencies in some places. The budget information is complete and aligns with the requested total funds.	14
Poor	The LEA demonstrates incomplete planning for device procurement that does not align with needs outlined in Section 3 as well as subsequent deployment and management of the devices. Some of the requested devices may not be compliant with Georgia Milestones requirements. The applicant does not fully describe how the devices were 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, maintenance during and between school years, how technical support will be provided during instructional time, and the expected device life, casting doubt on whether devices would be managed appropriately. The budget information is not fully complete or does not align with the requested total funds.	8
Unsatisfactory	The LEA demonstrates little to no planning for device procurement, deployment and management of the devices. Some or all of the requested devices may not be compliant with Georgia Milestones requirements. The applicant includes little or no description of how the devices were selected or will be selected through procurement, steps taken to ensure competitive pricing, how students will be assigned devices, nor how devices will be maintained, nor how technical support will be provided. The budget information is incomplete and does not align with the requested total funds.	0

Connections for Classrooms Grant Program
Digital Learning Device Rural Grant Program Application Scoring Rubric

Section 5: Assurance of Network Preparedness for Effective Device Usage (15 points)		
Evaluation	Description	Points
Exemplary	The LEA’s network preparations are detailed and clearly outline how it will accommodate requested devices. A certification document or letter from the vendor or another external party ensuring network preparedness has been included. The applicant clearly describes what steps have been taken or will be taken to ensure the schools’ networks are prepared to accommodate the additional devices for simultaneous usage, including sufficient bandwidth capacity, internal fiber/wiring, switch capacity, and wireless access point (WAP) deployment. If the applicant received a prior CFC grant award, the application clearly describes how a Digital Learning Device Rural Grant Program 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 Digital Learning Device Rural Grant Program grant will complement its current network efforts.	15
Satisfactory	The LEA’s network preparations are sufficiently prepared to accommodate requested devices. A certification document or letter from the vendor or another external party ensuring network preparedness has been included. The applicant describes what steps have been taken or will be taken to ensure the schools’ networks are prepared to accommodate the additional devices for simultaneous usage, including sufficient bandwidth capacity, internal fiber/wiring, switch capacity, and wireless access point (WAP) deployment. However, the summary lacks some details. If the applicant received a prior CFC grant award, the application describes how a Digital Learning Device Rural Grant Program 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 Digital Learning Device Rural Grant Program grant will complement its current network efforts.	10
Poor	The LEA has made some network preparations, but the incomplete description casts doubt on its network readiness when devices are deployed. A certification document or letter from the vendor or another external party ensuring network preparedness was not included. 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 additional devices for simultaneous usage. However, the plan lacks significant details on several required components (bandwidth capacity, internal fiber/wiring, switch capacity, and wireless access point (WAP) deployment), indicating that the network may not be prepared to fully leverage the requested 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 Digital Learning Device Rural Grant Program grant will complement its current network efforts.	5
Unsatisfactory	The LEA’s network is not prepared to accommodate requested devices. A certification document or letter from the vendor or another external party ensuring network preparedness was not included. 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 how past Connections for Classrooms or other network efforts compliment this grant application.	0

Connections for Classrooms Grant Program
Digital Learning Device Rural Grant Program Application Scoring Rubric

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 LEA'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 LEA'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 of 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

Connections for Classrooms Grant Program
Digital Learning Device Rural Grant Program Application Scoring Rubric

Section 7: Instructional Staff Readiness Plans (15 points)		
Evaluation	Description	Points
Exemplary	The LEA demonstrates clear capacity to ensure that instructional staff members are able to successfully integrate requested 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 LEA will diagnose and address instructional staff learning needs. The plan has specific and attainable measures to gauge success of the support provided.	15
Satisfactory	The LEA demonstrates sufficient capacity to ensure that instructional staff members are able to successfully integrate requested 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 LEA 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.	10
Poor	The LEA does not clearly demonstrate that instructional staff members will be able to integrate requested 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 LEA will diagnose and address instructional staff learning needs. Or, the plan generically describes LEA-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.	5
Unsatisfactory	The LEA does not appear prepared to ensure that instructional staff members will be able to integrate requested 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 LEA-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