**SRG Application Review Components**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Process** |
| Part 1: Review of Written Turnaround Plan  | 3-person review teams (1 external reviewer, 2 internal ESE reviewers) read the written turnaround plan and develop a team score based on Scoring Rubric, generate questions and identify rubric items to be addressed in interview, and ensure proposal meets all federal requirements for the selected SRG model |
| Part 2: Budget Review | Internal SRG Budget review based on Scoring Rubric |
| Part 3: School and District Interview  | 3-person interview teams (1 external reviewer, 2 internal ESE reviewers) conducts a 2-hour school and district interview for each application and come to a team score based on Scoring Rubric |

**SRG Application Review Dimensions**

Each component of a SRG application for an eligible school will be reviewed along three rubric dimensions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Dimension** | **Explanation** |
| Capacity and Commitment | The extent to which the district and school demonstrate the capacity and commitment to use School Redesign Grant funds to support the Turnaround Plan and the successful implementation of the identified intervention model and strategies. |
| Data Analysis and Selection of Supports and Intervention Model | The extent to which the Turnaround Plan is based on a detailed analysis of current, accurate, and precise data, including but not limited to state assessments, educator data, and other student data. The extent to which the proposed intervention model and district support strategies are based upon an analysis of data. |
| Strategic and Actionable Approach | The extent to which the Turnaround Plan displays a strategic and well-thought out approach that will lead to rapid and sustainable improvement in targeted schools. A strategic and actionable plan includes, but is not limited to: (1) a theory of action or logic model, (2) key strategies and action steps that together affect each Turnaround Practice, and (3) specific benchmarks to track progress and a strategy for monitoring progress. |

**Scoring Criteria:**

All School Redesign Grant (SRG) written applications and interviews are scored against the following rubrics. Applications must receive a total combined score of at least 75 (out of 100) to be considered for funding.

**School Redesign Grant (SRG) Rubric Levels**

Each element within each dimension described above will be rated using the following scale.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Explanation** | **Points** |
| Strong | The response is clear, complete, and provides detailed, compelling evidence (including supporting documentation as appropriate) that meets the criteria listed in the rubric dimension. | 4 |
| Adequate | The response is clear, complete, and provides some evidence, that meets the criteria listed in the rubric dimension. | 3 |
| Marginal\* | The response is partially complete and provides only limited evidence that meets the criteria listed in the rubric dimension. | 2 |
| Weak\* | The response is incomplete and lacks evidence that meets the criteria listed in the rubric dimension. | 1 |
| Absent\* | No response or evidence is provided that addresses the criteria listed in the rubric dimension. | 0 |

\*If any rubric items are “marginal,” “weak” or “absent” during the review of the Turnaround Plan and Budget Review, those rubric items will move to the interview portion of the review process where school and district leaders will have the opportunity to provide additional information on rubric items that were not sufficiently addressed.

**Required Elements**

|  |
| --- |
| **Capacity and Commitment**Scoring Criteria: The extent to which the district and school demonstrate the capacity and commitment to use School Redesign Grant funds to support the Turnaround Plan and the successful implementation of the identified intervention model and strategies.  |
|  | **Strong - 4** | **Adequate - 3** | **Marginal - 2** | **Weak - 1** |
| 1: Turnaround Plan Executive Summary  | The overall rationale for school turnaround and key strategies that will be used to accelerate improvement in each turnaround practice are clearly described. | The overall rationale for school turnaround and key strategies that will be used to accelerate improvement in each turnaround practice are generally described. | The overall rationale for school turnaround and key strategies that will be used to accelerate improvement in each turnaround practice are vaguely described. | The overall rationale and key strategies that will be used to accelerate improvement in each turnaround practice are unclear. |
| 2:District Support | The plan provides a compelling and detailed description of how existing or new district resources, initiatives, technical support, and professional development will be allocated to and aligned with the needs of the school.  | The plan provides a general description of how existing or new district resources, initiatives, technical support, and professional development will be allocated to and aligned with the needs of the school.  | The plan provides a marginal description of how existing or new district resources, initiatives, technical support and professional development will be allocated to and aligned with the needs of the school, but there may be gaps or areas of misalignment.  | The plan provides a partial or weak description of how existing or new district, initiatives, technical support and professional development will be allocated to and aligned with the needs of the school.  |
| 3: District Capacity | The plan provides a detailed description of how the district has the ability and full complement of necessary authorities to support the principal’s implementation of the Turnaround Plan, including those related to principal/teacher evaluation, increased learning time, and school-level operational flexibilities (budget and staffing). Detailed evidence is provided that affected collective bargaining units are supportive of the Turnaround Plan.  | The plan provides a general description of how the district has the ability and necessary authorities to support the principal’s implementation of the Turnaround Plan, including those related to principal/teacher evaluation, increased learning time, and school-level operational flexibilities (budget and staffing). General evidence is provided that affected collective bargaining units are supportive of the Turnaround Plan.  | The plan provides a marginal or partial description of how the district has the ability and necessary authorities to support the principal’s implementation of the Turnaround Plan, including those related to principal/teacher evaluation, increased learning time, and school-level operational flexibilities (budget and staffing). Limited evidence is provided that affected collective bargaining units are supportive of the Turnaround Plan.  | The plan provides little to no description of how the district has the ability and necessary authorities to support the principal’s implementation of the Turnaround Plan. Limited or no evidence is provided that affected collective bargaining units are supportive of the Turnaround Plan.  |
| 4: School Leadership | The plan provides a detailed description of how the principal has the necessary competencies and experience to lead a successful school turnaround effort, including student performance data from previous school(s). If a new principal has yet to be chosen, the plan describes in detail how the district will recruit, screen and select a school leader that has a proven track record of rapidly advancing student achievement in a low-performing school. | The plan generally describes how the principal has the necessary competencies and experience to lead a successful school turnaround effort. If a new principal has yet to be chosen, the plan generally describes how the district will recruit, screen and select a school leader that has a proven track record of rapidly advancing student achievement in a low-performing school. | The plan demonstrates the district’s commitment to ensuring strong leadership at the school, but does not provide sufficient detail as to how it will recruit, screen and/or select a school leader with a proven track record of rapidly advancing student achievement in a low-performing school.  | The plan provides limited evidence that the district has a sufficient process for recruiting, screening, and selecting a proven turnaround leader for the school.  |
|  | **Strong - 4** | **Adequate - 3** | **Marginal - 2** | **Weak – 1** |
| 5: High-Quality Instructional Staff | The plan describes in detail how the district and/or school leadership will assess the will and skill of current staff to ensure the right instructional staff are in the right positions to successfully implement the Turnaround Plan AND describes in detail how the district and/or school leadership will recruit, screen and select high-quality instructional staff at the school to successfully implement the Turnaround Plan and the selected intervention model.  | The plan generally describes how the district and/or school leadership will assess the will and skill of current staff to ensure the right instructional staff are in the right positions to successfully implement the Turnaround Plan AND generally describes how the district and/or school leadership will recruit, screen and select high-quality instructional staff at the school to successfully implement the selected intervention model. | The plan generally describes how the district and/or school leadership will assess the will and skill of current staff to ensure the right instructional staff are in the right positions to successfully implement the Turnaround Plan OR generally describes how the district and/or school leadership will recruit, screen and select high-quality instructional staff at the school to successfully implement the selected intervention model. | The plan provides limited evidence that the district and/or school leadership has a sufficient process for recruiting, screening, and selecting high-quality instructional staff at the school to successfully implement the Turnaround Plan and selected intervention model. |
| 6: External Partners | The plan describes in detail how the district will recruit, screen and select external partners AND describes in detail systems/structures for coordinating and holding external providers accountable for meeting agreed-upon performance benchmarks. | The plan generally describes how the district will recruit, screen and select external partners AND generally describes systems/structures for coordinating and holding external providers accountable for meeting agreed-upon performance benchmarks. | The plan generally describes how the district will recruit, screen and select external partners OR generally describes systems/structures for coordinating and holding external providers accountable for meeting agreed-upon performance benchmarks. | The plan provides limited evidence of how the district will recruit, screen and select external partners and how they will be held accountable to agreed-upon performance benchmarks. |
| 7: Stakeholder Input | The plan provides a detailed description, including LSG recommendations, of how the district and school have gathered input from stakeholders to inform the Turnaround Plan AND how input from stakeholders will be used to support the continued implementation of the Turnaround Plan.  | The plan provides a general description, including LSG recommendations, of how the district and school gathered input from stakeholders to inform the Turnaround Plan AND how input from stakeholders will be used to support the continued implementation of the Turnaround Plan.  | The plan contains a brief statement that the district and school collected information from stakeholders to inform the Turnaround Plan, but it is unclear how input from stakeholders will be used to support the continued implementation of the Turnaround Plan.  | It is unclear if the district and school collected information from stakeholders to inform the Turnaround Plan and how input from stakeholders will be used to support the continued implementation of the Turnaround Plan.  |
| 8: School Teams | The plan provides a detailed description of each school-level team (i.e. instructional leadership team, data team, etc.) including a detailed explanation of how each team will support the management of the school’s Turnaround Plan, and how the work of all teams will be integrated to work together coherently.  | The plan provides a general description of each school-level team (i.e. instructional leadership team, data team, etc.) including a general explanation of how each team will support the management of the school’s Turnaround Plan and how the work of all teams will be integrated to work together coherently. | The plan provides a general description of each school-level team (i.e. instructional leadership team, data team, etc.) OR a general description of how each team will support the management of the school’s Turnaround Plan and how the work of all teams will be integrated to work together coherently. | The plan only identifies members of the school-level teams (i.e. instructional leadership team, data team, etc.). It unclear how school teams will support the management of the school’s Turnaround Plan.  |
|  | **Strong - 4** | **Adequate - 3** | **Marginal - 2** | **Weak – 1** |
| 9: Professional Collaboration | The plan describes in detail: structures and opportunities for fostering staff input into school decisions AND initiatives to build relationships and two-way communication across staff and school teams. | The plan generally describes: structures and opportunities for fostering staff input into school decisions AND initiatives to build relationships and two-way communication across staff and school teams. | The plan generally describes: structures and opportunities for fostering staff input into school decisions OR initiatives to build relationships and two-way communication across staff and school teams. | The plan provides a limited description of: structures and opportunities for fostering staff input into school decisions AND initiatives to build relationships and two-way communication across staff and school teams. |
| **Data Analysis for Selection of Supports and Intervention Model**Scoring Criteria: The extent to which the Turnaround Plan is based on a detailed analysis of current, accurate, and precise data, including but not limited to state assessments. The extent to which the proposed intervention model and district support strategies are based upon an analysis of data. |
|  | **Strong – 4** | **Adequate - 3** | **Marginal - 2** | **Weak – 1** |
| 10:Data Analysis | The plan includes the results from a detailed and accurate data/needs analysis process that incorporated multiple sources of data including demographic, achievement, perceptual and observational (e.g. classroom instruction or use of teacher collaborative time, etc.) data, probed for causation, identified and prioritized critical issues aligned to each Turnaround Practice.  | The plan includes the results from an adequate data/ needs analysis process based upon multiple sources of data including demographic, achievement, perceptual and observational (e.g. classroom instruction, use of teacher collaborative time, etc.) data and probed for causation. Critical issues under each Turnaround Practice are identified, but all may not be directly linked to the data analysis. | The plan includes the results from a marginal data/needs analysis process based upon only a few data sources. Critical issues under each Turnaround Practice are identified, but all may not be directly linked to the data analysis. | The plan lacks evidence that the district or school completed a comprehensive data/needs analysis.  |
| 11: Benchmarks Linked to Data | All implementation benchmarks are clearly described and explicitly linked to district and school-level data and needs analysis. | Most implementation benchmarks are clearly described and explicitly linked to district and school-level data and needs analysis. | Some of the implementation benchmarks are clearly described and generally linked to district and school-level data and needs analysis. | Few of the implementation benchmarks are clearly described and generally linked to district and school-level data and needs analysis. |
| 12: MAGs | All proposed MAGs are ambitious-yet-attainable and are clearly linked to a thorough analysis and understanding of the school’s current baseline data and identified strategies.  | Most proposed MAGs are ambitious-yet-attainable and are clearly linked to a thorough analysis and understanding of the school’s current baseline data and identified strategies. | Most proposed MAGs are ambitious-yet-attainable but are not clearly linked to a thorough analysis and understanding of the school’s current baseline data and/or identified strategies. | Few of the proposed MAGs are ambitious and/or attainable and the connection to the school’s current baseline data and/or identified strategies is unclear. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Strategic and Actionable Approach**Scoring Criteria: The extent to which the Turnaround Plan displays a strategic and well-thought out approach that will lead to rapid and sustainable improvement in targeted schools. A strategic and actionable plan includes, but is not limited to: (1) a theory of action or logic model, (2) key strategies and action steps that together affect each Turnaround Practice, and (3) specific benchmarks to track progress and a strategy for monitoring progress. |
|  | **Strong – 4** | **Adequate - 3** | **Marginal - 2** | **Weak – 1** |
| 13: Theory of Action | The plan describes a detailed and strategic theory of action focused on promoting rapid student achievement and building the school’s capacity to sustain efforts under each Turnaround Practice beyond the proposed funding schedule.  | The plan describes a general theory of action focused on promoting rapid student achievement and building the school’s capacity to sustain efforts under each Turnaround Practice beyond the proposed funding schedule.  | The plan’s theory of action is only marginally focused on promoting rapid student achievement and building the school’s capacity to sustain efforts under each Turnaround Practice beyond the proposed funding schedule.  | The plan’s theory of action is not clearly focused on promoting rapid student achievement and building the school’s capacity to sustain efforts under each Turnaround Practice beyond the proposed funding schedule.  |
| 14:Rationale for Model | The plan provides a clear and compelling rationale for the selection of the intervention model, how it is linked to the critical issues identified in the data analysis and, what the intervention model will allow the school to do that is different from previous reform efforts. | The plan provides a general explanation and justification for the selection of the intervention model, how it is linked to the critical issues identified in the data analysis, and what the intervention model will allow the school to do that is different from previous reform efforts. | The plan provides a general explanation for the selection of the intervention model, but is not clearly or only partially linked to critical issues identified in the data analysis. | The plan provides little explanation for the selection of the intervention model or how it is linked to critical issues identified in the data analysis. |
| 15: Strategic Approach | The plan exhibits a detailed strategic approach to school turnaround that prioritizes key strategies and actions. Key strategies are rigorous and clearly aligned to each Turnaround Practice. | The plan exhibits a strategic approach to school turnaround that prioritizes key strategies and actions. Key strategies are ambitious and aligned to each Turnaround Practice. | The plan exhibits a strategic approach to school turnaround that prioritizes key strategies and actions OR key strategies are ambitious and aligned to each Turnaround Practice.  | The plan does not present a strategic approach to school turnaround that prioritizes key strategies and actions AND key strategies are not ambitious or aligned to most Turnaround Practice areas. |
| 16:Strategic Benchmarks | Throughout the full plan, interim benchmarks (e.g., changes in discourse, actions, instruction, or belief) are precise, measurable, and time-bound (e.g., 3- 6- or 12-month; or by December 2016). Benchmarks are clearly aligned with the key strategies described in the plan, and there are clear connections between implementing a strategy and meeting the described benchmarks. | The plan provides many interim benchmarks (e.g., changes in discourse, actions, instruction, or belief) that are precise, measurable, and time-bound (e.g., 3- 6- or 12-month; or by December 2016). Benchmarks are mostly aligned with the key strategies described in the plan, and there are many connections between implementing a strategy and meeting the described benchmarks. | The plan provides some measureable interim benchmarks for accomplishing key strategies to address the areas of need identified in the plan. Benchmarks are marginally aligned with the key strategies described in the plan, and there are some connections between implementing a strategy and meeting the described benchmarks. | The plan lacks measureable interim benchmarks for accomplishing key strategies to address the areas of need identified in the plan. Benchmarks are minimally aligned with the key strategies described in the plan, and connections between implementing a strategy and meeting the described benchmarks are lacking. |
| 17: District Monitoring | The plan includes a detailed description of specific district systems and structures to monitor implementation benchmarks in the Turnaround Plan, evaluate the effectiveness of the selected intervention model at the school, and use data to target or refine supports, and inform future funding decisions and sustainability. | The plan generally describes district systems and structures to monitor implementation benchmarks in the Turnaround Plan, evaluate the effectiveness of the selected intervention model at the school, and use data to target or refine supports, and inform future funding decisions and sustainability. | The plan provides a basic description of district systems and structures to monitor implementation benchmarks in the Turnaround Plan, evaluate the effectiveness of the selected intervention model at the school, and use data to target or refine supports, and inform future funding decisions and sustainability. | The plan’s description of how the district will monitor implementation benchmarks in the Turnaround Plan, evaluate the effectiveness of the selected intervention model at the school, and use data to inform future funding decisions lacks specificity. |
|  | **Strong – 4** | **Adequate - 3** | **Marginal - 2** | **Weak – 1** |
| 18: School Monitoring | The plan provides a detailed description of how the school will collect data and monitor progress towards turnaround goals and benchmarks and how information and data will be used to modify strategies and initiatives.  | The plan generally describes how the school will collect data and monitor progress towards meeting benchmarks and how the information will be used to modify strategies and initiatives. | The plan states that the school will monitor progress towards meeting benchmarks, but there is little to no information about how the information will be used to modify strategies and initiatives.  | The plan provides a weak description of how the school will monitor progress towards meeting benchmarks and how the school will use data to modify strategies and initiatives.  |
| 19:5-Year Financial Plan | The 5-year financial plan exhibits a strategic use and alignment of resources; specifically identifies sources and amounts (either new or repurposed) of funds that will complement the grant funds to support timely implementation of the intervention model; and provides a thorough analysis of how critical intervention reforms will be sustained after the grant funds expire. | The 5-year financial plan exhibits a strategic use and alignment of resources; generally describes how the district/school will realign and repurpose other sources of funding that will complement the grant funds to support timely implementation of the intervention model; and provides a general description of how critical intervention reforms will be sustained after the grant funds expire. | The 5-year financial plan is not strategic; does not provide specific detail about how the district/school will use other resources or funds to complement the grant funds to support timely implementation of the intervention; or provides a limited description of how critical intervention reforms will be sustained after the grant funds expire. | The 5-year financial is not strategic; does not provide specific detail about how the district/school will use other resources or funds to complement the grant funds to support timely implementation of the intervention; and provides little to no description of how critical intervention reforms will be sustained after the grant funds expire. |

**Budget Review**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strong - 4** | **Adequate - 3** | **Marginal - 2** | **Weak - 1** |
| 24: Sufficient Size and Scope | The grant budget and budget narrative for district activities and for each identified school is of sufficient size and scope **to support full and effective implementation** of the selected intervention over the grant period. Full detail is provided for Year 1 and a reasonable overview is provided for anticipated costs in the following years. The plan provides evidence that district and school leadership has considered the cost implications of the selected interventions and how the interventions can be sustained after three years. | The grant budget request for district and school activities is of sufficient size and scope to support the full implementation of key strategies and interventions over the grant period. Detail is provided for Year 1 and a reasonable overview is provided for costs in the following years.  | The grant budget request for district activities and for each identified school is of sufficient size and scope to support the full implementation of most of the selected interventions over the grant period. It is unclear how certain aspects of the district’s approach and school-level strategies will be funded, either through the grant funds or other from other resources. | The grant budget request for district and school activities is not sufficient and will not support the full implementation of selected interventions and strategies over the grant period. It is unclear how central components of the district’s approach and school-level strategies will be funded. |
| 25: Quality of Budget Proposal | The budget narrative clearly justifies how all proposed grant expenditures are aligned, reasonable, necessary, and allowable to support the pre-implementation and implementation of the intervention model (e.g., principal and teacher incentives, extended learning and/or collaboration time, use of external partners). | The budget narrative clearly justifies how proposed grant expenditures are aligned, reasonable, necessary, and allowable to support the pre-implementation and implementation of the intervention model, though a few may require clarification. | The budget narrative provides an overall justification for proposed grant expenditures. A few aspects of the proposed budget may not be reasonable, necessary, or allowable and they require clarification. | The budget narrative provides little or no justification for proposed grant expenditures or many aspects of the proposed budget are not reasonable, necessary, or allowable. |

 **Interview Scoring Rubric**

**Interview Process**

All applicants will participate in a 2 hour interview that address the rubric items below, as well as any rubric items from the Required Elements and Budget Review that received a score of “2” or less. Rubric items moved from Required Elements and Budget Review will be rescored based on the interview team’s response and evidence within the written application.

During the interview, the Interview Team will be asked to provide a brief 15-20 minute presentation of the proposed Turnaround Plan. Following the presentation, the district and school team members will be jointly asked to respond to a set of standard questions and to address areas in the proposal that the review team identified as needing clarification or additional detail. The following Interview Scoring Rubric will be used during the interview process as well as the rubric for items moved from Required Elements and Budget Review.

**The Interview Team for each application** should include:

* From the **district**: (1) the Superintendent (or designee); (2) a member of the School Committee; (3) the district leader responsible for coordinating the implementation of school turnaround efforts; (4) and a member of the managing or lead partner team (if applicable); and
* Up to five individuals from the **school**: (1) the Principal (or designee); (2) a member of the school’s leadership team; (3) the administrator(s) responsible for coordinating and managing school turnaround effort (if applicable); and (4) teachers or other individuals (e.g., parents, students) that can speak to the willingness of the school to engage in the proposed turnaround effort.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strong - 4** | **Adequate – 3** | **Marginal - 2** | **Weak - 1** |
| 20: District Knowledge of Turnaround Plan and Readiness for Turnaround | District representatives clearly describe the central issues and needs facing the district and applicant school, provide a strong rationale for the selection of the intervention model, and discuss the major actions (policy, structural, cultural, other) that will occur as part of turnaround efforts. The team clearly describes how implementation challenges will be addressed.  | District representatives adequately describe the central issues and needs facing the district and applicant school, why the intervention model was chosen, and the major actions (policy, structural, cultural, other) that will occur as part of redesign efforts. The team generally describes how implementation challenges will be addressed.  | District representatives marginally describe the central issues and needs facing the district and applicant school, why the intervention model was chosen, and the major actions (policy, structural, cultural, other) that will occur as part of redesign efforts. It is not clear how implementation challenges will be addressed. | District representatives do not acknowledge or describe central issues and needs. Key implementation challenges are not voiced or there is no clear strategy for addressing challenges.  |
| 21: School Knowledge of Turnaround Plan and Readiness for Turnaround | School representatives clearly describe the central issues and needs facing the school, provide a strong rationale for the selection of the intervention model, and discuss the major actions (policy, structural, cultural, other) that will occur as part of turnaround efforts. The team clearly describes how implementation challenges will be addressed.  | School representatives describe the central issues and needs facing the school and explain why the intervention model was selected. There is general discussion of implementation challenges and the major actions that need to be taken.  | School representatives generally describe the issues and needs facing the school and provide some reasons for why the intervention model was selected. There is some discussion of implementation challenges and the major actions that need to be taken. | School representatives do not acknowledge or describe central issues and needs. Key implementation challenges are not voiced or there is no clear strategy for addressing challenges.  |
| 22: Unified Response | All team members describe a unified and systematic approach to turnaround and an urgency to change and improve, and each member is able to articulate their specific role in the school’s turnaround process.  | Most team members describe a unified and systematic approach to turnaround and an urgency to change and improve, and most members were able to articulate their specific role in the school’s turnaround process. | Most team members describe a unified and systematic approach to turnaround and an urgency to change and improve OR most members were able to articulate their specific role in the school’s turnaround process. | Only a few members answered the majority of questions, making it unclear if all team members were unified in the approach to turnaround, have a sense of urgency to change or improve, and aware of their specific roles in the turnaround process. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strong – 4** | **Adequate – 3** | **Marginal - 2** | **Weak – 1** |
| 23: Ability to Address Questions | School representatives fully address questions regarding proposed Turnaround Plan strategies and actions, specifically in any areas rated below adequate in the review of the Redesign Plan.  | School representatives adequately address nearly all of the questions regarding proposed redesign efforts, specifically in those areas rated below adequate in the review of the Redesign Plan. | School representatives marginally address some of the questions regarding proposed redesign efforts, specifically in those areas rated below adequate in the review of the Redesign Plan. | School representatives address none, or only a few of the questions in those areas rated below adequate in the review of the Redesign Plan. |

**School Redesign Grant Scoring Sheet**

District Name:

School Name:

Review Team:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Capacity and Commitment** | **Data Analysis for Selection of Supports and Intervention Model** | **Strategic and Actionable Approach** | **Total** | **Comments** |
| **Required Elements** | 36 | 12 | 28 | 76 |  |
| **Interview Score** | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |
| **Budget Review** |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |
| **Dimension Totals** | 52 | 12 | 36 | **100** |  |

**\*Applications must receive a total combined score of at least 75 (out of 100) to be considered for funding.**