**FY25 IAG Scoring Rubric**

|  |
| --- |
| *Required Criteria for Written Application: applicants must receive a “yes” on each item to be considered for funding.*  |
| The district instructional priority is listed (Section I) | **Yes** [ ]  | **No** [ ]  |
| The curriculum being used is provided and of high quality. If it is not HQ, then their application centers around their plan to obtain HQIM. (Section I) | **Yes** [ ]  | **No** [ ]  |

**Sections I and II: The Schools Instructional Priority and Budget (the written application)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rubric Item** | **Weak -1** | **Marginal -2** | **Adequate -3** | **Strong -4** |
| **School Instructional Priority**  | There is no alignment discussed between the school’s instructional priority and the district’s instructional priority.  | There is a weak alignment between the school’s instructional priority and the district’s instructional priority. The meaningful changes to educator practice are discussed on a superficial level. | The alignment between the school’s instructional priority and the district’s instructional priority is stated. The meaningful changes to educator practice are discussed, though more clarity could have been provided. | There is clear alignment between the school’s instructional priority and the district’s instructional priority. The school’s priority is grounded in equitable opportunities and outcomes for students, particularly those that are historically marginalized. The meaningful changes to educator practice are clearly articulated.  |
| **Analysis of Strengths and Challenges**  | A data analysis and the underlying systemic factors contributing to the challenges are not described. The data analysis, if present, does not include disaggregating by student groups. | While a data analysis is described, the explanation is vague and/or surface level. There is minimal discussion of the underlying systemic factors contributing to the challenges. The data analysis has little to no disaggregating by student groups. | A reasonable amount of data analysis is described. Underlying systemic factors contributing to the challenges are discussed. The data analysis includes disaggregating by student groups. | A clear data analysis is described. There is a clear articulation of the underlying systemic factors contributing to the challenges. The data analysis includes disaggregating by student groups. |
| **Stakeholder Engagement**  | The application does not describe how stakeholders were consulted, including students and families. The application barely describes, if at all, what input was gleaned from stakeholders or how they will be continually engaged throughout the process.  | The application vaguely describes how stakeholder input informed the plan. The stakeholder group, particularly from students and families, is partially representative of the overall population. The application generally describes what input was gleaned from stakeholders as well as how they will be continually engaged throughout the process.  | The application generally describes how stakeholder input informed the plan. The stakeholder group, particularly from students and families, is representative of the overall population. The application generally describes what input was gleaned from stakeholders as well as how they will be continually engaged throughout the process.  | The application clearly describes how stakeholder input informed the plan. The stakeholder group, particularly from students and families, is representative of the overall population. The application clearly describes what input was gleaned from stakeholders as well as how they will be continually engaged throughout the process.  |
| **Outcomes**  | The application barely, or not at all, identifies the targets that will be met from focusing on this priority. The application barely, or not at all, describes how the various tenets of quality instruction will look once efforts are successful. | The application vaguely identifies the targets that will be met from focusing on this priority. The application vaguely describes how the various tenets of quality instruction will look once efforts are successful. | The application generally identifies the targets that will be met from focusing on this priority. The application generally describes how the various tenets of quality instruction will look once efforts are successful. | The application clearly identifies the targets that will be met from focusing on this priority. The application clearly describes how the various tenets of quality instruction will look once efforts are successful. |
| **Role Clarity**  | The strategy to ensure all stakeholders understand their role in implementing this priority is not discussed or barely mentioned. | The strategy to ensure all stakeholders understand their role in implementing this priority is vaguely articulated, possibly including the roles of the district, school, and teacher levels, though if it is included, done at a brief level. | The strategy to ensure all stakeholders understand their role in implementing this priority is generally articulated, including role clarity at the district, school, and teacher levels. | The strategy to ensure all stakeholders understand their role in implementing this priority is clearly articulated, including role clarity at the district, school, and teacher levels.  |
| **Monitoring Implement-ation**  | Interim benchmarks are not identified or given only a cursory mention.  | A vague listing of interim benchmarks used to track progress throughout the year are identified. The benchmarks include some of the following: the roles of both the district and school, who will monitor these benchmarks, and how often they will be monitored. | A listing of interim benchmarks used to track progress throughout the year are identified, though they could be clearer. The benchmarks include the roles of both the district and school, who will monitor these benchmarks, and how often they will be monitored. | A clear listing of interim benchmarks used to track progress throughout the year are identified. The benchmarks include the roles of both the district and school, who will monitor these benchmarks, and how often they will be monitored.  |
| **Resources** | There is little to no explanation provided of the partnerships, programs, or resources used to support this priority. | There is a vague explanation provided of the partnerships, programs, or resources used to support this priority. | There is a general explanation provided of the partnerships, programs, or resources used to support this priority. | There is a clear explanation provided of the partnerships, programs, or resources used to support this priority.  |
| **School Leadership**  | Names and roles of the leadership team are either not listed or there are only 1-2 members. The team does not have the authority to make resource, scheduling, programmatic, and staffing decisions.  | A couple of names and roles of the leadership team are listed. The team has little authority to make resource, scheduling, programmatic, and staffing decisions. There is minimal representation from a range of leaders (e.g., academics, student support, special education, and Multilingual learners). | Several names and roles of the leadership team are listed. The team has some authority to make resource, scheduling, programmatic, and staffing decisions. There is some representation from a range of leaders (e.g., academics, student support, special education, and Multilingual learners). | Many names and roles of the leadership team are listed. The team has the authority to make resource, scheduling, programmatic, and staffing decisions. There is representation from a range of leaders (e.g. academics, student support, special education, and Multilingual learners). |
| **Participants creating the plan** | There may be a description of the racial breakdown of the student population and the staff implementing the plan. If there is a large difference between the two, no explanation of challenges and solutions are provided.  | There is a description of the racial breakdown of the student population and the staff implementing the plan. If there is a large difference between the two, then a vague explanation of challenges and solutions are provided.  | There is a description of the racial breakdown of the student population and the staff implementing the plan. If there is a large difference between the two, then a general explanation of challenges and solutions are provided.  | There is a description of the racial breakdown of the student population and the staff implementing the plan. If there is a large difference between the two, then a clear explanation of challenges and solutions are provided.  |
| **Budget**  | Funding may or may not align with district and school priorities to promote student success. Descriptions are missing or provide minimal insights into each activity. | Funding might align with district and school priorities to promote student success, though it is not clear. The descriptions give the reader a vague understanding of each activity. | Funding aligns with district and school priorities to promote student success. The descriptions give the reader a general understanding of each activity. | Funding aligns with district and school priorities to promote student success. The descriptions give the reader a clear understanding of each activity.  |
| **Equity Focus, particularly Racial Equity (no specific section; it should be embedded in various sections)** | Written answers grounded in racial equity appear minimally or not at all.  | Concepts of equity and goals to close opportunity gaps are vaguely mentioned. An equity lens might be used in areas like a review for disproportionality for students of color or accessing the language accessibility of the ML assessments, but it is not discussed in detail. | Written answers are generally grounded in concepts of equity and identify general goals to close the opportunity gap for all students, including students of color, students with a disability, students living in poverty, and students learning English. Policies, practices, and procedures are analyzed with an equity lens. | Written answers are clearly grounded in concepts of equity and identify clear goals to close the opportunity gap for all students, including students of color, students with a disability, students living in poverty, and students learning English.Policies, practices, and procedures are analyzed with an equity lens. |

**Sections III: The Quality of Instruction (the interview)**

|  |
| --- |
| *Required Criteria for Interview: applicants must receive a “yes” on each item to be considered for funding.*  |
| At least 10 classrooms were observed | **Yes** [ ]  | **No** [ ]  |
| The classrooms observed constitute a representative sample of the school | **Yes** [ ]  | **No** [ ]  |
| A representative sample of student work was used in data analysis | **Yes** [ ]  | **No** [ ]  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessing the Quality of Instruction**  | There is minimal discussion of patterns and trends that emerged from the classroom visits and student work. The discussion is not grounded in data. | There is a vague discussion of patterns and trends that emerged from either the classroom visits or student work that is grounded in data. A single data point was discussed. | There is a general discussion of patterns and trends that emerged from the classroom visits and student work that is grounded in data. A couple of data points are discussed. | There is a detailed discussion of patterns and trends that emerged from the classroom visits and student work that is grounded in data. Multiple data points are discussed. |
| **Identifying Strengths and Barriers**  | Educators cannot identify their strengths and barriers. The answers do not identify root causes and may blame students or families. | Educators vaguely articulate their strengths and what their current barriers to success are. The answers identify root causes that do not blame students or families. | Educators generally discuss their strengths and what their current barriers to success are. The answers identify root causes that do not blame students or families. | Educators can clearly articulate their strengths and what their current barriers to success are. The answers identify root causes that do not blame students or families. |
| **Vision for the Future** | There is little to no discussion of what the quality of instruction ***will*** look like in 3-5 years.  | There is a vague discussion of what the quality of instruction ***will*** look like in 3-5 years. The steps needed to realize this vision along with the metrics used to measure it are briefly discussed. Why the strategies were selected and how they are different than previous efforts are either not mentioned or barely discussed. | There is a general discussion of what the quality of instruction ***will*** look like in 3-5 years. The steps needed to realize this vision along with the metrics used to measure it are explained, though more detail would have been helpful. Why the strategies were selected and how they are different than previous efforts is explained, though more details would have been helpful. | There is a clear discussion of what the quality of instruction ***will*** look like in 3-5 years. The steps needed to realize this vision along with the metrics used to measure it are explained in detail, articulating why the strategies were selected and how they are different than previous efforts.  |
| **Equity Focus, particularly Racial Equity**  | Written answers grounded in racial equity appear minimally or not at all.  | Concepts of equity and goals to close opportunity gaps are vaguely mentioned. An equity lens might be used in areas like a review for disproportionality for students of color or accessing the language accessibility of the ML assessments, but it is not discussed in detail. | Written answers are generally grounded in concepts of equity and identify general goals to close the opportunity gap for all students, including students of color, students with a disability, and students learning English. Policies, practices, and procedures are analyzed with an equity lens, such as a review for disproportionality for students of color or accessing the language accessibility of the ML assessments. | Written answers are grounded in concepts of equity and identify clear goals to close the opportunity gap for all students, including students of color, students with a disability, and students learning English.Policies, practices, and procedures are analyzed with an equity lens, such as a review for disproportionality for students of color or accessing the language accessibility of the ML assessments. |