# Scoring Rubrics for K12 SWP Application 2019–2020

## Part 1. Scoring Rubric for Problem Statement and Project Objectives (Maximum Points: 25)

### A. Problem Statement (9 points)

Provide a brief Problem Statement that is concise, clear, and evidence-based, supporting the problem or need that your K12 SWP efforts will address (1,500 characters maximum). Be sure to include:

1. Local/regional workforce need informed by your region’s Strong Workforce Program Regional Plan.
2. Targeted underserved student populations requiring increased access and engagement in CTE.
3. Challenge(s) in current or new CTE pathway(s) that this plan will address.
4. Evidence that supports the above needs.

Scoring Rubric for Problem Statement

| **Very Strong (9 points)** | **Strong (6–8 points)** | **Moderate (2–5 points)** | **Weak (0–1 point)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Statement is clear and concise, describing problem or need.Statement clearly describes and provides convincing evidence of the following: * Local/regional workforce need.
* Targeted underserved students who need more opportunities for access and engagement.
* Challenges in current CTE programs or pathways that this plan will address.
 | Statement strongly describes problem or need.Statement includes description and some evidence of the following:* Local/regional workforce need.
* Targeted underserved students who need more opportunities for access and engagement.
* Challenges in current CTE programs or pathways that this plan will address.
 | Statement adequately describes a problem or need. It includes, but does not provide sufficient evidence for, the following:* Local/regional workforce need.
* Targeted underserved students who need more opportunities for access and engagement.
* Challenges in current CTE programs or pathways that this plan will address.
 | Statement lacks clarity or evidence base. Statement does not satisfactorily address:* Local/regional workforce need.
* Targeted underserved students who need more opportunities for access and engagement.
* Challenges in current CTE programs or pathways that this plan will address.
 |

### B. Project Objectives (8 points)

Provide clear, concrete objectives, which this project aims to achieve, to address the issues in the Problem Statement. Include how the LEA(s) is using the K12 SWP funds to help meet those objectives. Avoid statements of lofty goals (1,500 characters maximum).

You will have the opportunity to use the CTE Pathway/Program Work Plan to describe the specific activities that are planned for achieving these objectives.

Please include program objectives that:

1. Are informed by your Problem Statement and the region’s Strong Workforce Program Regional Plan (or Summary) and/or that address workforce needs in the local or regional economy.
2. Lead K–12 students to postsecondary studies.
3. Target improved access and engagement of underserved students.

Scoring Rubric for Project Objectives

| **Very Strong (8 points)** | **Strong (5–7 points)** | **Moderate (2–4 points)** | **Weak (0–1 point)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project objectives:* Clearly and completely align with the Problem Statement and link to workforce needs in the local or regional economy.
* Demonstrate how they will lead K–12 students to postsecondary studies.
* Target access and engagement gaps of underserved students.
 | Project objectives:* Are informed by the Problem Statement and address workforce needs in the local or regional economy.
* Lead K–12 students to postsecondary studies.
* Target access and engagement gaps of underserved students.
 | Project objectives:* Partially reference the issues in the Problem Statement and workforce needs in the local or regional economy.
* Direct K–12 students toward postsecondary studies.
* Reference access and engagement gaps of underserved students.
 | Project objectives:* May partially reference the issues in the Problem Statement and workforce needs in the local or regional economy.
* May not direct K–12 students toward post-secondary studies.
* May not reference access and engagement gaps of underserved students.
 |

### C. Local/Regional Economies (3 points)

1. Is the proposed CTE Program/Pathway located in an area with an unemployment rate above the state unemployment rate? (The state unemployment rate is 4.2% as of May 2019, CA Employment Development Department.)

| **2 point** | **0 points** |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |

2. Is the proposed CTE Program/Pathway located within a rural school district?

| **1 points** | **0 points** |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |

### D. Underserved Student Populations (5 points)

3. Does the proposed CTE Program/Pathway serve student subgroups that have a dropout rate higher than the state dropout rate? (The annual adjusted statewide grades 9–12 dropout rate is 2.4%, CDE 2016–17.)

| **2 points** | **0 points** |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |

4. Does the proposed CTE Program/Pathway serve the following unduplicated pupils: English learners, students who qualify for free or reduced-price meals, or foster youth?

| **2 points** | **0 points** |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |

5. Does the proposed CTE Program/Pathway serve K–12 students that are defined as special populations per Perkins V?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1 point** | **0 points** |
| Yes | No |

## Part 2. Scoring Rubric for CTE Pathway/Program Work Plan (Maximum Points: 60)

Column A. Work to be funded by K12 SWP (20 points)

| **Very Strong(19–20)**  | **Strong(13–18)** | **Moderate(6–12)** | **Weak(0–5)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The proposed activities and efforts demonstrate a direct connection to addressing the entire issue(s) in the Problem Statement.Provides a thorough and convincing description of how the specific activities and efforts will improve CTE programs or pathways.A coherent strategy is described to improve access and engagement for underserved students.Description includes cohesive planning and intermediary steps that are appropriate for the status of the CTE program or pathway—whether it is established or newly created.The description of the activities and efforts clearly focus on the selected K14 Pathway Quality Element(s).  | The proposed activities and efforts demonstrate a direct connection to addressing most of the issue(s) in the Problem Statement.Provides a clear description of how the specific activities and efforts will improve CTE programs or pathways.A reasonable strategy is described to improve access and engagement for underserved students.Description includes planning and intermediary steps that are appropriate for the status of the CTE program or pathway—whether it is established or newly created.The description of the activities and efforts focus on the selected K14 Pathway Quality Element(s).  | The proposed activities and efforts demonstrate a partial connection to addressing some of the issue(s) in the Problem Statement.Provides an adequate description of how the specific activities and efforts will improve CTE programs or pathways.A reasonable strategy is referenced for improving access and engagement for underserved students.Description includes some planning and intermediary steps that are appropriate for the status of the CTE program or pathway—whether it is established or newly created.The description of the activities and efforts partially focus on the selected K14 Pathway Quality Element(s).  | The proposed activities and efforts demonstrate a tangential or no connection to addressing some of the issue(s) in the Problem Statement.Provides a minimal description of how the specific activities and efforts will improve CTE programs or pathways.An inadequate strategy or no strategy is referenced for improving access and engagement for underserved students.Description includes minimal or no planning and intermediary steps that are appropriate for the status of the CTE program or pathway—whether it is established or newly created.The description of the activities and efforts do not focus on the selected K14 Pathway Quality Element(s).  |

Column B. Artifacts of activities (5 points)

| **Very Strong(5)** | **Strong****(4)** | **Moderate****(2–3)** | **Weak****(0–1)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Proposes a thorough set of artifacts, which convincingly shows evidence that the activities and efforts will occur during the grant period. | Proposes a set of artifacts, which shows strong evidence that the activities and efforts will occur during the grant period. | Proposes a set of artifacts, which shows adequate evidence that the activities and efforts will occur during the grant period. | Proposes one or more artifacts showing little or noevidence that the activities and efforts will occur during the grant period. |

Column C. Role of partner community college (15 points)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Very Strong(14–15)** | **Strong(11–13)** | **Moderate(5–10)** | **Weak(0–4)** |
| The role of community college partner(s) reflects deep commitment and high levels of collaboration with LEA to support the activities and efforts of the CTE programs or pathways.ORLEA has initiated plans for multiple and ongoing outreach efforts to build a collaborative relationship with community college partner(s). | The role of community college partner(s) reflects strong commitment and collaboration with LEA to support the activities and efforts of the CTE programs or pathways.ORLEA has initiated plans for several outreach efforts to build a collaborative relationship with community college partner(s). | The role of community college partner(s) reflects some commitment and adequate collaboration with LEA to support the activities and efforts of the CTE programs or pathways.ORLEA plans for adequate outreach efforts to build a collaborative relationship with community college partner(s). | The role of community college partner(s) reflects minimal or no collaboration with LEA to support the activities and efforts of the CTE programs or pathways.ORLEA plans minimal or no outreach efforts to build a collaborative relationship with community college partner(s). |

Column D. Collaborative partner(s), K–12 Partner Agency, and/or CTE resources (10 points)

| **Very Strong(10)** | **Strong (7–9)** | **Moderate(3–6)** | **Weak(0–2)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Support from * collaborative partner(s) (e.g., industry businesses or organizations),
* partnering LEAs, and/or
* existing CTE resources (e.g., committed funds for CTE)

provides direct support, plus useful services and resources for the selected K14 Pathway Quality Element. | Support from * collaborative partner(s) (e.g., industry businesses or organizations),
* partnering LEAs, and/or
* existing CTE resources (e.g., committed funds for CTE)

provides useful services and resources for the selected K14 Pathway Quality Element. | Support from * collaborative partner(s) (e.g., industry businesses or organizations),
* partnering LEAs, and/or
* existing CTE resources (e.g., committed funds for CTE)

provides adequate services and resources for the selected K14 Pathway Quality Element. | Support from * collaborative partner(s) (e.g., industry businesses or organizations),
* partnering LEAs, and/or
* existing CTE resources (e.g., committed funds for CTE)

provides minimal or no services and resources for the selected K14 Pathway Quality Element. |

Column E. Indicators of accomplishments (10 points)

| **Very Strong(10)** | **Strong****(7–9)** | **Moderate****(3–6)** | **Weak****(0–2)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Describes a comprehensive set of indicators that quantifies teachers, faculty, staff, and other stakeholders participating in activities designed to establish, improve, or expand CTE programs or pathways.The set of indicators reflects ongoing and active participation by all or most participants in the activities and efforts.One or more quantifiable indicators that directly measures access and engagement of specific, underserved student populations. | Describes a broad set of indicators that quantifies teachers, faculty, staff, and other stakeholders participating in activities designed to establish, improve, or expand CTE programs or pathways.The set of indicators reflects ongoing and active participation by some participants in the activities and efforts.One or more quantifiable indicators that directly measures access or engagement of specific, underserved student populations. | Describes a small set of indicators that somewhat quantifies teachers, faculty, staff, and other stakeholders participating in activities designed to establish, improve, or expand CTE programs or pathways.The set of quantifiable indicators reflects passive or single-event participation by some participants in the activities and efforts.One or more quantifiable indicators that reference access and engagement of non-specific, underserved student populations. | Describes one or more indicators that do not satisfactorily quantify teachers, faculty, staff, and other stakeholders participating in activities designed to establish, improve, or expand CTE programs or pathways.The one or more indicators reflect very minimal or passive participation by all participants in the activities and efforts.No or non-quantified indicator that addresses access and engagement of any underserved student populations. |

## Part 3. Scoring Rubric for K12 SWP Pathway/Program Budget and Match (Maximum Points: 15)

### A. Match (5 points)

1. Is at least 50% of the match financial?

| **5 points** | **0 points** |
| --- | --- |
| Yes, at least 50% of the match is financial. | No, at least 50% of the match is not financial. |

### B. Budget (10 points)

1. Are budget allocations reasonably aligned with the work plan? Reasonable is defined by the dictionary as agreeable to sound judgment, not exceeding the limit prescribed by reason (not excessive), moderate in price, and a rational decision.

| **10 points** | **5 points** | **0 points** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Yes, budget allocations are reasonably aligned with the work plan. | Somewhat, however, there are multiple concerns about misalignment between the budget and work plan. | No, there is no alignment between the budget and work plan. |