## Peer Reviewer Scoring Rubric for the McKinney Vento Grant<sup>1</sup>

Reviewer ID #	
Applicant's Name	

The McKinney-Vento grant is competitive. Proposals that receive higher peer reviewer scores increase their likelihood of approval and receipt of funding at requested levels. IDOE staff conducts a final review of all applications to ensure fidelity, compliance with requirements, and determine final budgets awarded.

Peer reviewer scoring instructions:

- Assign a numeric score to each component of each part below. A response may have components that fit multiple descriptions (e.g. meeting and exceeding). The peer reviewer will assign the score that best fits the overall response.
- Peer reviewer must provide comments for each section justifying scores awarded.
- Comments must provide specific examples to substantiate these scores.
- Use whole numbers for scoring.

Rating Scale

Not Meeting/Approaching	Meeting	Exceeding
0 Points	2-3 Points	4-5 Points

<sup>1</sup> Revised June 2019

	Assurances Total Points Available: 5		
	0 Points		5 Points
	Assurances are not signed.		Assurances are complete with all signatures.
		Part A: Needs Assessment Total Points Available: 25	
	0 Points	3 Points	5 Points
A.1 Score:	There is not a clear indication whether the applicant will use Option 1: individual LEA application or Option 2: consortium application	The applicant is using Option 1: individual LEA application	The applicant is using Option 2: consortium application
	Part A: Needs Assessment		
	Not Meeting/Approaching 0 Points	Meeting 3 Points	Exceeding 5 Points
A.2 Score:	The applicant provides little to no data regarding the homeless student population. If applicable, the applicant does not provide the necessary information regarding homeless student data discrepancies.	Partial information is offered to defend the need for the grant. Vague summaries of homeless student populations may be offered, or information is only offered for parts of the question (homeless student counts, only certain grade levels, etc). Rationale for discrepancies in data is insufficient. Application provides a minimal plan to address these	The applicant demonstrates need through substantial data of homeless students by grade level. If applicable, data discrepancies of number of homeless/students in transition are thoroughly addressed.

		discrepancies.	
A.3 Score:	The applicant provides minimal to no explanation of their homeless students' specific needs.	The applicant only describes some of the needs of homeless students. The description of population may not be unique to the service area.	The applicant provides thorough explanation of their homeless students' specific needs. The applicant demonstrates collaboration with students and families to determine the homeless students' specific needs.
A.4 Score:	The applicant does not provide a description of compliance for McKinney-Vento law compliance.	The applicant states that there is compliance with the McKinney-Vento law, but does not provide a thorough description demonstrating stated compliance.	The applicant fully describes how they assure full McKinney-Vento law compliance.
A.5 Score:	The applicant does not provide an explanation of current policies that assure homeless students understand their rights. Preventative measures against homeless students being stigmatized or isolated are not mentioned. LEA notice for rights for homeless students and dispute resolution process is not included.	Current policies regarding homeless students rights are briefly mentioned or described. Preventative measures against homeless students being stigmatized or isolated are not mentioned or vaguely described. LEA notice of rights for homeless students and dispute resolution process may or may not be included.	The applicant provides a detailed explanation of the current policies to assure homeless students understand their rights. Preventative measures against homeless students being stigmatized or isolated are thoroughly described. LEA notice of rights for homeless students and dispute resolution process is included.
Part A Total Score: /25	Part A: Needs Assessment Comme	ents:	•
	Part B: Project Description Total Points Available: 55		

	Not Meeting/Approaching 0 Points	Meeting 3 Points	Exceeding 5 Points
B.1 Score:	Project's mission statement is missing or vaguely stated. No mention of the project's target audience. Partners are mentioned but no description is offered. Activities may or may not be listed, no description of activities is offered.	A brief description of the projects mission is offered. Some description or mention of the target audience is offered. Partners may or may not be mentioned and briefly described. Activities expected to take place are briefly described.	The applicant has a clear and thorough explanation of the project's mission, and description of target audience. Partners in the project and their roles are thoroughly described as well as activities expected to take place.
B.2 Score:	Objectives and metrics are mostly missing or not offered. The required <u>B2 Project Objective Template</u> . is missing or mostly incomplete.	Objectives and metrics are offered, but incomplete or not fully developed. The required template is incomplete or not utilized: <u>B2 Project Objective Template</u> .	The applicant provides detailed objectives and metrics to measure the success of the project using the required template: <u>B2 Project Objective Template</u>
B.3 Score:	The applicant offers minimal or no responses to the <u>B3 Project</u> <u>Evaluation Tools: Performance</u> <u>Measures</u> . Rationale in each section is minimal or missing. If other measurement tools are chosen, little or no rationale and details are offered. There is little to no alignment with the objectives in the <u>B2 Project Objective Template</u> .	The applicant has not completed all parts of the <u>B3 Project Evaluation</u> <u>Tools: Performance Measures</u> , and/or rationale in each section is not fully developed. If other outcome measurement tools are chosen, a partially developed rationale and minimal details are offered. The evaluation tools and rationale are somewhat aligned to the objectives listed in the <u>B2 Project Objective</u> <u>Template</u> .	The applicant has completed the <u>B3</u> <u>Project Evaluation Tools: Performance</u> <u>Measures</u> citing outcomes for each area and providing a complete rationale. If other outcome measurements tools are chosen, a rationale and additional details are provided. The evaluation tool is aligned to the objectives from the <u>B2</u> <u>Project Objective Template</u> .
B.4 Score:	The application does not align its grant application plan activities and objectives to the IDOE McKinney- Vento state priorities and objectives.	The application somewhat aligns its grant application plan activities and objectives to the IDOE McKinney-Vento state priorities and objectives.	The application very clearly aligns its grant application plan activities and objectives to the IDOE McKinney-Vento state priorities and objectives .

B.5 Score:	The application provides little to no description of their family engagement plan. Little to no description of wraparound and preventative supports and resources for the school community is offered. Support for parents AND/OR families of the homeless student population is not described.	The applicant provides a moderate description of their family engagement plan, including a moderate description of wraparound and preventative supports and resources provided by the school community. Support may or may not include both parents and families of their homeless student population.	The applicant provides a thorough description of their family engagement plan, including a very detailed description of wraparound and preventive supports and resources provided by the school community to support parents and families of their homeless student population.
B.6 Score:	Option 1: The applicant does not meet the expectation of creating a partnership with one homeless- serving community organization. Option 2: The applicant does not meet the minimum expectation of creating a homeless-serving community organization partnership per LEA.	Option 1: The applicant meets the expectation of creating a partnership with one homeless-serving community organization. Option 2: The applicant meets the minimum expectation of creating a homeless-serving community organization partnership per LEA.	Option 1: The applicant exceeds the expectation of creating more than one partnership with community homeless- serving organizations. Option 2: The applicant exceeds the minimum expectation by creating multiple community organization partnerships per LEA.
B.7 Score:	The applicant's service plan does not include programs and supports that exceed the minimum requirements for homeless student services.	The applicant's service plan includes adequate programs and supports that exceed beyond the minimum requirements for homeless student services.	The applicant's service plan includes a strong variety of programs and supports that exceed beyond the minimum requirements for homeless student services.
B.8 Score:	The applicant does not provide a justification of the need for funding.	The applicant provides a justification for the need for funding.	The applicant provides a detailed justification of the need for funding with exceeding supporting evidence.
	If applicable, the applicant does not provide a rationale for the additional need and supporting evidence for requesting higher funding than the corresponding amount in the	If applicable, the applicant provides a rationale for the additional need requesting higher funding than the corresponding amount in the funding chart.	If applicable, the applicant provides a detailed rationale for the additional need and supporting evidence for requesting higher funding than the corresponding amount in the funding chart.

	funding chart.		
B.9 Score:	The applicant does not use the Title I Set Aside template and/or provides an incomplete Title I Set Aside template; OR The applicant does not take Title I funding.	The applicant meets the expectation by using the provided template with sufficient evidence on the Title I Set Aside usage.	The applicant uses the provided template to fully describe Title I Set Aside usage, including a strong description as to the justification for the amount set-aside.
B.10 Score:	The applicant does not provide a clear description of the state, local, and federal funding collaboration. The applicant focuses minimal funding on <i>Additional Authorized Activities</i> or <i>Priority McKinney-Vento Grant Activities</i> as defined in the grant application.	The applicant provides a description of state, local, and federal funding collaboration, but the description lacks specific, important details. The applicant focuses the majority of funding toward <i>Additional Authorized</i> <i>Activities</i> as defined in the grant application	The applicant provides a thorough description of state, local, and federal fund collaboration for current supplemental supports and programming for homeless students. The applicant focuses the majority of funding toward <i>Priority McKinney-Vento</i> <i>Grant Activities</i> as defined in the grant application.
B.11 Score:	The applicant does not submit a budget or submits a budget in a non approved budget template. The budget includes 4 errors or more. The applicant does not submit the budget in the appropriate format (Excel).	The applicant provides budget in the required budget template, but the budget includes 1-3 errors. The applicant submits the budget in the appropriate format (Excel).	The applicant provides an error-free, detailed budget using the required budget template. The applicant submits the budget in the appropriate format (Excel).
Part B Total Score:	Part B: Project Description Comme	nts:	

/55				
	DO NOT SCO	Part C: Consortium Consultation & Planning DO NOT SCORE PART C FOR OPTION 1: INDIVIDUAL APPLICATIONS PART C IS ONLY APPLICABLE FOR OPTION 2: CONSORTIUM APPLICATIONS Total Points Available: 24		
	Not Meeting/Approaching 0 Points	Meeting 2 Points	Exceeding 4 Points	
C.1 Score:	The applicant either does not provide a consortium list or the list is incomplete and missing any of the following areas: all consortium members including LEA name, LEA number, LEA primary contact, and 18-19 homeless student enrollment count for each.	The applicant provides a complete list of all consortium members including LEA name, LEA number, LEA primary contact, and 18-19 homeless student enrollment count for each.	The applicant provides a complete list of all consortium members including LEA name, LEA number, LEA primary contact, and 18-19 homeless student enrollment count for each. It is evident that the applicant has carefully and clearly identified Lead LEA and fiscal agent for the consortium.	
C. 2 Score:	The applicant does not provide a description of how the consortium was formed nor a description of LEA involvement in activities.	The applicant provides a limited description of how the consortium was formed and a limited description of LEA involvement in proposed activities.	The applicant provides a very detailed description of how the consortium was formed including the involvement of all LEAs in the proposed activities.	
C.3 Score:	It is unclear how the Lead LEA will implement oversight, support activities, manage data, reporting and/or the budget.	The applicant provides a sufficient management plan for the Lead LEA to implement for implementing oversight and support for activities, managing data, reporting and the budget.	The applicant provides a detailed- oriented management plan with actionable items for the Lead LEA to implement oversight and support for activities, managing data, reporting and the budget.	

C.4 Score:	The applicant does not provide a plan for assuring the delivery of equitable services to all homeless students in the consortium.	The applicant provides a limited plan for assuring the delivery of equitable services to all homeless students in the consortium.	The applicant provides a detailed plan to assure the delivery of equitable services to all homeless students in the consortium.
C.5 Score:	The applicant does not provide evidence of identifying a candidate (preferred individual's background) to serve as the McKinney-Vento Consortium Coordinator. The applicant does not provide a job description of the McKinney-Vento Consortium Coordinator and/or the position is less than .33 FTE.	The applicant identifies a candidate (preferred individual's background) to serve as the McKinney-Vento Consortium Coordinator. The applicant provides a job description including a description of the amount of time and effort while meeting the minimum of .33 FTE required time.	The applicant identifies a strong candidate (preferred individual's background) to serve as the McKinney- Vento Consortium Coordinator with experience serving homeless populations. The applicant provides a detailed job description including a description of the amount of time and effort while meeting the minimum of .33 FTE required time.
C.6 Score:	The applicant does not provide a fully completed participation form for each LEA consortium member and/or the applicant did not use the template in Attachment C.		The applicant provides a fully completed participation form for each LEA consortium member using the template in Attachment C.
Part C Total Score: /24	Part C: Consortium Consultation &	Planning - Comments:	

Summary of Scores			
Scored Element	Points Possible	Points Awarded	
Attachment A: Program Assurances	5		
A.1	5		
A.2	5		
A.3	5		
A.4	5		
A.5	5		
B.1	5		
B.2	5		
B.3	5		
B.4	5		
B.5	5		
B.6	5		
B.7	5		
B.8	5		
B.9	5		
B.10	5		
B.11	5		

Total Points Possible	85	
-----------------------	----	--

## Consortium Preference Point Section This section is only scored for consortia applications

C.1	4	
C.2	4	
C.3	4	
C.4	4	
C.5	4	
C.6	4	
Total Preference Points Possible	24	

Total Points Received (out of 85):\_\_\_\_\_

Competitive Preference Points Received (up to 24): \_\_\_\_\_

Total Score Including Preference Points (out of 109 total possible):