## RUTH TOOR GRANT AWARD RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTSTANDING</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
<th>ACCEPTABLE</th>
<th>UNACCEPTABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Plan with timeline (55 points)** | • Creative/innovative Plan. Ambitious goals.  
Will promote strong libraries and public awareness beyond length of grant.  
Able to be replicated/adapted in whole or part in other districts.  
Realistic timeline within guidelines.  
**41-55 points** | • Solid plan with clearly thought-out goals.  
Will promote strong libraries and public awareness. Possibly able to be replicated in whole or part in other districts.  
Realistic timeline within guidelines.  
**31-40 points** | • Good plan.  
Supports identified goals. Promotes public awareness. Timeline is within guidelines.  
**21-30 points** | • Plan is not tied to public awareness of libraries.  
Timeline is unrealistic and/or not within guidelines.  
**Under 20 points** |
| **Number of Users to be reached (20 points)** | • High proportion of school library-users reached.  
Reaches high-proportion of stakeholders beyond school (school board, district administration, families, community)  
**16-20 points** | • Significant portion of school library-users reached.  
Reaches significant proportion of stakeholders beyond school (school board, district administration, families, community)  
**9-15 points** | • Reaches a reasonable portion of school library-users.  
Reaches a reasonable proportion of stakeholders beyond school (school board, district administration, families, community)  
**1-8 points** | • Reaches few school library-users.  
Reaches few stakeholders beyond school (school board, district administration, families, community)  
**0 points** |
| **Key Staff with bio (5 points)** | • Involves at least 4 people clearly involved (e.g. Youth Services Librarians/ Administrators/ teachers/ parents) who will potentially be future advocates.  
Bios are brief and include all involved.  
**5 points** | • Involves at least 3 people clearly involved. Bios are brief and include all involved.  
**3 points** | • Involves 2 people clearly involved. Bios are brief and include all involved.  
**2 points** | • Only librarian involved.  
**0-1 point** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget (15 points)</th>
<th>Mechanics/ Grammar (5 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Comprehensive realistic budget demonstrating understanding of project needs and good use of grant funds. | • Within length guidelines.  
• No mechanical or grammatical errors.  
• 5 points |
| 11-15 points | • Within length guidelines.  
• Few mechanical or grammatical errors.  
• 4 points |
| • Budget is realistic showing understanding of project needs using all the grant funds.  
• 7-10 points | • Within length guidelines  
Some mechanical and/or grammatical errors.  
• 3 points |
| • Budget makes use of all the grant funds.  
• 2-6 points | • Is not within length guidelines  
Has many mechanical and grammatical errors.  
• 0-2 points |
| • Budget does not fully detail what is needed and/or all grant funds are not used.  
• 0-1 point |