

High Quality Special Education Incentive Grant Scoring Rubric (100 Points Total)

1. Grant Focus Area

Weight: 5 pts.

Evaluates: Scorers will review the executive summary and determine whether the proposal clearly identifies and aligns to an allowable grant focus area within the stated funding parameters.

Rating	Description
Yes (5 pts.)	The proposal clearly identifies a grant focus area and aligns with allowable activities and funding requirements.
No (0 pts.)	The focus area is unclear, not aligned to allowable activities, and/or falls outside the grant’s funding parameters.

Note: Proposals must receive a “Yes” to advance to full scoring.

2. Access to High-Quality Instruction in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)

Weight: 20 pts.

Evaluates: The extent to which the proposed program increases students’ access to grade-level, high-quality instruction in the LRE.

Rating	Description
Exemplary (20 pts.)	Clear plan demonstrating significant expansion of access to grade-level curriculum and high-quality instruction. Alignment with the stated goals and anticipated student outcomes are measurable and clear.
Strong (15 pts.)	Strong plan to increase access with defined strategies and reasonable evidence of impact. Some measurable outcomes included.
Developing (5 pts.)	General intent to increase access, but limited detail on implementation, staffing, or measurable outcomes.
Limited (3 pts.)	Minimal or unclear description of how access to LRE will increase. Lacks actionable strategies or measurable impact.

3. Enhancement of In-District or Regional Special Education Services

Weight: 20 pts.

Evaluates: The degree to which the program strengthens local capacity, particularly for students with intensive needs.

Rating	Description
Exemplary (20 pts.)	Clearly builds sustainable in-district/regional capacity (e.g., specialized programming, therapeutic supports, behavioral services) aligned with program description. Demonstrates immediate or likely reduction in out-of-district placements and strong staffing plan.
Strong (15 pts.)	Enhances local services and capacity with moderate sustainability and capacity-building components. Demonstrates potential reduction in out-of-district placements.
Developing (5 pts.)	Adds services but minimal alignment with program description and limited enhanced capacity or unclear sustainability.
Limited (3 pts.)	Does not meaningfully strengthen in-district or regional services.

4. Evidence of Increased Time with Non-Disabled Peers

Weight: 20 pts.

Evaluates: Evidence-based strategies to increase meaningful participation alongside non-disabled peers.

Rating	Description
Exemplary (20 pts.)	Provides strong evidence-based strategies (e.g., co-teaching, peer supports, integrated service delivery) with baseline data and measurable goals for increasing time with non-disabled peers.
Strong (15 pts.)	Clear evidence-based strategies with measurable goals and supporting data.
Developing (5 pts.)	General plan to increase inclusion opportunities but limited measurable targets or data.
Limited (3 pts.)	Lacks clear strategies or evidence for increasing time with non-disabled peers.

5. Implementation Readiness & Sustainability

Weight: 20 pts.

Evaluates: District readiness to implement and sustain programming that proactively reduces instructional barriers (e.g., Universal Design for Learning, flexible service delivery, MTSS alignment).

Rating	Description
Exemplary (20 pts.)	Demonstrates strong infrastructure: leadership commitment, staffing, professional development plan, implementation timeline, sustainability plan, and budget alignment. Clear use of proactive design (e.g., UDL, inclusive scheduling, data systems).
Strong (15 pts.)	Demonstrates readiness with moderate detail in infrastructure and sustainability planning.

Developing (10 pts.)	Some readiness indicators present but limited sustainability or implementation clarity.
Limited (3 pts.)	Lacks evidence of readiness or sustainability planning.

6. Alliance District Priority Consideration

Weight: 5 pts.

Evaluates: Whether the applicant district is designated as an Alliance District pursuant to Section 10-262u of the general statutes.

Rating	Description
Alliance District (5 pts.)	Applicant is designated as an Alliance District.
Non-Alliance District (0 pts.)	Applicant is not designated as an Alliance District.

7. Clarity, Completeness, and Adherence to Word Count

Weight: 10 pts.

Evaluates: Quality of writing and compliance with application requirements.

Rating	Description
Exemplary (10 pts.)	Clear, concise, well-organized narrative; fully responsive to all prompts; adheres to word count in each section.
Strong (5 pts.)	Mostly clear and responsive; minor clarity issues. Adheres to word count throughout.
Developing (3 pts.)	Adheres to word count throughout, although some sections are unclear or missing minor components.
Limited (0 pts.)	Poor organization, missing sections, and/or word count violations.