# Restorative Practices Grant Program

## Grant Scoring Rubrics

**The total points maximum is 100 points. Applicants need a minimum of 70 points to be eligible for funding.**

| **Outstanding 4-5** | **Good – 3** | **Fair – 2** | **Minimal 0-1** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The applicant’s response to the prompt is exceptionally clear, specific, detailed, relevant, and thorough.  | The applicant’s response to the prompt is sufficiently clear, specific, relevant, and provides adequate detail.  | The applicant’s response to the prompt is in some respects clear, specific, and relevant, but lacks detail.  | The applicant’s response to the prompt is minimal, insufficient, and vague.  |

1. **Problem Statement – 20 Maximum Points**

| **Problem Statement** | **Outstanding 4-5** | **Good 3** | **Fair 2** | **Minimal 0-1** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Provides an overview of the LEA, including LEA geographical location, student enrollment, and student demographics information such as racial ethnic breakdown, percentage of low income, English learner, foster, homeless, and other demographics information. |  |  |   |  |
| Describes the school climate and discipline needs of the LEA. Provides detailed relevant data such as chronic absenteeism, in and out-of-school suspension rates, and student dropout rates, disaggregated by student groups.  |  |  |  |  |
| Includes relevant student, staff, and parent school climate survey data (such as from the California School Climate, Health, and Learning Surveys), disaggregated by student groups on school connectedness, student wellness, and safety.  |  |  |  |  |
| Describes how restorative practices can address the needs of students and improve student outcomes. |  |  |  |  |

1. **District commitment and capacity (20 points)**

| **District commitment and capacity** | **Outstanding 4-5** | **Good 3** | **Fair 2** | **Minimal 0-1** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Describes the commitment and capacity of the LEA in implementing and sustaining best practices for restorative practices. Describe the LEA’s existing non-punitive discipline policies and practices. |  |  |   |  |
| Explains how restorative practices align and support LEA’s Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP). |  |  |  |  |
| Describes existing staff training and expertise for the implementation of restorative practices.  |  |  |  |  |
| Select one: Describe current restorative practice implementation in the LEA. Specifies which restorative practices best practices as specified in Section I.B. of the RFA are being implemented by the LEA. **OR**If the LEA is new to restorative practices, explains how the proposed grant application will be leveraged and sustained with existing resources.  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Proposed Grant Activities (30 points)**

| **Proposed Grant Activities** | **Outstanding 4-5** | **Good 3** | **Fair 2** | **Minimal 0-1** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Describes the project goals and measurable objectives. |  |  |   |  |
| Identifies the proposed best practices for restorative practices that will be implemented. |  |  |  |  |
| Provides details on how the project will be implemented, including details such as schools or grades selected, responsible staff and qualifications etc. Provides a project timeline, including responsible staff, proposed activities, and proposed activities in the timeline.**(Score x 2. Maximum points = 10 points)**  |  |  |  |  |
| Describes how the proposed project will initiate, enhance, or align to existing LEA’s school climate initiatives, current RJ implementation, or LCAP.**(Score x 2. Maximum points = 10 points)**  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Measuring of Impact (20 points)**

| **Measuring of Impact**  | **Outstanding 4-5** | **Good 3** | **Fair 2** | **Minimal 0-1** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Describes how the LEA will measure the impact of the proposed application.**(Weight x 2. Maximum points = 10 points)**  |  |  |   |  |
| Describes the staffing capacity to collect and analyze data, such as attendance rate, rate of chronic absenteeism, suspension rate, and school climate survey data (e.g., California Healthy Kids Survey) to assess school connectedness, safety, and student well-being etc. Data should be disaggregated by student subgroups to monitor equitable outcomes and address disparities.**(Weight x 2. Maximum points = 10 points)**  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Budget (10 points)**

| **Budget** | **Outstanding 4-5** | **Good 3** | **Fair 2** | **Minimal 0-1** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Complete Budget Template (Attachment 2) and provides detailed, relevant, line-item budget to support the proposed grant application.  |  |  |   |  |
| Budget justification includes detailed cost breakdowns for each line-item.  |  |  |  |  |
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