

2018 Champion Creatively Alive Children® Grant Judging Rubric

Note: See Tips for Judging on last page.

PROPOSAL # _____ Judge _____ Circle Tier: **One** **Two**

Principal _____ School _____ # students _____ City _____ State _____

Criteria	0	1	2	3	4	5	Score
<p>I. How did they describe the “What If…” opportunities and address the creative leadership needs of their school?</p> <p><i>Note: “What if…” must be about leadership teams strengthening the creative capabilities and increasing art-infused education in the school.</i></p>	Does not address a “What If…” opportunity (original or from sample list).	Describes a “What If…” opportunity but does not address how it would meet the school’s creativity leadership needs.	Describes a “What If…” opportunity and addresses how it fits the school’s needs, but is not closely related to the CCAC grant purpose.	Describes a “What If…” opportunity and addresses the school’s needs. Is aligned with the CCAC grant purpose.	Describes a “What If…” opportunity and addresses the school’s needs. Is aligned with the CCAC grant purpose. Demonstrates strong “what if” opportunities.	Describes extraordinary “what if…” ideas that address this school’s needs and the CCAC grant purpose. Demonstrates strong “what if…” opportunities and significant thought leadership that could help other schools.	
<p>II. Outline goals and objectives.</p> <p><i>Note: should closely align with their “what if…” statements on their application and address how a Creative Leadership Team will impact the school.</i></p>	Did not define their goals and objectives.	Defined goals and objectives, but they were neither closely aligned with the “what if…” statements or address impact of a Creative Leadership team on the school.	Defined goals and objectives that are closely aligned with at least one of the “what if…” statements and mentions a Creative Leadership Team, but the goals and objectives were not well articulated or insightful.	Defined goals and objectives that are closely aligned with several of the “what if…” statements that are well articulated and insightful and mentions role of a Creative Leadership Team.	Defined goals and objectives that are closely aligned with all the “what if…” statements and they are well articulated and insightful. Addresses the role of the Creative Leadership Team in meeting the goals and objectives and this has potential to significantly advance the school’s creative capacity.	Defined goals and objectives that are closely aligned with all the “what if…” statements and they are well articulated and insightful. The proposal communicates goals and objectives in ways that would inspire other educators to implement a similar Creative Leadership program. This proposal has strong potential for resulting in significant change in this and other schools.	
<p>III. How did they define success and how progress will be measured? Did they describe metrics and ongoing assessment?</p>	Did not define success or show how progress will be measured.	Success is mentioned but ongoing assessment or progress is not addressed.	Success and progress metrics are defined but are neither closely aligned with the Creative Leadership concept nor address how creative capacity will be strengthened, school-wide.	Success and progress metrics are defined. Methods of ongoing evaluation are addressed. Success measures are closely aligned with proposal’s objectives and assess how the Creative Leadership Team will build the school’s creative capacity.	Success and progress metrics are defined. Methods of ongoing assessment measurements are addressed and are closely aligned with goal/objectives and will assess how the Creative Leadership Team built the school’s creative capacity. The results of assessment would likely inspire others.	Proposal exceeds the level of score 4, by providing exceptional thought leadership in the area of success metrics and ongoing assessments. Their methods of evaluation have strong potential for documenting significant impact of the Creative Leadership Team and helping other schools adopt these promising practices.	

2018 Champion Creatively Alive Children® Grant Judging Rubric

Note: See Tips for Judging on last page.

PROPOSAL # _____ Judge _____ Circle Tier: **One** **Two**

Principal _____ School _____ # students _____ City _____ State _____

Criteria	0	1	2	3	4	5	Score
<p>IV. How will they identify and share Creative Leadership promising practices with other schools?</p>	Did not address how promising practices would be identified.	Promising practices are mentioned but are either unclear or not closely aligned with Creative Leadership Team's purpose or do not address how they will be shared.	Promising practices are discussed and they are aligned with the Creative Leadership Team's purpose, but plans do not address sharing them with other schools.	Promising practices are discussed and align with Creative Leadership Team's purpose. Plans address sharing with others, but are not likely to have significant impact on other schools.	This proposal would likely create new promising practices that are well articulated and aligned with the Creative Leadership Team's purpose, and have strong potential for influencing other schools.	This proposal is stellar in articulating how they will create and identify new promising practices that are aligned with the Creative Leadership Team's purpose. They will likely have a significant impact on other schools and generate new promising practices that Crayola and NAESP can showcase.	
<p>V. Why/how is proposal innovative?</p> <p><i>Note: While it is important that schools have an art program, the purpose of this grant is to equip a newly formed art program. This grant is focused on advancing the field beyond basics.</i></p>	Proposal does not address innovation.	Application says it is innovative but the proposed idea is already in common practice in many schools.	Application mentions what they believe is innovative about this idea. Proposed idea is commonly talked about and is seen in some schools, but this is a new/novel way of implementing the idea.	Application points out what is innovative about this idea. While the proposed idea is commonly discussed in education, it is not yet in common practice in schools.	Application points out what is innovative about this idea. The innovative idea is novel and is currently not common practice in schools. Implementing these ideas could provide new education insights. It is likely that other schools could implement this plan and learn from this school's innovation.	This exceptional proposal is highly innovative—the idea is new/novel AND has potential to “move the needle.” They will likely generate innovative solutions and improved learning outcomes. The proposal explains why this is innovative and how these cutting edge ideas could help shape educational practices beyond their school. Implementation in other schools is very likely.	
<p>VI. What collaboration is planned?</p> <p><i>Note: Preference is given to applications emphasizing broad collaboration—including school-wide initiatives and involves parents, community members, universities, museums, and other partners.</i></p>	Application does not describe collaboration	Application describes minimal collaboration (not beyond the team who authored the proposal).	Application describes some collaboration but is not school-wide. Plan includes members of the teaching staff, plus other classroom teachers, literacy specialists, administrators and/or parents, but no external or community involvement.	Application describes collaboration that is school-wide and broad-based, including members of the entire teaching staff, specialists as well as administrators, parents, and some “unexpected members” beyond the school (community members, museum partners, arts organizations, university partners, etc.)	Application describes collaboration similar to score 3, but this collaborative model is articulated in ways that would inspire others to implement and the model could be easily transferred to other schools.	This exceptional application describes a collaboration plan beyond score 4. The proposal is well articulated and provides thought leadership on community collaboration. The outcomes of this project would likely generate new collaboration models that Crayola and NAESP can showcase, demonstrating what educators, parents and partners in the community can do together to champion creatively alive children.	

2018 Champion Creatively Alive Children® Grant Judging Rubric

Note: See Tips for Judging on last page.

PROPOSAL # _____ Judge _____ Circle Tier: **One** **Two**

Principal _____ School _____ # students _____ City _____ State _____

Criteria	0	1	2	3	4	5	Score
<p>VII. How sustainable is the program? Have they addressed the ability to implement aspects of this program beyond the CCAC grant funding period?</p> <p><i>Note: Preference given to “long term” plans versus an event like “art night.”</i></p>	Application does not describe sustainability of either the program or ideas.	Describes sustainability of some aspects of the program (i.e. non-consumable supplies) but does not address embedding new promising practices in school.	Application describes what aspects of the program or idea will continue beyond initial funding, but will be limited unless the school finds new resources.	Application describes what aspects of the program or idea will continue beyond initial funding and become embedded in school culture.	Application describes what aspects of the program or idea will continue beyond initial funding, become embedded in school culture, and provide a model for other schools or community organizations to follow.	Application goes beyond what is required for score 4. The ideas in this proposal will have significant long-term impact on the school, and will influence educational practices beyond initial funding. The sustainability model proposed increases the likelihood of implementation at other schools.	
<p>VIII. Provide Key Contacts. Outline timeline (with key milestones) and show work plan (spanning October 2017 to May 2018)</p>	Application contains contacts, but unclear on roles. Vague timeline or work plan.	Application includes key contacts but their roles are unclear. Application contains a rough timeline that spans school year, but not a detailed work plan.	Application includes key contacts but some roles seem to be missing or do not seem to significantly involve school leaders. Application contains timeline with milestones. Work plan includes key milestones but no detailed work plan.	Application includes key contacts with roles. All responsibilities outlined in proposal are assigned. Key leaders are involved in the project. Contains detailed timeline, work plan contains key milestones and gives the judge confidence that the plan will be implemented.	Application includes key contacts and roles. School leaders are clearly involved in the project. Contains detailed timeline with key milestones. The work plan gives the judge confidence that the plan will be implemented. This plan appears to be a model that could be applicable to other schools.	The application is outstanding. Contains all information for score 4 and went beyond. School leaders are very involved. Work plan is a clear model that other schools could implement and is an ideal example of how a Creative Leadership Team can impact a school. The results of this work plan will likely result in examples that can be showcased and implemented elsewhere.	
<p>IX. Budget (how funds would be used). List other resources or contributions applied to program.</p> <p><i>Note: While some technology might be needed, proposals that indicate a significant amount of funds would be spent on tech, 3D printers, projection screens or tablets are less likely to be funded. Projects that beautify school are not likely to be funded.</i></p>	Budget included is vague or planned expenditures are not aligned to goals-objectives or Creative Leadership.	Budget is clear on how \$2,500 would be spent, but there is not enough emphasis on Creative Leadership or there is an over-emphasis on purchase of technology.	Budget is included and is clear on how \$2,500 would be spent. But only some of the planned expenditures are aligned with building Creative Leadership capacity or only a weak plan to spread art-infused education school-wide.	Budget is included. Clear on how \$2,500 would be spent. All the expenditures are closely aligned with the “we believe...” statements and building the school’s Creative Leadership capacity. This proposal would fund a program that would advance creative capacity school-wide.	Budget included is clear on how \$2,500 would be spent and addresses what other resources will be leveraged to build creative capacity in the school. Expenditures are closely aligned with “we believe...” statements and building the school’s Creative Leadership capacity. This proposal would fund a program that would significantly advance creativity in this school.	Contains everything for score 4 and went beyond. This proposal would fund a program that would significantly advance creative leadership in this school. This model could be applied to other schools and will very likely inspire other schools to implement a similar program, even if those schools don’t receive a grant.	

2018 Champion Creatively Alive Children® Grant Judging Rubric

Note: See Tips for Judging on last page.

PROPOSAL # _____ Judge _____ Circle Tier: **One** **Two**

Principal _____ School _____ # students _____ City _____ State _____

Criteria	0	1	2	3	4	5	Score
						TOTAL SCORE:	

Tips for Judging: The information below can help clarify some of the terminology in the judging rubric.

- “What if...” opportunity:** While the application contained some sample “what if...” questions, we urged applicants to use those only as a springboard and to come up with their own ideas, that address their school’s needs. The application stated, **“What if School Creative Leadership Teams...**
 - ...served as Chief Creative Officers in the school, responsible for increasing the creative capacity and confidence of teachers, as well as students?
 - ...wove art and creative thinking experiences across the entire learning community?
 - ...led the innovative integration of hands-on art and robotics/ed tech, giving students new ways to explore the creative process?
 - ...used art-infused education to implement and integrate standards?
 - ...developed comprehensive performance, formative, and portfolio assessments that value students’ creativity and use the: Create-Present-Respond-Connect framework?
 - ...established a collaborative, creative culture that fosters 21st century learning?

Submissions are not limited to the “what if...” ideas above. We encourage a “what if...” that addresses the school's needs.”
- Goals and Objectives:** The proposal should be aligned with the Crayola—NAESP Core Beliefs: **At Crayola and NAESP we believe...**
 - in the power of original thought and innovative practices.
 - art-infused education engages students and results in robust, memorable learning.
 - children are empowered by creative leaders.
 - it takes a visionary leadership team to enhance a school’s creative collaborative culture.
 - “what if...?” is a great question that makes leaders explore new possibilities and implement change.
- Art-infused education (sometimes called Art Integrated Education) is a cross-curricular way of teaching about and with the arts, to build knowledge and competency in various subjects including reading, math, science, social studies, and art.
- Use a **score 5** to note a proposal that is **EXTRAORDINARY**. Submit comments along with total score to explain why the proposal stands out and what makes it exceptional beyond the categories on the rubric.