# OSIT's Regional STEM Networks Grant Application Evaluation Rubric - Spring 2026
Visit OSIT.nv.gov or email OSITsupport@gov.nv.gov for more information.

## Project Description (80PTS)

| Criterion | (High) | (Mid) | (Low) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project Overview** | **4-5** — The Project Overview provides a clear, compelling summary of the project. The overview can stand on its own to describe the project to those unfamiliar. | **2-3** — The Project Overview provides an adequate summary of the project. The overview lacks full clarity or completeness in some areas. | **0-1** — The Project Overview lacks sufficient details or organization, making it difficult for reviewers to understand what the applicant is proposing. |
| **Project Need** | **8-10** — The Project Need establishes a clear and compelling problem statement that the project seeks to address. The application includes a well-developed, complete description of the region's STEM landscape, including opportunities and gaps. The application differentiates the project from existing projects. | **4-7** — The Project Need includes general statements about why the project is needed, but is not particularly compelling. The application provides a partially developed description of the region's STEM landscape, but may omit key opportunities or gaps. The application does not successfully differentiate the proposed project from existing initiatives. | **0-3** — The Project Need is neither clear nor compelling. The application's description of the region's STEM landscape is incomplete, inaccurate or missing. It is unclear how the proposed project relates to the identified need. |
| **Alignment with Regional STEM Network Goals** | **8-10** — The project intends to leverage the region's unique resources to ultimately increase the number and preparedness of Nevadans accessing high-quality STEM learning, training, or workforce opportunities. The application clearly articulates STEM preparedness as the main goal, in part by increasing awareness, access, or quality of STEM opportunities. Goals are specific, measurable, and ambitious yet feasible. | **4-7** — The project demonstrates a reasonable connection to the region's goal of preparing Nevadans for STEM careers by improving awareness, access, or quality of STEM opportunities. STEM preparedness is acknowledged as an important outcome but is not consistently positioned as the central focus. Goals are present and somewhat measurable, but lack full clarity, specificity, or ambition. The project shows potential to benefit Nevadans broadly, though strategies for leveraging regional resources or achieving significant impact are only partially developed. | **0-3** — The project aims to increase awareness of, access to, or the quality of STEM opportunities, but the application fails to clearly articulate measurable goals, or the main beneficiaries of the project are the organization or its customers rather than Nevadans broadly. Alignment with regional STEM network goals is weak or incidental. |
| **Project Audience** | **4-5** — The Project Audience is appropriate for the project and targeted to regional needs. The application describes in detail the population the project intends to serve, and specific, research-backed strategies the applicant will utilize to engage the audience. | **2-3** — The Project Audience is appropriate for the project. The application describes a population generally but could be strengthened with specific details. The application mentions general recruitment strategies for the project. | **0-1** — The Project Audience may not be found in the local region or may be inappropriate for the project. The application lacks detail regarding a target audience. |
| **Roles and Responsibilities** | **6-8** — The Roles and Responsibilities table provides a comprehensive overview of those involved in the project, and their roles. The application describes committed strategic partnerships that bring complementary strengths. Partnerships are clearly integrated into the implementation plan. | **3-5** — The Roles and Responsibilities table provides an incomplete overview of those involved in the project, and their roles. Partnerships are present and relevant but may lack full clarity, formalization, or integration into the plan. Assumptions are required to understand how the team will work together on the project. | **0-2** — The Roles and Responsibilities table provides an incomplete overview of those involved in the project, and their roles. Major responsibilities or key players are missing from the table. Strategic partnerships are minimal, unclear, or absent. Partnerships, if mentioned, are informal or not well-integrated into the plan. |
| **Timeline and Milestones** | **8-10** — The Timeline and Milestones table provides a comprehensive step-by-step plan for the project, including spending and major milestones. It is clear how the project will progress. The Timeline and Milestones are aggressive yet feasible. The approach is logical, well-structured, and demonstrates strong alignment with project goals. All State Funding will be spent by the end of the State Fiscal Year. | **4-7** — The Timeline and Milestones table provides an incomplete overview of the project roll-out. Key milestones may be included, but it is unclear how the milestones will be achieved. Reviewers can generally understand the intended activities, but some uncertainty remains about execution. Assumptions are required to understand how the project will progress. | **0-3** — The Timeline and Milestones table provides an incomplete picture of the project. Key milestones are missing from the table. Activities are described in broad terms without clear timelines, responsibilities, or milestones. It is unclear how the team will effectively complete the project. |
| **Applicant Capacity** | **6-8** — The application describes robust organizational capacity, including sufficient staffing, expertise, and resources to implement the project successfully. Overall, the proposal instills confidence in the project's successful execution. | **3-5** — The application describes adequate capacity to implement the project, though some gaps or weaknesses exist. While the proposal suggests the project can succeed, some uncertainty remains regarding resource sufficiency. The approach appears moderately feasible, though success may depend on resolving gaps or ambiguities. | **0-2** — The applicant lacks key resources or expertise needed for successful implementation. The application does not convincingly demonstrate how resource or knowledge gaps will be addressed, making the likelihood of success low without significant revision or additional planning. |
| **Innovation** | **6-8** — The project is unique, novel, or cutting-edge for the region. The application effectively and accurately describes how the project addresses the region's needs with new methods, tools, or partnerships. The project offers compelling value to the region. | **3-5** — The project is potentially innovative, but the Innovation section leaves reviewers with questions. Or, the project has innovative components to an otherwise existing project. | **0-2** — The application ineffectively describes how the project is innovative, or the project is duplicative of existing projects in the region. |
| **Evaluation Plan** | **6-8** — The Evaluation Plan is detailed and comprehensive, including formative and summative evaluations, metrics, methods, and course correction interventions. | **3-5** — The Evaluation Plan adequately describes how the applicant will determine if the project was successful at the conclusion. The evaluation plan lacks sufficient detail regarding formative metrics, methods and interventions. | **0-2** — The Evaluation Plan will not effectively assess the project's success. Details are insufficient. The Evaluation Plan does not appropriately align with the project goals or actions. |
| **Impact** | **6-8** — The project will have a lasting impact on the region by providing new knowledge, tools, or opportunities in the region. The application describes evidence or research to support claims about the project's expected impact. | **3-5** — The project is likely to have benefits that extend beyond the immediate project period, but these impacts may diminish over time or require continued effort to maintain. The proposal includes some strategies for sustainability or follow-up, though they are not fully developed or guaranteed. | **0-2** — The project's benefits are limited to the duration of the project or tied to one-time activities (e.g., events, workshops) without clear plans for continuation or systemic change. There is little suggestion of long-term regional impact or sustainability beyond the initial implementation. |

## Letters of Commitment (10PTS)

| Criterion | (High) | (Mid) | (Low) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Letters of Commitment** | **8-10** — Each person listed in the Roles and Responsibilities portion of the application has provided a letter. The letters of commitment are on letterhead, signed, and recently dated. Letters provide specific commitments to the proposed project. Letters describe collaborative partnerships rather than transactional ones. | **4-7** — The majority of those listed in the Roles and Responsibilities portion of the application has provided a letter. Letters show support of the project rather than specific commitment, or the partnership is transactional rather than collaborative. Letters of commitment are limited, ambiguous or restrained. Letters of commitment may detail specific commitments, but commitments are duplicative rather than fill a project gap. | **0-3** — Letters are limited, missing, outdated, for different projects, or are written by the applicant and signed by partners. |

## Budget Plan (10PTS)

| Criterion | (High) | (Mid) | (Low) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Budget Narrative** | **4-5** — The Budget Narrative establishes a clear and convincing relationship between the project's activities, expenses and goals. The narrative is comprehensive and effectively justifies all expenses. Applicant leverages existing resources. | **2-3** — The Budget Narrative describes expenses and provides some justification, but connections to project goals and outcomes are insufficiently detailed. Existing resources are minimally leveraged. | **0-1** — The Budget Narrative does not effectively describe, explain or justify expenses. It is unclear how costs support project goals or outcomes. There is no evidence of the applicant leveraging existing resources. Or, funding would be used for an existing project. |
| **Budget Table** | **4-5** — The Budget Table is comprehensive. Costs are broken down, organized and easily understood. Costs are reasonable and allowable. | **2-3** — The Budget Table is mostly complete but may be missing items or cost breakdowns. Costs are mostly reasonable and allowable. The budget may need adjustments prior to awarding funding. | **0-1** — The Budget Table is inaccurate, missing items or missing item breakdowns. Costs are unreasonable or include unallowable expenses. The Budget Table could not be used to develop an award. |

## Bonus Points: Up to 5 Bonus Points for Match

| Criterion | (High) | (Mid) | (Low) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Match (Optional)** | **4-5** — Applicant matches with cash in an amount equal to or greater to the grant funding requested. In-kind may be included, but cash alone is equal to or greater. | **2-3** — Applicant proposes in-kind match in an amount equal to or greater than, or a combination of in-kind and cash match in an amount equal to or greater than the amount of grant funding requested. | **1** — Applicant proposes match of either cash or in-kind in an amount less than the amount of grant funds requested. |

Total Score (out of possible 105)