

# 2015-2016 Budget Initiative Application Scoring

February 24, 2015

Scoring by: Budget Stakeholder Engagement Committee

## Submission 1: Tech Ed Teachers: Shop Equipment

		Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6	Group 7	Total
Criteria	Possible Points	Score							
1. Alignment with Student Expectations & Board Goals	20	20	20	20	20	15	18	14	127
2. Impact on Students	12	8	12	11	12	12	12	10	77
3. Achievement Contract Gaps	12	8	10	12	12	6	10	9	67
4. SD8 Support Person	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	70
5. Alignment with Global Education Trends	6	6	6	6	6	4	5	4	37
6. Need Vs. Wish	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	4	31
7. Measure of Project Success	5	4	5	5	5	3	5	3	30
8. Lifecycle Analysis	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	3	32
9. Budget	5	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	31
10. Alignment with Local Education Trends	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	33
11. One Time Savings Vs. Annual On-Going Savings	5	4	5	5	0	1	4	1	20
12. Student Support	5	0	1	0	5	5	0	5	16
13. Alignment with Provincial Curriculum	5	5	5	5	5	2	5	5	32
<b>Total Points</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>603</b>

# 2015-2016 Budget Initiative Application Scoring

February 24, 2015

Scoring by: Budget Stakeholder Engagement Committee

## Submission 2: PE Teachers: Equipment

		Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6	Group 7	Total
Criteria	Possible Points	Score							
1. Alignment with Student Expectations & Board Goals	20	15	10	10	15	10	15	11	86
2. Impact on Students	12	10	6	10	12	12	12	6	68
3. Achievement Contract Gaps	12	6	4	6	8	6	6	9	45
4. SD8 Support Person	10	5	10	5	10	10	10	10	60
5. Alignment with Global Education Trends	6	6	6	6	6	4	6	2	36
6. Need Vs. Wish	5	1	5	5	5	5	5	1	27
7. Measure of Project Success	5	4	5	2	5	5	3	3	27
8. Lifecycle Analysis	5	4	2	3	3.5	4	3	4	23.5
9. Budget	5	3	3	5	5	5	4	5	30
10. Alignment with Local Education Trends	5	5	5	2	5	4	5	3	29
11. One Time Savings Vs. Annual On-Going Savings	5	0	5	4	0	1	4	1	15
12. Student Support	5	0	5	0	5	4	0	5	19
13. Alignment with Provincial Curriculum	5	5	5	5	5	2	5	5	32
<b>Total Points</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>84.5</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>497.5</b>

## 2015-2016 Budget Initiative Application Scoring

February 24, 2015

Scoring by: Budget Stakeholder Engagement Committee

### Submission 3: BK Assistive Technology

Criteria	Possible Points	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6	Group 7	Total
		Score							
1. Alignment with Student Expectations & Board Goals	20	10	10	15	12	10	15	13	85
2. Impact on Students	12	8	8	8	6	2	3	6	41
3. Achievement Contract Gaps	12	10	12	10	8	6	8	12	66
4. SD8 Support Person	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	70
5. Alignment with Global Education Trends	6	6	6	6	6	4	4	6	38
6. Need Vs. Wish	5	4	3	5	5	4	3	2	26
7. Measure of Project Success	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	33
8. Lifecycle Analysis	5	1	5	5	0	4	3	1	19
9. Budget	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	33
10. Alignment with Local Education Trends	5	5	5	3	5	5	4	5	32
11. One Time Savings Vs. Annual On-Going Savings	5	5	5	4	0	5	2	4	25
12. Student Support	5	0	5	0	5	2	0	5	17
13. Alignment with Provincial Curriculum	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	34
<b>Total Points</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>519</b>