



Utah State Board of Education

**UTAH STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
(USBE) CARDIAC EMERGENCY
RESPONSE PLAN (CERP) GRANT
APPLICATION SCORING RUBRIC**

A UTAH STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION TECHNICAL
ASSISTANCE DOCUMENT

July 2026

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	1
Funding Distribution Plan and Internal Logic.....	2
Priority Level Match.....	3
Section A: LEA Overview and Initial Routing.....	4
Section B: Supporting Evidence and Operational Readiness.....	5
Section C: Budget Plan and Financial Justification.....	9
Budget Breakdown Matrix.....	11
Section D: Assurances and Electronic Certifications.....	12
Section E: Scoring Summary and Reviewer Checklist.....	12

Funding Distribution Plan and Internal Logic

- **Review process:** This grant utilizes a competitive, tiered, first-come first-served allocation structure. Applications are evaluated chronologically in the order they are received through the Utah Grants Management System (UGMS).
- **Qualitative quality threshold:** Reviewers will evaluate the narrative portions competitively against this rubric. Applications must secure a minimum score of 15 out of 18 points and pass all pass/fail metrics to be approved for the funding queue. Applications falling below this threshold will be denied.
- **Tiered funding prioritization:** Once an application passes the competitive threshold, it is placed into the funding queue based on its submission date and its Priority Tier level. In accordance with Board Rule R277-634, Tiers 1 and 2 will be fully funded in chronological order ahead of Tier 3 applications.
- **Maximum funding:** The maximum amount that an individual local education agency (LEA) can request or be funded is strictly capped at \$6,000.00, inclusive of all direct and indirect costs.
- **Gatekeeper filter:** applications that receive a failure on any of the pass/fail elements in Sections A, C or D will automatically be disqualified from the scoring process and the funding requests will be denied.

Priority Level Match

Priority 1

- Tier 1 High-Needs
- Section B: scores between 11-12
- Section C: score of 6

Priority 2

- Tier 1 High-Needs
- Section B: scores between 9-10
- Section C: scores between 4-5

Priority 3

- Tier 2 Rural
- Section B: scores between 11-12
- Section C: score of 6

Priority 4

- Tier 2 Rural
- Section B: scores between 9-10
- Section C: scores between 4-5

Priority 5

- Tier 3 Standard Metrics
- Section B: scores between 9-12
- Section C: scores between 4-6

Deficit threshold note: Application sections that score 0 points on any individual criteria matrix will receive zero funding allocations for that specific category.

Section A: LEA Overview and Initial Routing

Reviewer instructions: verify completion of administrative data routing fields. Missing items must trigger failure.

- Name of applicant (LEA)

- Primary and secondary lead contact logs

Section B: Supporting Evidence and Operational Readiness

- Total possible section points: 12 points
- Minimum passing section score: 9 points
- Total Section B score:

1. Statutory Requirements (gatekeeper metrics)

Responses to the following questions must prove compliance with Utah Code Section 53G-9-216. Responses out of compliance will automatically void the application.

- Has the LEA attached an individualized, school campus-specific CERP for every single school building listed on this application?
- Do the uploaded campus plans explicitly confirm that before-school and after-school extended hour activity drills are actively built into the plan?

2. Statement of Readiness and Asset Inventories

Evaluates narrative fields concerning hardware needs, structural obstacles, and operational training protocols.

- **Part A: asset inventory and layout constraints** (*evaluates Part 6, Section 2*)
 - **Does not meet expectations (0 pts)**
 - No asset counts provided or age and condition of existing materials is omitted
 - **Meets minimum expectations (1 pt)**
 - General asset counts provided but lack clear explanation of why numbers are required
 - **Adequately meets expectations (2 pts)**
 - Detailed account of existing vs. required AED units; layout factors (stadiums, wings, multi-story) clearly justify numbers

- **Part B: 3-minute rule deployment** (*evaluates Part 6, Section 2*)
 - **Does not meet expectations (0 pts)**
 - No placement plan described or fails to show a path to rapid implementation
 - **Meets minimum expectations (1 pt)**
 - General statements regarding central placement routes across campus premises

- **Adequately meets expectations (2 pts)**
 - Precise physical placement routes mapped to meet the 3-minute rule, equipment remains unlocked and centrally accessible

- **Part C: staff training and CERP team roles** (*evaluates part 6, section 3*)
 - **Does not meet expectations (0 pts)**
 - No schedule provided, personnel roles are not defined or fail to use approved training agencies
 - **Meets minimum expectations (1 pt)**
 - General statement of training, roles listed but rely on single individuals rather than an integrated framework
 - **Adequately meets expectations (2 pts)**
 - Detailed training strategy and multi-disciplinary team structure, explicit check confirms all certifications cover full adult/pediatric/AED scopes

- **Part D: daytime response drills** (*evaluates part 6, section 4*)
 - **Does not meet expectations (0 pts)**
 - No live daytime drill frequency or coordination schedule provided
 - **Meets minimum expectations (1 pt)**

- General daytime drill timeframe stated, but lacks verification of a tracked execution timeline
 - **Adequately meets expectations (2 pts)**
 - Comprehensive daytime drill protocols detailed, specific timeline maps annual live exercises involving campus staff during peak hours
- **Part E: extended day drills** *(evaluates part 6, section 4)*
 - **Does not meet expectations (0 pts)**
 - Did not provide extended hours access guarantees or live annual drill tracking details
 - **Meets minimum expectations (1 pt)**
 - General drill timeline stated, fails to address how shift variables (athletics, clubs) are tested
 - **Adequately meets expectations (2 pts)**
 - Detailed plan showing live drills are executed and timed across all operational hours, access to units is guaranteed during after-school shifts
- **Part F: compliance recordkeeping systems** *(evaluates Part 6, Section 4)*
 - **Does not meet expectations (0 pts)**
 - Did not provide a baseline system to log operations

- **Meets minimum expectations (1 pt)**
 - General description of school office compliance tracking
- **Adequately meets expectations (2 pts)**
 - Comprehensive description of local digital or physical log systems tracking emergency medical system (EMS) alerts, drill logs and monthly hardware visual checks

Section C: Budget Plan and Financial Justification

- Total possible section points: 6 points
- Minimum passing section score: 4 points
- Total Section C score:

1. Budget narrative justification

Evaluates the connection between itemized fund usage and localized school safety requirements.

- **Part A: local need justification** (*Evaluates Part 6, Section 5*)
 - **Does not meet expectations (0 pts)**
 - Did not explain why specific materials or services are being requested
 - **Meets minimum expectations (1 pt)**
 - Included a general statement of need that does not account for specific school variance

- **Adequately meets expectations (2 pts)**
 - Clear local justification provided based on reported age, quality gaps or safety deficits of individual buildings

- **Part B: statutory spending priority alignment** *(Evaluates Parts 5 and 6, Section 5)*
 - **Does not meet expectations (0 pts)**
 - Funding requests ignore statutory priority levels or prioritize materials ahead of required items
 - **Meets minimum expectations (1 pt)**
 - Budget proposal is generally categorized but fails to clearly map across the five distinct eligible category limits
 - **Adequately meets expectations (2 pts)**
 - Comprehensive narrative proving itemized requests flow sequentially down from Priority 1 (AED procurement) to Priority 5 (materials)

- **Part C: grant funding history validation** *(Evaluates Part 6, Section 5)*
 - **Does not meet expectations (0 pts)**
 - Fails to address prior funding history

- **Meets minimum expectations (1 pt)**
 - General statement regarding history provided, but exact award years or past asset health are missing
- **Adequately meets expectations (2 pts)**
 - Explicit timeline of prior cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) grant allocations detailed or certified proof of zero prior state allocations submitted

2. Budget Breakdown Matrix (data verification)

Instructions: cross-reference mathematical data entries between the school breakdown tables and final totals. Missing components or math errors trigger an automatic failure.

- A. Individual school matrix matching:** individual site costs itemized across the five categories in Part 5 match perfectly across all vertical columns and rows inside the data fields.
- B. Master summary math:** combined direct cost subtotals transfer accurately to the master summaries and stay within the statutory allocation boundaries.
- C. Indirect cost application:** restricted rate percentage matches officially approved state records, calculates accurately, and aggregate total stays at or under the \$6,000.00 maximum cap.

Section D: Assurances and Electronic Certifications

- Authorized electronic certification check: reviewer verifies that the applicant completed the confirmation checklist fields in Part 7.

Section E: Scoring Summary and Reviewer Checklist

- Section B qualitative score total (max 12):
- Section C qualitative score total (max 6):
- Total combined qualitative points (max 18):
- Gatekeeper verification status:
- Reviewer name:
- Evaluation date: