

Teacher Technology Grant Feedback

I Have a Dream to Make the Classroom Green

| Required Components | | Rate each 1 for Good or 0 for Poor |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| 1A | The application was submitted by an eligible person or team. | 1 |
| 1B | The application does not exceed the maximum funding amount. | 1 |
| 1C | The application was received prior to the application deadline. | 1 |
| 1D | The applicant has agreed to the procedural assurances. | 1 |
| 1E | The proposal is supported by building administrative leadership. | 1 |
| 1F | The proposal does not conflict with existing or imminent district goals, technology initiatives, policies, or procedures. | 1 |
| Total (6 Required): | | 6 |

| Goals & Objectives | | Rate each 4 for Excellent, 3 for Good, 2 for Fair, or 0 for Poor |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| 2A | The proposal lists clear, realistic, measurable objectives that address an educational need. | 3.4 |
| 2B | The proposal objectives include specific ties to Ohio's Academic Content Standards for Technology | 3.4 |
| 2C | The proposal objectives address the improvement of students' 21st Century Skills | 3.6 |
| Total (8 Required): | | 10.4 |

| Project Plan | | Rate each 4 for Excellent, 3 for Good, 2 for Fair, or 0 for Poor |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| 3A | The proposal provides a clear description of the project's components. | 3.4 |
| 3B | The proposal addresses the stated objectives. | 3.4 |
| 3C | The hardware specified in the proposed budget is appropriate for the project described. | 3.6 |
| 3D | The proposal clearly identifies how the items in the budget will be used to further the program goals. | 3.4 |
| 3E | Appropriate provisions have been made for non-funded, but necessary, components | 4 |
| Total (14 Required): | | 17.8 |

| Impact | | Rate each 4 for Excellent, 3 for Good, 2 for Fair, or 0 for Poor |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| 4A | The proposal improves student access to and use of technology | 3.6 |
| 4B | The proposal improves students' technology skills | 3.2 |
| 4C | The proposal incorporates the use of technology in other academic areas | 3.6 |
| 4D | The proposal facilitates multidisciplinary learning | 3.4 |
| 4E | The proposed project provides a good value for the investment. | 3 |
| 4F | The proposal includes a plan to sustain the project beyond the first year. | 3.6 |
| Total (16 Required): | | 20.4 |

| Evaluation | | Rate each 4 for Excellent, 3 for Good, 2 for Fair, or 0 for Poor |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| 5A | The proposed evaluation plan measures the objectives of the project. | 3 |
| 5B | The evaluation plan includes a description of the process for evaluating the project and the data collected. | 2.6 |
| 5C | The evaluation plan is likely to produce reasonably reliable results. | 2 |
| Total (8 Required): | | 7.6 |

| Other Considerations | | Rate each as indicated below |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| 6B | The proposed project has a substantial impact on an at-risk population. Rate 4 for Excellent, 3 for Good, 2 for Fair, or 0 for Poor. | 2.2 |
| 6C | The proposal leverages additional resources beyond the scope of the grant. Rate 4 for Excellent, 3 for Good, 2 for Fair, or 0 for Poor. | 1.6 |
| Total (0 Required): | | 3.8 |

Comments from Reviewers: **Total Score: 66**

When you get this set up in your room, invite others to come and see how it works. It sounds very innovative.

I would have liked to see a price break down for the Smartboard and Senteo system. Over \$6,000 seems like an expensive package for this hardware. The evaluations are vague. A more specific evaluation plan would have been helpful. The flash drive idea sounded neat but few details were provided about how they would be used. How would the Airliner be used by the students? Why only one?

I like how you tied this into the environment and making the students better citizens. You explain how you will evaluate your learning and your students' learning, but what about the parent component?

| Description of Ratings | |
|------------------------|--|
| Excellent | Specific and comprehensive. Complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. Well-conceived and thoroughly developed ideas. |
| Good | General but sufficient detail. Adequate information as to how the criteria are met, but some areas are not fully explained and/or questions remain. Some minor inconsistencies and weaknesses. |
| Fair | Sketchy and non-specific. Criteria appear to be minimally met, but limited information is provided about approach and strategies. Lacks focus and detail. |
| Poor | Does not meet the criteria, fails to provide information, provides inaccurate information, or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the criteria are met. |