

Teacher Technology Grant Feedback

Labspiration

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.	2.6
2B	The proposal objectives include specific ties to Ohio's Academic Content Standards for Technology	2.6
2C	The proposal objectives address the improvement of students' 21st Century Skills	2.8
Total (8 Required):		8

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
3B	The proposal addresses the stated objectives.	3
3C	The hardware specified in the proposed budget is appropriate for the project described.	3
3D	The proposal clearly identifies how the items in the budget will be used to further the program goals.	3
3E	Appropriate provisions have been made for non-funded, but necessary, components	3.2
Total (14 Required):		15.2

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	3.2
4B	The proposal improves students' technology skills	3
4C	The proposal incorporates the use of technology in other academic areas	3.4
4D	The proposal facilitates multidisciplinary learning	3.2
4E	The proposed project provides a good value for the investment.	3.6
4F	The proposal includes a plan to sustain the project beyond the first year.	3
Total (16 Required):		19.4

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.	2.2
5B	The evaluation plan includes a description of the process for evaluating the project and the data collected.	2.2
5C	The evaluation plan is likely to produce reasonably reliable results.	2.4
Total (8 Required):		6.8

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.	2.25
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.	2.25
Total (0 Required):		4.5

Comments from Reviewers: **Total Score: 59.9**

This grant seemed to be too general, need more specific information. Who is going to implement the projects, teachers or lab manager. Mentioned PowerPoint and Word, the labs already have this, how does Inspiration aid in this?

This is such an invaluable piece of software.

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.