

Teacher Technology Grant Evaluation Rubric

Spring, 2010

Total Score

Required Components

Score (out of 8):

- The application was submitted by an eligible person or team.
- The application does not exceed the maximum funding amount.
- The application was received prior to the application deadline.
- The applicant has agreed to the procedural assurances.
- The proposal is supported by building administrative leadership.
- The proposal does not conflict with existing or imminent district goals, technology initiatives, policies, or procedures.

Goals & Objectives

Score (out of 8):

- The proposal lists clear, realistic, measurable objectives that address an educational need.
- The proposal objectives include specific ties to Ohio's Academic Content Standards for Technology
- The proposal objectives address the improvement of students' 21st Century Skills

Project Plan

Score (out of 8):

- The proposal provides a clear description of the project's components.
- The proposal addresses the stated objectives.
- The hardware specified in the proposed budget is appropriate for the project described.
- The proposal clearly identifies how the items in the budget will be used to further the program goals.
- Appropriate provisions have been made for non-funded, but necessary, components

Impact

Score (out of 8):

- The proposal improves student access to and use of technology
- The proposal improves students' technology skills
- The proposal incorporates the use of technology in other academic areas
- The proposal facilitates multidisciplinary learning
- The proposed project provides a good value for the investment.
- The proposal includes a plan to sustain the project beyond the first year.

Evaluation

Score (out of 8):

- The proposed evaluation plan measures the objectives of the project.
- The evaluation plan includes a description of the process for evaluating the project and the data collected.
- The evaluation plan is likely to produce reasonably reliable results.

Other Considerations

Extra Credit (up to 4):

- The proposed project has a substantial impact on an at-risk population
- The proposal leverages additional resources beyond the scope of the grant.

Description of Ratings

Excellent 7 - 8	Specific and comprehensive. Complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. Well-conceived and thoroughly developed ideas.
Good 4 - 6	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 2 - 3	Sketchy and non-specific. Criteria appear to be minimally met, but limited information is provided about approach and strategies. Lacks focus and detail.
Poor 0 - 1	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.

Rubric References:

<http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/funding/ltg0609rubric.htm>

http://www.ihets.org/archive/progserv_arc/education_arc/IPSEgrants_arc/04-05/rubric.pdf