

# Teacher Technology Grant Evaluation

Title: Trailblazing With Technology	Proposal: 21
Applicant(s): Judy Coleman, Cathy Schwenn, Dena Wilson	Total Score: 63.00

## Required Components *Rate each 1 for Good or 0 for Poor*

The application was submitted by an eligible person or team.	1.00
The application does not exceed the maximum funding amount.	1.00
The application was received prior to the application deadline.	1.00
The applicant has agreed to the procedural assurances.	1.00
The proposal is supported by building administrative leadership.	1.00
The proposal does not conflict with existing or imminent district goals, technology initiatives, policies, or procedures.	1.00
<b>Total (6 Required):</b>	<b>6.00</b>

## Goals & Objectives *Rate each 4 for Excellent, 3 for Good, 2 for Fair, or 0 for Poor*

The proposal lists clear, realistic, measurable objectives that address an educational need.	2.75
The proposal objectives include specific ties to Ohio's Academic Content Standards for Technology	3.75
The proposal objectives address the improvement of students' 21st Century Skills	2.25
<b>Total (8 Required):</b>	<b>8.75</b>

## Project Plan *Rate each 4 for Excellent, 3 for Good, 2 for Fair, or 0 for Poor*

The proposal provides a clear description of the project's components.	3.25
The proposal addresses the stated objectives.	3.00
The hardware specified in the proposed budget is appropriate for the project described.	3.25
The proposal clearly identifies how the items in the budget will be used to further the program goals.	3.25
Appropriate provisions have been made for non-funded, but necessary, components	3.00
<b>Total (14 Required):</b>	<b>15.75</b>

## Impact *Rate each 4 for Excellent, 3 for Good, 2 for Fair, or 0 for Poor*

The proposal improves student access to and use of technology	3.25
The proposal improves students' technology skills	3.00
The proposal incorporates the use of technology in other academic areas	3.25
The proposal facilitates multidisciplinary learning	3.50
The proposed project provides a good value for the investment.	2.00
The proposal includes a plan to sustain the project beyond the first year.	2.75
<b>Total (16 Required):</b>	<b>17.75</b>

## Evaluation *Rate each 4 for Excellent, 3 for Good, 2 for Fair, or 0 for Poor*

The proposed evaluation plan measures the objectives of the project.	2.75
The evaluation plan includes a description of the process for evaluating the project and the data collected.	3.00
The evaluation plan is likely to produce reasonably reliable results.	2.75
<b>Total (8 Required):</b>	<b>8.50</b>

## Other Considerations *Rate each as indicated*

The applicant is willing to present the project to other staff members or at professional conferences (1 for Yes, 0 for No).	1.00
The proposed project has a substantial impact on an at-risk population (3 for Excellent, 2 for Good, 1 for Fair, 0 for Poor).	2.50
The proposal leverages additional resources beyond the scope of the grant (3 for Excellent, 2 for Good, 1 for Fair, 0 for Poor).	2.75
<b>Total (0 Required):</b>	<b>6.25</b>