#### APPENDIX K: REVIEW PANEL RUBRIC – FY 2017

**DO NOT SUBMIT THIS RUBRIC WITH YOUR PROPOSAL –**

**FOR REVIEWER USE ONLY**

**INSTITUTION PROPOSAL TITLE PROPOSAL # \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND Improving Teacher Quality: P-16 Education Partnerships**

**ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

**EVALUATION OF GRANT PROPOSALS – FY 2017**

 **1=POOR 3=AVERAGE 5=SUPERIOR**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **DEMONSTRATED PROGRAM NEEDS AND PROGRAM**

 **DESCRIPTION (20)**1. Demonstrated evidence that teaching needs were assessed through a well-defined assessment process that included teachers and administrators. Needs assessment is included.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Described the collaboration of partners and provided evidence of demographics of partners and explained interactions and linkages that are sustainable. Described the inclusion of an engineering partner.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Described the project planning process including meetings held. Dates of meetings and participants are included.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Stated goals and objectives most likely to result in a measurable change/ improvement in targeted population.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **PLAN OF OPERATION (30)**
2. Assigned completion of major tasks and project deliverables according to an acceptable and achievable time schedule. Evidence of a topical outline of the scope and sequence of the content area, a syllabus and an action plan.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Described the magnitude of the outcomes likely to be sustained.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Designed appropriate methodology to achieve goals and objectives indicating scientifically-based research. Described the extent to which the services provided by the project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. Evidence of 60 hours of contact time. Evidence of face-to-face planned follow-up sessions.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Described the adequacy of procedures for ensuring follow-up activities, feedback, and continuous improvements in the operation of the project.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Described administrative operating procedures and reporting relationships that ensure efficient management. Included a clear description of the responsibilities of key personnel.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Described explicit plans for project dissemination of information about project effectiveness.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **III. RECRUITMENT (15)**1. Adequately explained active recruitment plan with samples of recruitment materials and timeline.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Demonstrated potential to have positive impact on underrepresented, underserved students and teachers.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Identified ways the project included principals and/or superintendents in project activities in meaningful and substantive ways
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **IV. EVALUATION AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES (20)**1. Described evaluation and performance measures most appropriate to assure a successful project. Evidence included a variety of measurement tools.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Included sample pre- and post questions.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Stated the name and qualifications of the project evaluator.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Described evaluation of project effectiveness that reflects the needs of partner school districts for highly qualified teachers and improved student academic outcomes.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **V. ADEQUACY OF RESOURCES, BUDGET, PERSONNEL (15)**1. Presented an adequate budget to achieve goals and objectives including matching funds. Demonstrated adequate resources through a well-defined assessment process or statement of institutional priorities. Priority points are awarded for graduate courses.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Demonstrated the ability of faculty, staff, or students to achieve proposed goals. (project director, key personnel, and evaluator vitae included)
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Described the proposed budget duration and funding request concisely and adequately to support program needs. Described the cost-effectiveness of the project.
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL (Each column) |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL EVALUATION SCORE (100 POSSIBLE POINTS)Sum of above column totals |  |

EACH OF THE SECTIONS BELOW MUST HAVE INFORMATION.

LIST STRENGTHS:

LIST WEAKNESSES:

DESCRIBE RECOMMENDATIONS:

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ FUND \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ FUND WITH REVISIONS \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ DO NOT FUND