

College Ready STEM Demonstration Grants Program Scoring Rubric

Reviewer:

Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Reviewer Score	Average Total	Comments/Recommendations
<p>Project Design</p> <p>Concise and clear statement of goals and measurable objectives aligned with one or more of the three priorities of the RFP (i.e., college readiness learning, STEM teacher effectiveness and distribution and student engagement/persistence).</p> <p>1 – Proposal states goals but does not connect to measures or priorities.</p> <p>5 – Proposal states goals and connects to measures and priorities but lacks detail.</p> <p>10 – Proposal provides detailed and clear connection between goals, measurable objectives and priorities.</p>	<p>40</p> <p>10</p>			
<p>Key tasks and milestones. The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones for accomplishing project task. Detailed timeline for project activities from January 2011 through June 2011. Include all required tasks to carry out all aspects of the project.</p> <p>1 – Proposal includes limited timeline but may lack detail, may have missing key tasks and/or project deliverables.</p> <p>5 – Proposal includes reasonable timeline with all required tasks and deliverables.</p> <p>10 – Proposal provides detailed and clear project timeline with required tasks for the project and deliverables.</p>	<p>10</p>			
<p>A. Outreach plan. Demonstration that IHE and K-12 partnership around demonstration project will function to ensure optimal regional and statewide impact.</p> <p>1 – Partnership provides minimal information about regional and/or statewide impact. Proposed impact is not significant.</p> <p>3 – Partnership has clear plans to have regional and statewide impact but does not have a</p>	<p>10</p>			

Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Reviewer Score	Average Total	Comments/Recommendations
<p>strong record of spreading demonstration impact.</p> <p>5 – Partnership is well positioned to ensure optimal regional and statewide impact. Planning is underway and prior regional and statewide impact is demonstrated.</p> <p>B. Evidence that the partnership has the capability to mobilize a broad range of traditional and non-traditional education stakeholders in the demonstration process. Proposal includes prior evidence and/or plans to engage STEM Schools, K-8 Programs of Excellence, and other relevant STEM initiatives at both the regional and statewide level.</p> <p>1 – Proposal provides limited evidence that partnership has the appropriate type(s) of leadership capacity to mobilize partners but partnerships are not broad enough to include traditional and non-traditional education stakeholders.</p> <p>3 – Proposal provides evidence that partnership has the appropriate type(s) of leadership capacity to mobilize a broad range of traditional and non-traditional education stakeholders in process.</p> <p>5 – Proposal provides strong evidence that partnership has the appropriate type(s) of leadership capacity and mixture of non-traditional and traditional educators to be a highly attractive and viable demonstration site.</p>				
<p>A. Evaluation. The extent to which the applicant describes strategies for using data to manage program implementation, inform decision-making, engage stakeholders and measure success. Describes the capacity of the partnership to carry out a rigorous demonstration project evaluation. Identifies key evaluation personnel and describe how the expertise of each individual will be utilized. Describes how the partnership will collect data on participants impacted by the demonstration project. Describes a formative and summative evaluation plan including identification of measurable outcomes that will be collected and tracked to evaluate the partnership's effectiveness.</p> <p>1 – Proposal outlines a limited plan to carry out project evaluation but plan may not include all required elements. (Key evaluation personnel, data collection on participants, formative and summative outcomes.)</p> <p>3 – Proposal outlines capacity of partnership to carry out a reasonable project evaluation including all required evaluation requirements. (Key evaluation personnel, data collection on participants, formative and summative outcomes.)</p> <p>5 – Proposal outlines the capacity of partnership to carry out a strong and rigorous project evaluation plan. Plan is high-quality including a detailed approach to how STEM initiative will be</p>	10			

Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Reviewer Score	Average Total	Comments/Recommendations
<p>measured for effectiveness.</p> <p>B. Describes how evaluation findings will be communicated to external stakeholders and how the project will ensure timely and accurate reporting to the STEM Committee. Explain how findings will be communicated to and used by partnership members and other stakeholders for strengthening impact of the demonstration site.</p> <p>1 – Proposal describes a limited plan to communicate evaluation findings to external stakeholders and the STEM Committee but may lack breadth in means of communicating and using findings.</p> <p>3 – Proposal describes a reasonable plan to communicate evaluation findings to external stakeholders including the STEM Committee. Plan includes means using evaluation findings to stakeholders for demonstration project improvement.</p> <p>5 – Proposal describes an extensive and effective communications plan to communicate evaluations results to external stakeholders and the STEM Committee. The plan includes an explanation of how the results will be communicated to improve the demonstration project.</p>				
Knowledge, Experience and History	20			
<p>Prior work in college ready STEM connected to one or more of the three priorities of the RFP (i.e., college readiness learning, STEM teacher effectiveness and distribution and student engagement/persistence). The extent to which the demonstration project is based on the best available evidence including, where available, strong or moderate evidence.</p> <p>1 – Proposal describes limited evidence on the project’s established capacity to impact one or more of the identified competitive priorities.</p> <p>5 – Moderate evidence: Previous studies with designs that can support causal connection (i.e., high internal validity) and limited generalizability (i.e., moderate external validity).</p> <p>10 – Strong evidence: Studies with designs that can support causal connections (i.e., high internal validity) and support scaling up to the State, regional or national level (i.e., high external validity.)</p>	10			
<p>Personnel Qualifications. The qualifications, relevant training and experience of the applicant including the project director and prior performance of the applicant on similar efforts. Listing and documentation of key individuals (e.g., PI, IHE faculty, district leaders, business and industry, etc.) and partnerships from preK-12, higher education, and community/business participating in project activities and their respective roles, responsibilities or contributions.</p>	10			

Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Reviewer Score	Average Total	Comments/Recommendations
<p>1 – Little meaningful involvement from key individuals and partnerships from preK-12, higher education and community/business. Respective roles, responsibilities and contributions are not spelled out.</p> <p>5 – Progress has been demonstrated securing key individuals and partnerships from preK-12, higher education and community/business but respective roles, responsibilities and contributions are still under development.</p> <p>10 – Strong demonstration that key individuals, partnerships from preK-12, higher education and community/business are actively engaged with the partnership. Respective roles, responsibilities and contributions of partners are well underway and demonstration project efficacy is demonstrated.</p>				
Level of Effort and Strength of Principal Partners	30			
<p>Project expenses tied to goals and outcomes. Documentation of how the budget will be apportioned and prioritized, and the requirements for any matching investments or commitments from private or community partners. Describes all anticipated project expenses for the period. Include an explanation of how each expense reflects the goals and scope of the project.</p> <p>1 – Proposal includes budget but may lack detail or have key elements missing and/or may be missing matching investments and/or how expense reflects the goals and scope of the project.</p> <p>5 – Proposal provides detailed budget including apportionments, prioritization and requirements for any matching investments. Includes explanation of how expenses reflect the goals and scope of project. Reasonable use of resources.</p> <p>10 – Proposal includes thorough budget with documentation of how the budget will be apportioned and prioritized. Describes how anticipated expenses reflect the goals and scope of project and person(s) responsible. Excellent use of resources.</p>	10			
<p>20% match viability. Securing and integrating funding streams from multiple public and private sources. Evidence that partnership has received fiscal and in-kind support from private and non-state governmental resources.</p> <p>1 – Limited evidence of securing resources and/or in-kind support needed to achieve success in terms of having capacity to have regional impact (less than 20% match).</p> <p>5 – Some evidence of securing resources and/or in-kind support needed to achieve success in terms of having capacity to have regional impact (meet 20% match).</p>	10			

Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Reviewer Score	Average Total	Comments/Recommendations
<p>10 – Strong evidence of securing resources and/or in-kind support needed to achieve success in terms of having regional and state impact (30% match or more).</p>				
<p>Partnership efficacy. Evidence that the partnership is structured to receive and distribute knowledge. Describes the partnership’s meaningful connectivity to any existing STEM infrastructures and initiatives such as the Ohio Department of Education’s Next Generation Learners initiative, regional “informal” education providers, middle school and high school transformation initiatives (Early College High Schools, Credit Flexibility) and higher education access initiatives (e.g., Choose Ohio First Scholarship program, Ohio Woodrow Wilson STEM Teaching Fellows.) This is not an exhaustive list of potential STEM connections.</p> <p>1 – Proposal describes connectivity to existing STEM infrastructures and initiatives but provides minimal evidence of leveraging multiple initiatives.</p> <p>5 – Proposal describes partnership’s connectivity to existing STEM infrastructures and initiatives and evidence of leveraging multiple initiatives.</p> <p>10 – Proposal strongly describes connectivity to existing infrastructures and transformational initiatives of the Ohio Department of Education and the Ohio Board of Regents. Partnership demonstrates optimal leveraging power of state-wide initiatives.</p>	10			
<p>Participation in State-wide Demonstration Network</p>	10			
<p>A. The potential for continued support for the demonstration project after state funding ends, including the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to sustain and/or scale up the project.</p> <p>1 – Limited commitment/resources from partners for a sustainable demonstration site and the plan does not have the necessary qualities or resources for long-term success.</p> <p>3 – Some commitment/resources from partnerships for a sustainable demonstration site and some of the necessary qualities or resources are in place for long-term success.</p> <p>5 – Strong commitment/resources from partnerships for a sustainable demonstration site and many of the necessary qualities or resources are in place for long-term success.</p> <p>B. Evidence of working with Battelle, the non-profit entity selected by the STEM Committee. Indicate partnership commitment to participating in collaborative sharing lessons and meetings, and through collaborative on-line tools that may be employed by the Ohio STEM Learning Network.</p> <p>1 – Proposal presents minimal evidence of working with the non-profit entity, Battelle and the</p>	10			

Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Reviewer Score	Average Total	Comments/Recommendations
<p>Ohio STEM Learning Network.</p> <p>3 –Proposal presents evidence of working with Battelle and demonstration of partnership commitment to participating in collaborative sharing lessons and meetings through the Ohio STEM Learning Network.</p> <p>5 – Proposal presents strong evidence of effectively working with Battelle. Proposal demonstrates how the partnership has worked with Battelle and the Ohio STEM Learning Network to establish connectivity and productivity.</p>				