Attachment B Evaluation Capacity

Standard Review Criteria

The following standard review criteria listed in the Rubric Reference Guide are used in scoring the application. Each competitive application is reviewed to determine the capability of the applicant to implement its proposed program. In reviewing the information submitted and in recommending competitive applications for funding, reviewers consider the following ratings:

Clearly Outstanding, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Standard, or Needs Improvement. When scoring each indicator, reviewers select a rating which has an appropriate point value assigned. The minimum threshold for grant award is 60 points in total.

| Rubric Reference Guide | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| Rubric Category | Total Points Possible | Proposed Activities | | |
| Quality of Program | 30 | Comprehensive plan to provide LEAs with immediate short-term relief for evaluation personnel shortages Comprehensive plan for recruitment of evaluation personnel for participation and communication of program activities across the state | | |
| Essential Components | 50 | Creation and maintenance of online database to connect available, properly certified/licensed personnel with LEAs Partnerships and collaboration with evaluation personnel professional organizations, IHEs and other organizations | | |
| Quality of Program Evaluation | 10 | Multiple measures of program evaluation based on outcomes; should include qualitative and quantitative measures | | |
| Quality of Program Management | 5 | Qualifications, knowledge, skills and experiences are commensurate with scope of proposed program | | |
| Appropriateness of Budget | 5 | Costs reflected in the budget commensurate with expected results and do not supplant or duplicate services | | |

Quality of Program (Up to 30 Points) Reviewers will consider the following application information when evaluating an application for quality of the program.

| | Clearly Outstanding | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Needs Improvement | Score |
|---|---|--|--|---|-------|
| | 15-12 points | 11-8 points | 7-4 points | 3-0 points | |
| Short term plan for evaluation personnel shortages | The proposed program introduces new and promising ideas for addressing the stated goal, includes all requirements at an exceptional level of quality, and describes an exemplary plan that would clearly provide substantial short-term relief to LEAs facing personnel shortages | The proposed program includes all requirements at a very high level of quality and describes strong plan that would be very likely to produce significant short-term relief for LEAs facing personnel shortages | The proposed program includes all requirements at a high level of quality and describes an adequate plan that would be likely to produce noticeable short-term relief for LEAs facing personnel shortages | The proposed program demonstrates a plan that is unlikely to yield any improvement, or only negligible improvements in relieving short term personnel shortages for LEAs | /15 |
| Recruitment and communication across the state | The proposed program introduces new and promising ideas for addressing the stated goal, includes all requirements at an exceptional level of quality, and describes an exemplary plan to market to and recruit evaluation personnel that would add to the overall pool of evaluation personnel vs. taking personnel who are already practicing in public schools as well as a comprehensive plan to clearly communicate the program to LEAs | The proposed program includes all requirements at a very high level of quality and describes strong plan to market to and recruit evaluation personnel that would add to the overall pool of evaluation personnel ws. taking personnel who are already practicing in public schools as well as a comprehensive plan to clearly communicate the program to LEAs | The proposed program includes all requirements at a high level of quality and describes an adequate plan to market to and recruit evaluation personnel that would add to the overall pool of evaluation personnel ws. taking personnel who are already practicing in public schools as well as a comprehensive plan to clearly communicate the program to LEAs | The proposed program to market and recruit evaluation personnel may result in a shifting of evaluation personnel resources rather than a clear increase in the overall pool of available evaluators in the state and/or does not have a clear plan to communicate the program to LEAs | /15 |
| | | | | TOTAL POINTS (sum of 2 components) | /30 |

Essential Components (Up to 50 points) Reviewers will consider the following application information when evaluating an application for essential components.

| | Clearly Outstanding | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Needs Improvement | Score |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|--|-------|
| | 25-18 points | 17-11 points | 10-4 points | 3-0 points | |
| Online database system | The proposed program introduces new and promising ideas for addressing the stated goal, includes all requirements at an exceptional level of quality, and describes an exemplary plan to deliver and maintain a database system that is intuitive and simple for users and provides robust features and options that will allow for matches between LEA needs and properly certified/licensed evaluation personnel for all types of evaluation needs (e.g. bilingual, psychological, eligibility, related services) | The proposed program includes all requirements at a very high level of quality and describes a strong plan to deliver and maintain a database system that is intuitive and simple for users and provides robust features and options that will allow for matches between LEA needs and properly certified/licensed evaluation personnel for a wide variety of evaluation needs (e.g. bilingual, psychological, eligibility, related services) | The proposed program includes all requirements at a high level of quality and describes an adequate plan to deliver and maintain database system that is intuitive and simple for users and provides robust features and options that will allow for matches between LEA needs and properly certified/licensed evaluation personnel for the most common types of evaluation needs (e.g. bilingual, psychological, eligibility, related services) | The proposed program is not adequate to deliver and maintain a database system that is intuitive and simple for users and/or does not provide for enough features and variety to meet the evaluation needs of LEAs | /25 |
| Partnerships and collaboration | The proposed program introduces new and promising ideas for addressing the stated goal, includes all requirements at an exceptional level of quality, and describes an exemplary plan to identify, develop, and leverage partnerships with applicable stakeholder groups including evaluation personnel professional organizations, institutes of higher education, and other organizations that could work collaboratively towards providing both short and long-term solutions for evaluation personnel shortages | The proposed program includes all requirements at a very high level of quality and describes strong plan to identify, develop, and leverage partnerships with applicable stakeholder groups including evaluation personnel professional organizations, institutes of higher education, and other organizations that could work collaboratively towards providing both short and long-term solutions for evaluation personnel shortages | The proposed program includes all requirements at a high level of quality and describes an adequate plan to identify, develop, and leverage partnerships with applicable stakeholder groups including evaluation personnel professional organizations, institutes of higher education, and other organizations that could work collaboratively towards providing both short and long-term solutions for evaluation personnel shortages | The proposed program does not demonstrate an adequate plan to identify, develop, and leverage partnerships with applicable stakeholder groups | /25 |
| | | | | TOTAL POINTS (sum of 2 components) | /50 |

Quality of Program Evaluation (Up to 10 points) Reviewers will consider the following application information when evaluating an application for quality of program evaluation.

| | Clearly Outstanding 10-9 points | Exceeds Expectations 8-6 points | Meets Expectations 5-3 points | Needs Improvement 2-0 points | Score |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|--|-------|
| Methods of Evaluation | The proposed program clearly identifies a comprehensive evaluation plan, utilizing rigorous evaluation methodology, to track overall outcomes and attainment of program goal(s). Evaluation plan includes collection of feedback from stakeholder groups representative of the state. Additionally, the evaluation plan details a method for periodic reporting to TEA leadership, interested stakeholders, and the public. | The proposed program clearly identifies a comprehensive evaluation plan, utilizing rigorous evaluation methodology, to track measures of effectiveness related to outcomes Evaluation plan includes collection of feedback from stakeholder groups representative of the state. Additionally, the evaluation plan details a method for periodic reporting to TEA leadership, interested stakeholders, and the public. | The proposed program clearly identifies an evaluation plan to track overall outcomes. Evaluation plan includes collection of feedback from stakeholder groups representative of the state. Additionally, the evaluation plan details a method for periodic reporting to TEA leadership and interested stakeholders. | The proposed program does not provide adequate details for the methods of evaluation of program effectiveness. | /10 |
| | | | | TOTAL POINTS (one component) | /10 |

Quality of Program Management (Up to 5 points) Reviewers will consider the following application information when evaluating an application for quality of program management.

| | Clearly Outstanding | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Needs Improvement | Score |
|-------------------------------|---|---|--|--|-------|
| | 5 points | 4-3 points | 2-1 point | 0 points | |
| Qualifications and Experience | Proposed program plan clearly details the qualifications and experience of the program implementers and other personnel (as appropriate). Roles and responsibilities are designated; and individuals' knowledge, skills, abilities and experiences are strongly aligned with specified roles. | Proposed program plan clearly details the qualifications and experience of the program implementers and other personnel (as appropriate). Roles and responsibilities are designated; and individuals' knowledge, skills, abilities and experiences are closely aligned. | Proposed program plan provides qualifications and experience of implementers and other personnel (as appropriate). Roles and responsibilities are tentative. | Proposed program plan provides qualifications and experiences of implementers however, roles and responsibilities are not aligned with qualifications. | /5 |
| | | | | TOTAL POINTS (one component) | /5 |

Appropriateness of Budget (Up to 5 points) Reviewers will consider the following application information when evaluating an application for appropriateness of budget.

| | Clearly Outstanding | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Needs Improvement | Score |
|--|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | 5 points | 4-3 points | 2-1 point | 0 points | |
| Cost Commensurate with Expected Results | The costs detailed in the budget are inclusive of all aspects of the program, including personnel, materials, and ongoing support. Additionally, program seeks to leverage existing networks/systems. | The costs detailed in the budget are inclusive of all aspects of the program, including personnel, materials, and ongoing support and do not duplicate efforts. | The costs detailed in the budget reflect a cohesive plan to achieve the scope of expected results and do not duplicate efforts. | The costs detailed in the budget does not reflect a cohesive plan to achieve the scope of expected results. | /5 |
| | | | | TOTAL POINTS (one component) | /5 |