

PART VIII – REVIEW SHEET FOR EVALUATING PROPOSALS

District: _____

School: _____

Commonwealth Priority School (circle): Yes No

Partner: _____

Total Number of Points: _____

Two (2) hard copies of the following were sent:

Standard Contract with Original Signatures	YES	NO
Budget Detail Pages	YES	NO
Comments:		
Assurance from School District	YES	NO
Comments:		
Assurance from Each Participating School Principal	YES	NO
Assurance from Partner	YES	NO

Submitted Electronically

Budget Detail Pages	YES	NO
Narrative	YES	NO

Narrative

1. District and Schools Participating

Eligible districts and schools are currently funded (2008-2009) Reading First districts and schools that are on the 2008 list of schools serving grade 3 and are identified for Corrective Action and Restructuring in the aggregate or Restructuring for subgroups in English Language Arts (ELA) and have a grade 3 ELA CPI (Composite Performance Index) less than 80.

Provide a list of the schools participating. Indicate why particular schools have been selected with respect to student proficiency on MCAS reading at grade 3 and school factors related to leadership, curriculum and instruction, assessment, professional development, and literacy coaching. Indicate why particular schools are selected related to the identified critical issue (See #2 below). A district may propose multiple partnerships in the grant application. Prioritize partnerships if more than one partnership is proposed. Prepare separate budgets for each partnership and a combined budget for the district.

Indicate quality of proposal. 3 = weak; 12 = strong

3	6	9	12
---	---	---	----

Comments:

PART VIII – REVIEW SHEET FOR EVALUATING PROPOSALS (continued)**2. Critical Issue**

Identify a critical issue based on analysis of recent (MCAS/grade 3) data. Be mindful of subgroup data and the intent to close the achievement gap by implementing research-based instructional practices in specified areas.

Indicate quality of proposal. 3 = weak; 12 = strong

3	6	9	12
---	---	---	----

Comments:

3. Higher Education/Organizations Participating

Identify one or more partners from higher education or other organizations (e.g., educational consulting group) with expertise in K-3 reading instruction. Include resumes that demonstrate expertise for the people who will provide professional development on the critical issue being addressed.

Indicate quality of proposal. 3 = weak; 12 = strong

3	6	9	12
---	---	---	----

Comments:

4. Plan for Initiative

Describe the plan to implement a recommended best practice that will address the identified critical issue: What professional development will take place? Describe proposed professional development in reading for this grant. Proposed professional development should be related directly to needs identified in data analysis and related to the implemented best practice. Who will be responsible (district, school, external provider)? How will it take place (district-based meetings, regional professional development, study groups)? When will professional development take place (proposed dates required)? Indicate the approximate number of staff in schools who will participate in the training or will be involved in other aspects of the program. What are the indicators for success?

Indicate quality of proposal. 4 = weak; 16 = strong

4	8	12	16
---	---	----	----

Comments:

5. Research on Implemented Practices

Indicate the research on effectiveness of implemented practice and related professional development in connection to this grant.

Indicate quality of proposal. 4 = weak; 16 = strong

4	8	12	16
---	---	----	----

Comments:

PART VIII – REVIEW SHEET FOR EVALUATING PROPOSALS (continued)

6. Evaluation

It is expected that each grant recipient will conduct *action research* related to the identified critical issue and effectiveness of the proposed initiative. Each partnership will be required to submit a local evaluation report using a common template provided by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (Department). Required elements of the reporting will include measure(s) of changes in teacher knowledge and/or practice as well as pre/post student achievement data. Note that grantees are **not** required to hire an external evaluator, but rather to use expertise provided by one or more of the partners for this purpose.

The proposal narrative should include the following items with regard to evaluation:

- a. identify essential research questions that will be addressed through local evaluation;
- b. provide a general description of the measure(s) that will be used to gauge changes in teacher knowledge and/or practice (may be locally-developed by the partnership);
- c. identify the assessment(s) that will be used for pre/post student achievement data;
- d. indicate that there will be a report prepared in collaboration with the district, school(s), and partner(s) describing the effectiveness of the implementation of the proposed research-based instructional strategies in K-3 and that the report will be shared with the Department at the conclusion of the project; and
- e. identify who will be responsible for conducting and reporting on the evaluation and describe his/her qualifications and experience.

Indicate quality of proposal. 4 = weak; 16 = strong

4	8	12	16
---	---	----	----

Comments:

7. Matching Funds

Describe how the matching funds will help to support this grant and how this grant is connected to efforts the district is supporting with American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) stimulus funding.

Indicate quality of proposal. 3 = weak; 12 = strong

3	6	9	12
---	---	---	----

Comments:

Commonwealth Priority School (add 4 points) _____

Total Number of Points: _____

Overall Comments: