

## Georgia’s Improving Teacher Quality Grant Program Proposal Rating Instrument – 2010

Proposal ID: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer’s Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer Score**

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Demonstrated Need (out of 15 points)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Meaningful Partnership (out of 10 points)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Project Goals and Objectives (out of 15 points)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Plan of Operation (out of 25 points)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Capacity (out of 15 points)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Evaluation (out of 15 points)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Budget (out of 5 points)

Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_ (out of 100 points)

**1. Demonstrated Need – 15 points**

**Reviewer Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

- There is evidence that proposed activities address documented, real needs of participants with an emphasis on participants from high need, low performing Local Education Agencies (i.e., school systems).
- Project involves one or more Local Education Agencies that is below the State highly qualified teacher average (in Georgia 97.7%) AND 20% or more of its students are members of families that live in poverty.
- **If the project is a continuation, the proposal provides documentation of the success of recent activities.**

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**2. Meaningful Partnership – 10 points**

**Reviewer Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

- There is evidence of active involvement of all required partners in planning, governance, and implementation.
  - Local Education Agency
  - Arts and Sciences (content) unit of Institution of Higher Education
  - Unit of an Institution of Higher Education that prepares teachers
- The planning process is clearly described and documented.
- Letters of support are provided from partners and clearly indicate the partner’s role and commitment.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**3. Project Goals and Objectives – 15 points****Reviewer Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

- Goals and objectives are clearly identified and are linked to demonstrated needs.
- The objectives have potential to result in measurable improvement in teachers' content knowledge in their academic subjects, teaching practice, and their students' learning.
- Objectives and project activities are aligned with Georgia Performance Standards (GPS).

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**4. Plan of Operation – 25 points****Reviewer Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

- There is evidence that proposed activities are scientifically based, reflective of effective professional development, and will have a demonstrable applicability to teacher practice and student learning.
- Activities are appropriate to the needs of the intended participants and aligned with project goals.
- Recruitment/selection plan ensures participation by teachers from one or more high need Local Education Agencies.
- A schedule of activities, including a timeline, is presented and is reasonable for completing all activities.
- There is evidence of follow-up activities, and in the case of Type C or Type BC proposals, sustained contact involving multiple group meetings OR project personnel visiting participants' classrooms.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**5. Capacity – 15 points****Reviewer Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

- The role of each key faculty and support personnel member is clearly described.
- Key staff members have appropriate credentials as evidenced in vitae or job narratives.
- The size of the staff and the amount of time devoted to the project is appropriate for the proposed activities.
- Facilities and equipment at the host institution needed to carry out the project are clearly described.
- Contributions from private business or industry, if applicable, are described.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**6. Evaluation – 15 points****Reviewer Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

- The evaluation plan includes measurable targets, and adequately assesses achievement of project goals and effectiveness of activities.
- The evaluation plan describes means of assessing participants' changes in content knowledge, classroom practice, and, if appropriate, their students' performance.
- Classroom visitations are included in the evaluation plan, if appropriate.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**7. Budget – 5 points**

**Reviewer Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

- The budget reflects all funding sources (cash and in kind) and clearly indicates how each activity is funded. Note: Contributions born by another Federal grant should not be shown as matching funds.
- Budget line items are adequately explained in the budget narrative.
- Budget costs are reasonable, tied to specific project activities, and adequate for the project objectives and design.
- The budget appears to meet the requirement that 3% of the grant funds are used for project evaluation.
- There is a financial commitment from each of the project partners.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_