# Attachment 5 – Evaluation Rubrics

## Attachment 5.A. – Professional Development Evaluation Rubric

**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.

|  | **Clearly Outstanding**  **4 points** | **Exceeds Expectations**  **3 points** | **Meets Expectations**  **2 points** | **Needs Improvement**  **0-1 points** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Resources to Meet**  **Objectives** | The proposal includes all requirements. Additionally, (1) role descriptions and resumes demonstrate skills and knowledge are exceptionally aligned to the work requirements, (2) if contractors are proposed to complete portions of the work, the number of contractors and their responsibilities are clearly established, and prospective contractors are listed | The proposal includes all requirements. Additionally, (1) role descriptions and resumes demonstrate skills and knowledge aligned to the work requirements, (2) if contractors are proposed to complete the work, the number of contractors and their responsibilities are clearly established | The proposal includes all requirements, including (1) complete role descriptions and resumes of the staff who would be responsible for the work, (2) a statement establishing whether contractors will be used to complete any part of the work | The proposal does not include all requirements, including (1) complete role descriptions and resumes of the staff who would be responsible for the work, (2) a statement establishing whether contractors will be used to complete any part of the work | /4 |
|  | **Clearly Outstanding**  **4 points** | **Exceeds Expectations**  **3 points** | **Meets Expectations**  **2 points** | **Needs Improvement**  **0-1 points** | **Score** |
| **Instructional Excellence**  **PD Experience** | The proposal includes (1) evidenced examples of previous, successful work developing instructional excellence and rigor competencies in high-need, urban and rural middle schools and high schools; and (2) explanations of positive intervention outcomes and how the applicant’s capabilities led to stated outcomes | The proposal includes evidenced examples of previous, successful work developing instructional excellence and rigor competencies in high-need, urban and rural middle schools and high schools | The proposal includes evidenced examples of previous work developing instructional excellence and rigor competencies in middle and high schools | The proposal does not include evidenced examples of previous work developing instructional excellence and rigor competencies in middle and high schools | /4 |
|  | **Clearly Outstanding**  **4 points** | **Exceeds Expectations**  **3 points** | **Meets Expectations**  **2 points** | **Needs Improvement**  **0-1 points** | **Score** |
| **Vertical Alignment Experience** | The proposal includes (1) evidenced examples of previous work aligning instruction in high-need, urban and rural middle schools and high schools, and institutes of higher education; and (2) explanations of positive intervention outcomes and how the applicant’s capabilities led to stated outcomes | The proposal includes evidenced examples of previous work aligning instruction in high-need, urban and rural middle schools and high schools, and institutes of higher education | The proposal includes evidenced examples of previous work aligning instruction between middle schools, high schools, and institutions of higher education | The proposal does not include evidenced examples of previous work aligning instruction between middle schools, high schools, and institutions of higher education | /4 |
|  | **Clearly Outstanding**  **7-8 points** | **Exceeds Expectations**  **5-6 points** | **Meets Expectations**  **3-4 points** | **Needs Improvement**  **0-2 points** | **Score** |
| **Quality of Activity and Budget Plan** | The proposed methodologies, plans, and budgets (1) address all activities in this request for LOIs in detail; (2) describe a program that is highly likely to meet the required work products outlined in this request; and (3) are resource/cost-efficient | The proposed methodologies, plans, and budgets address all activities in this request for LOIs in detail, and describe a program that is highly likely to meet the required work products outlined in this request | The proposed methodologies, plans, and budgets address all activities in this request for LOIs, and they describe a program that is likely to meet the required work products outlined in this request | The proposed methodologies, plans, and budgets do not address all activities in this request for LOIs, and/or they describe a program that is unlikely to meet the required work products outlined in this request | /8 |
|  | **Clearly Outstanding**  **4 points** | **Exceeds Expectations**  **3 points** | **Meets Expectations**  **2 points** | **Needs Improvement**  **0-1 points** | **Score** |
| **Fidelity of Implementation Metrics** | The program (1) proposes strong, evidenced measures for implementation fidelity evaluation; (2) addresses information collection needs; (3) includes robust methods for periodic reporting to TEA and other stakeholders; (4) evidences relevant tools and frameworks used by the applicant | The program (1) proposes strong measures for implementation fidelity evaluation; (2) addresses information collection needs; and (3) includes robust methods for periodic reporting to TEA and other stakeholders | The proposal includes measures that will provide adequate methods of evaluation of implementation fidelity; additionally, the evaluation plan details a method for periodic reporting to TEA and other stakeholders | The proposal does not include a plan and measures that will provide adequate methods of implementation fidelity evaluation | /4 |
|  |  |  |  | **TOTAL POINTS**  **(sum of 4 components)** | **/24** |

## Attachment 5.B. – Performance Management Evaluation Rubric

**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.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Clearly Outstanding**  **4 points** | **Exceeds Expectations**  **3 points** | **Meets Expectations**  **2 points** | **Needs Improvement**  **0-1 points** | **Score** |
| **Resources to Meet**  **Objectives** | The proposal includes all requirements. Additionally, (1) role descriptions and resumes demonstrate skills and knowledge are exceptionally aligned to the work requirements, (2) if contractors are proposed to complete portions of the work, the number of contractors and their responsibilities are clearly established, and prospective contractors are listed | The proposal includes all requirements. Additionally, (1) role descriptions and resumes demonstrate skills and knowledge aligned to the work requirements, (2) if contractors are proposed to complete the work, the number of contractors and their responsibilities are clearly established | The proposal includes all requirements, including (1) complete role descriptions and resumes of the staff who would be responsible for the work, (2) a statement establishing whether contractors will be used to complete any part of the work | The proposal does not include all requirements, including (1) complete role descriptions and resumes of the staff who would be responsible for the work, (2) a statement establishing whether contractors will be used to complete any part of the work | /4 |
|  | **Clearly Outstanding**  **4 points** | **Exceeds Expectations**  **3 points** | **Meets Expectations**  **2 points** | **Needs Improvement**  **0-1 points** | **Score** |
| **Data-driven Performance Management** | The proposal includes (1) evidenced examples of previous, successful work developing data-driven program performance management competencies in high-need, urban and rural middle schools and high schools; and (2) explanations of positive intervention outcomes and how the applicant’s capabilities led to stated outcomes | The proposal includes evidenced examples of previous, successful work developing data-driven program performance management competencies in high-need, urban and rural middle schools and high schools | The proposal includes evidenced examples of previous work developing data-driven program performance management competencies in middle and high schools | The proposal does not include evidenced examples of previous work developing data-driven program performance management competencies in middle and high schools | /4 |
|  | **Clearly Outstanding**  **9-11 points** | **Exceeds Expectations**  **6-8 points** | **Meets Expectations**  **3-5 points** | **Needs Improvement**  **0-2 points** | **Score** |
| **Information Collection and Reporting Tools** | The proposal (1) includes evidenced examples of previous work deploying information collection and reporting tools in middle schools and high schools; (2) identifies and demonstrates tools that are relevant and easily adapted to this request; and (3) details tool implementation and training methods | The proposal (1) includes evidenced examples of previous work deploying information collection and reporting tools in middle schools and high schools, and (2) identifies and demonstrates tools that are relevant to this request | The proposal includes evidenced examples of previous work deploying information collection and reporting tools in middle schools and high schools | The proposal does not include evidenced examples of previous work deploying information collection and reporting tools in middle schools and high schools | /11 |
|  | **Clearly Outstanding**  **7-8 points** | **Exceeds Expectations**  **5-6 points** | **Meets Expectations**  **3-4 points** | **Needs Improvement**  **0-2 points** | **Score** |
| **Quality of Activity and Budget Plan** | The proposed methodologies, plans, and budgets (1) address all activities in this request for LOIs in detail; (2) describe a program that is highly likely to meet the required work products outlined in this request; and (3) are resource/cost-efficient | The proposed methodologies, plans, and budgets address all activities in this request for LOIs in detail, and describe a program that is highly likely to meet the required work products outlined in this request | The proposed methodologies, plans, and budgets address all activities in this request for LOIs, and they describe a program that is likely to meet the required work products outlined in this request | The proposed methodologies, plans, and budgets do not address all activities in this request for LOIs, and/or they describe a program that is unlikely to meet the required work products outlined in this request | /8 |
|  | **Clearly Outstanding**  **4 points** | **Exceeds Expectations**  **3 points** | **Meets Expectations**  **2 points** | **Needs Improvement**  **0-1 points** | **Score** |
| **Fidelity of Implementation Metrics** | The program (1) proposes strong, evidenced measures for implementation fidelity evaluation; (2) addresses information collection needs; (3) includes robust methods for periodic reporting to TEA and other stakeholders; (4) evidences relevant tools and frameworks used by the applicant | The program (1) proposes strong measures for implementation fidelity evaluation; (2) addresses information collection needs; and (3) includes robust methods for periodic reporting to TEA and other stakeholders | The proposal includes measures that will provide adequate methods of evaluation of implementation fidelity; additionally, the evaluation plan details a method for periodic reporting to TEA and other stakeholders | The proposal does not include a plan and measures that will provide adequate methods of implementation fidelity evaluation | /4 |
|  |  |  |  | **TOTAL POINTS**  **(sum of 4 components)** | **/31** |