

ENTERPRISE GRANT SCORING RUBRIC		
Project Name/Lead Partner: Drew Charter	Possible Points	Reviewer Score
Review Date: July 14, 2011	100	89
Section 1: Partnership Overview	10 points	
(a) The past performance of the eligible applicant implementing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.	10	10
<i>Applicant demonstrates successful past performance (0-5) implementing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects (0-5).</i>		
<i>Reviewer Comments:</i>		
Section 2: Need for Project	25 points	
(a) The extent to which the project targets a population/geographic location of demonstrated need.	10	10
<i>Rationale behind site selection demonstrates in-depth knowledge of community demographics (0-5) and educational needs of targeted population (0-5).</i>		
<i>Reviewer Comments:</i>		
(b) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the Priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.	15	8
<i>The proposed project is innovative and has not been widely adopted (0-15).</i>		
<i>Reviewer Comments: While improved professional development opportunities for teachers and increased applied learning and curricular redesign are worthwhile, these approaches are not particularly innovative. However, points were awarded for the STEAM approach, the inclusion of CEISMC students as mentors and tutors as well as the integration of Singapore Math components.</i>		
Section 3: Quality of Project Design	15 points	
(a) The extent to which the proposed project as described in the Narrative and outlined in the Scope of Work has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are (a) aligned with the Priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet, and (b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.	9	10
<i>The proposed project has a clear set of goals aligned with the Priorities the applicant is seeking to meet (0-3), an explicit strategy to meet those goals (0-3), and strategy is expected to result in achieving the desired outcomes of the proposed project (0-3). Under Priority 1, provide one additional point for STEM-focused projects.</i>		
<i>Reviewer Comments:</i>		
(b) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that implementation of the proposed practice, strategy, or program will have a statistically significant, substantial, and important effect on improving student outcomes.	5	5
<i>Applicant provides research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses for all components of project (0-5).</i>		

<i>Reviewer Comments:</i>		
(c) The extent to which the project advances the state's Race to the Top strategy and/or other plans to improve student performance.	1	1
<i>Project advances/aligns state RT3 strategy (i.e. measuring teacher effectiveness, using Common Core) (1)</i>		
<i>Reviewer Comments:</i>		
Section 4: Quality of Project Evaluation	15 points	
(a) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, are rigorous, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.	10	8
<i>Applicant identifies data collection method (0-3), provides additional indicators beyond those required (0-3), and sets aggressive student achievement progress goals (0-4).</i>		
<i>Reviewer Comments: One point was deducted as the teacher evaluation component of the overall Evolution Plan seems to rely on self-efficacy surveys and administrator observations (which does not indicate student achievement will be taken into account when measuring teacher effectiveness).</i>		
(b) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.	3	3
<i>The evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings (0-3).</i>		
<i>Reviewer Comments:</i>		
(c) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.	2	2
<i>The project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the evaluation effectively (0-2).</i>		
<i>Reviewer Comments:</i>		
Section 5: Quality of Management Plan and Personnel	15 points	
(a) 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 tasks included in the Scope of Work.	10	10
<i>The applicant provides a detailed management plan with clear objectives (0-2), clear leadership roles (0-3), timelines and milestones (0-2), and a fully completed Scope of Work (0-3).</i>		
<i>Reviewer Comments:</i>		

(b) The qualifications, relevant training and experience of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.	5	5
<i>Project personnel (or search process) are well qualified (0-3) and have relevant experience managing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects (0-2).</i>		
<i>Reviewer Comments:</i>		
Section 6: Quality of Sustainability Plan	20 points	
(a) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the grant.	10	10
<i>Applicant details clear plan for sustaining project beyond the life of the grant (0-10).</i>		
<i>Reviewer Comments:</i>		
(b) Demonstrated commitment from additional partners or funders to advance the project.	5	5
<i>Applicant demonstrates strong commitment from additional partners or funders to advance the project (0-5).</i>		
<i>Reviewer Comments:</i>		
(c) Evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project's long-term success.	5	2
<i>Applicant demonstrates broad support from community stakeholders (0-5).</i>		
<i>Reviewer Comments: Would like to see more evidence of community support (letters, etc.)</i>		
TOTAL	100	89