Evaluation Scoring Rubric

All areas will use a six-point quality scale for each rubric item or question:

1. There is no evidence or irrelevant evidence that the data substantiates the educational needs described in the project summary.
2. There is minimal evidence and/or limited potential that the data provided substantiates the educational needs.
3. The data provides some evidence as to the educational need; however, there are some inconsistencies between the data supplied and the correlation to the need.
4. The summary provides some good examples of data substantiating the educational needs.
5. Strong, relevant data to substantiate the educational needs throughout the application are provided; high potential of need based upon data.
6. High-level of evidence, supported by relevant data, to substantiate the educational needs of the building; data strongly suggests educational needs.

Point Value	**Area**					
weighted	**1. District commits to serve Tier I, II, III schools:** **Priority- If an LEA serves schools in Tier I, Tier II Schools. Please see History Log to determine commitment by LEA to serve buildings.** **The LEA has selected an intervention model for each of its Tier I and Tier II schools OR if an LEA does not select an intervention model for each of its Tier I and Tier II schools, the LEA must explain why it lacks the capacity to serve all of its Tier I and Tier II schools. LEA must address areas including, but not limited to if school is closing, number of Tier I and Tier II schools within the LEA, enrollment number of students, percentages of proficient students (Reading and Math). LEA must indicate if Tier III schools will be served.**					
0 *Did Not Attempt*	*1* *No Evidence*	*2* *Minimal Evidence/ Limited Potential*	*3* *Some Evidence; Inconsistencies*	*4* *Some Good Examples*	*5* *Strong, relevant data; high potential*	*6* *High-level of evidence; substantiates need; high level of potential success*
	Omitted or vague information is provided for each school to be served. Response does not address the question	Vague or unclear identification of schools to be served with a school improvement 1003(g) grant. Limited evidence of the process used by the LEA to determine buildings served; lack of sound reasoning for serving buildings.	Proposal includes clear identification of the schools to be served with a school improvement 1003(g) grant; no additional information is given. The LEA has used a process to determine buildings served. However, the determination of the buildings to be served is lacking and some of the decision-making appears faulty. The same interventions are selected for the schools, regardless of student need.	Schools to be served are identified; however the LEA commits to serve all the schools in the same way (using the same strategies) without evidence that student need and capacity have been examined. The process for determining served buildings is sound, but does not give specific details regarding factors that are considered. Determination of served buildings seems reasonable and prioritized according to student needs.	Schools to be served are identified; however, there seems to be no prioritization if multiple schools are to be served. The LEA has considered factors in its decision to serve eligible buildings. Determination is reasonable and some of the factors in the decision-making process are specified. Student need is foremost in the decision process and selection of interventions.	Clearly identifies and prioritizes schools to be served based upon student need and capacity to implement The LEA has considered factors in its decision to serve eligible buildings. Determination is reasonable, sound, and factors in the decision-making process are specified. Student need is foremost in the decision process. The LEA has considered a number of factors in its decision to serve the eligible building(s). • Number and size of enrollment of schools to serve and management of the school improvement efforts • Need and prioritizing schools based upon student achievement levels of reading and math • Teacher hiring outside of seniority rules; stability for effective teachers; additional time and compensation; analysis of staff credentials and capabilities; commitment by teacher union, school board, parents, administrative staff • The schools served will be served as dictated by the student needs (intervention models, activities, and school improvement strategies differ and are not simply repeated).

weighted	2. Number of students to be impacted. Please see number of students impacted and budget narrative					
0 Did Not Attempt	*1 No Evidence*	*2 Minimal Evidence/ Limited Potential*	*3 Some Evidence; Inconsistencies*	*4 Some Good Examples*	*5 Strong, relevant data; high potential*	*6 High-level of evidence; substantiates need; high level of potential success*
	Few, if any, students will be impacted; budget requested reflects impact to factors other than those impacting students and individuals other than students	Few students will actually be impacted; no alignment of budget request to the amount of students impacted	Only small groups of students will actually be impacted; however, there is some alignment to number of students impacted with the actual budget request	Small number of students impacted; budget is appropriate for the number of students impacted	Entire school population is impacted; number of students is appropriate for the requested budget	Entire school population is impacted at far reaching levels; number of students is significant when compared to requested dollar amount

	3. Waiver section: LEA must complete all applicable waivers:		
	✓ Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.		
	1 Required Evidence Not Present	2 Required Evidence Present	
	✓ Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.		
	1 Required Evidence Not Present	2 Required Evidence Present	

18	**4. Intervention model selected** • **Turnaround** • **Restart** • **Transformation- an LEA that has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools** • **Closure** **AND anticipated indicators of impact based upon the selected model. LEA should provide information regarding how the selected intervention model or school improvement strategy matches the LEA's needs and examines the root cause for the school's identification of need for improvement (use of various data to analyze the needs of the LEA must include, but are not limited to student performance data, curriculum standards and assessment, effective teachers and leaders).** **Applicant will clearly indicate reading and math indicators of impact, standards of performance; specific target standards will be identified.** **Pre-implementation activities and budget are optional. However, the pre-implementation activities should be considered when examining the overall implementation plan. Pre-implementation activities are those that the LEA will take prior to the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year in order to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year.**					
0 *Did Not Attempt*	*1* *No Evidence*	*2* *Minimal Evidence/ Limited Potential*	*3* *Some Evidence; Inconsistencies*	*4* *Some Good Examples*	*5* *Strong, relevant data; high potential*	*6* *High-level of evidence; substantiates need; high level of potential success*
	Inappropriate selection of model or SI strategy (based on Tier designation). If the plan would require pre-implementation activities and expenditures, no activities or expenditures are given.	Model or SI strategy is chosen based upon if school is a Tier I, II, or III school. Indicators of impact loosely refer to student need and give vague, general outcomes (some related to student achievement). If the plan would require pre-implementation activities and expenditures, the given activities are superficial and will not contribute to effective implementation of school intervention model. If pre-implementation activities are given, the budget is missing.	Model or SI strategy is chosen based on a variety of factors (which may include student need) but no clear relationship exists. If the plan would require pre-implementation activities and expenditures, some of those activities are given, though they may not be sufficient in scope to allow for full implementation of school intervention model. If pre-implementation activities are given, the budget is missing.	Model or strategy is chosen based on student need. No other areas are addressed, but reading and math targets are given. If the plan would require pre-implementation activities and expenditures, some of those activities are given, though they may not be sufficient in scope to allow for full implementation of school intervention model. If pre-implementation activities are given the budget for those activities is given.	A relationship has been established between the needs (performance data, curriculum standards and assessments, effective teachers and leaders) of each school identified in the LEA's application and the respective intervention/ SI strategy chosen. General reading and math targets are given. If the plan would require pre-implementation activities and expenditures, those are given. Pre-implementation activities would be given if those activities are appropriate and will allow for full implementation of school intervention model. If pre-implementation activities are given, the budget for those activities is given.	A clear relationship has been established between the specific needs (performance data, curriculum standards and assessments, effective teachers and leaders) of each school identified in the LEA's application and the respective intervention chosen. The LEA has considered its needs and anticipated outcomes in relation to the applicable intervention model or SI strategy by considering factors that may include, but are not limited to, the following: • the leadership skills, training and experiences needed to drive school improvement efforts • the optimal assignment of staff to meet student needs • the required operational flexibility to recruit and retain qualified staff • the adequacy of current LEA OIP planning to support implementation of the selected intervention model • outcomes of student performance in Reading and Math, curriculum and assessment, effective teachers and leaders Clear targets of anticipated impact are given in reading and math performance. If the plan would require pre-implementation activities and expenditures, those are given. Pre-implementation activities would be given if those activities are appropriate and will allow for full implementation of school intervention model. If pre-implementation activities are given, the budget for those activities is thorough and fully

						supports necessary activities.

24	**5. Integration into Ohio Improvement Process: Applicants should address how the LEA's Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP) supports their grant proposal and work done in the Ohio Improvement Process. Applicants should specifically address the following: (6 points for each bulleted area to be calibrated later; please score this item as a total of 6 points)** • **data utilized to determine the instructional improvement strategies and action steps identified in this proposal** • **how the strategies and action steps support the OIP plan** • **how the district/building(s) plans to monitor the selected intervention model(s) and/or improvement strategies** • **how the selected intervention model(s) and/or improvement strategies are integrated into the existing OIP**					
0 *Did Not Attempt*	*1* *No Evidence*	*2* *Minimal Evidence/ Limited Potential*	*3* *Some Evidence; Inconsistencies*	*4* *Some Good Examples*	*5* *Strong, relevant data; high potential*	*6* *High-level of evidence; substantiates need; high level of potential success*
	No evidence of using the Ohio Improvement Process. No district leadership team nor identified person assigned for monitoring implementation.	States that the LEA has worked with the OIP, but no specific information is given. Lacks specific identification of leadership teams and teams for monitoring implementation.	Stage 1 and Stage 2 of the OIP are described in detail; however, there is a lack of information concerning how the LEA will implement, monitor, and evaluate the plan.	All stages of the OIP are given in general terms.	Data analysis is documented; goals, strategies and action steps are designed and based upon the examination of data. How the intervention or strategy will be implemented and monitored is described in general terms.	Root cause analysis is documented; goals, strategies and action steps are designed and based upon the examination of critical needs (root causes). A specific leadership team is identified and assigned for monitoring implementation. A description of how the selected model or strategy will be evaluated and adjusted to meet students' needs is given.

6	**6. Capacity to Implement: The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;: Tier I and Tier II will implement an intervention model; Tier III school intervention strategies, submit waiver request(s) and complete requirements associated with waiver (schoolwide components) and assurances**					
0 *Did Not Attempt*	*1* *No Evidence*	*2* *Minimal Evidence/ Limited Potential*	*3* *Some Evidence; Inconsistencies*	*4* *Some Good Examples*	*5* *Strong, relevant data; high potential*	*6* *High-level of evidence; substantiates need; high level of potential success*
	No evidence of how resources will impact the implementation of the interventions.	Few resources are in place. Those resources in place do not seem to be directly connected to the successful implementation of the interventions. No barriers are examined.	Some resources are in place but it is not clear if the resources will ensure that the interventions will be successfully implemented. The LEA has not attempted to address barriers to success.	LEA demonstrated that some resources (staffing, expertise, time, etc.) are in place and are likely to ensure some success of the implementation. The LEA has attempted to, but has not addressed how barriers will be overcome.	LEA demonstrates adequate staffing, expertise, time, and resources to design and implement the intervention model or SI strategies. Some specific examples are given. Past barriers to success are addressed.	The LEA has staff in place with the expertise and experience to research and design the selected intervention as intended while still meeting local needs. The LEA has set aside time and resources sufficient to facilitate the design and ongoing implementation of interventions. The LEA has successfully completed OIP that will guide the design of interventions. The LEA has implemented a comprehensive diagnostic process that will inform the design and implementation of intervention strategies. The LEA has demonstrated adequate capacity to implement the selected intervention models or strategies. Barriers to implementing the selected intervention models or SI strategies have been identified and addressed.

6	**7. Capacity to Implement: The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;** o **proven track record of successful school improvement** o **matched to the needs of the students and the interventions** o **selected from list of approved external providers supplied by the Ohio Department of Education**					
0 *Did Not Attempt*	*1* *No Evidence*	*2* *Minimal Evidence/ Limited Potential*	*3* *Some Evidence; Inconsistencies*	*4* *Some Good Examples*	*5* *Strong, relevant data; high potential*	*6* *High-level of evidence; substantiates need; high level of potential success*
	No external provider process is given.	The responsibilities of the external provider and the LEA are minimally or not defined and aligned. Available providers have not been researched. The track record of the provider identified has not been addressed, or it does not have a proven track record of success. The LEA has not indicated that it will hold the external provider accountable to high performance standards. The capacity of the external provider to serve the identified school has not been addressed, or has been minimally addressed.	The responsibilities of the external provider and the LEA are defined and aligned. The track record of the provider (in relation to the needs of the LEA) identified has not been examined and does not provide evidence that the provider matches the needs of the LEA. The LEA has not indicated that it will hold the external provider accountable to high performance standards.	Parents and community members have had some involvement in the selection process. The responsibilities of the external provider and the LEA are broadly defined and aligned. Available providers have been researched. The provider identified generally has a proven track record of success. The LEA has indicated that it will hold the external provider accountable to high performance standards. The capacity of the external provider to serve the identified school has been explored.	Parents and community members have been meaningfully involved from the beginning of the selection process. The responsibilities of the external provider and the LEA are clearly defined and aligned. Available providers have been thoroughly researched to match the needs of the LEA. The provider identified has a proven track record of success in working with similar schools and/or student populations. The LEA has specifically planned how it will hold the external provider accountable to high performance standards. The capacity of the external provider to serve the identified school has been clearly demonstrated. Implementation will occur swiftly and with fidelity during the 2011-2012 school year.	Reasonable and timely steps the LEA will take to recruit and screen providers to be in place by the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year that may include, but are not limited to: • Analyzing the LEA's operational needs. • Researching and prioritizing the external providers available to serve the school. • Considering and analyzing the external provider market. • Contacting other LEAs currently or formerly engaged with the external provider regarding their experience. • Engaging parents and community members meaningfully to assist in the selection process. • Delineating clearly the respective responsibilities and expectations to be assumed by the external provider and the LEA. • Capacity to serve the identified school and its selected intervention model is evident. Implementation will occur swiftly and with fidelity during the 2011-2012 school year.

6	**8. Capacity to Implement: The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and the LEA should describe how it will address details contained in, but not limited to, negotiated agreements, board policies, Ohio Revised Code. It is the responsibility of the LEA submitting the application to secure such approval prior to submission of the application.**					
0 *Did Not Attempt*	*1* *No Evidence*	*2* *Minimal Evidence/ Limited Potential*	*3* *Some Evidence; Inconsistencies*	*4* *Some Good Examples*	*5* *Strong, relevant data; high potential*	*6* *High-level of evidence; substantiates need; high level of potential success*
	Response does not address question	Description contains only a few of the six major categories of capacity and commitment • LEA personnel dedicated to supporting the project • Purposeful and effective instructional arrangements to support the project • Budgeting procedures/practices adjusted to respond efficiently and effectively to the project • Customized supplementary support and resources provided to meet the demands of the project • Precedence given to the project in HR practices of recruiting, selecting, hiring, supporting, and retaining turnaround principals and teachers • Other indicators of LEA commitment (Board awareness and support of turnaround initiatives, direct communication between Superintendent and project staff, policy changes and procedural exceptions that provide freedom and flexibility needed)	Description contains only some of the six major categories of capacity and commitment • LEA personnel dedicated to supporting the project • Purposeful and effective instructional arrangements to support the project • Budgeting procedures/practices adjusted to respond efficiently and effectively to the project • Customized supplementary support and resources provided to meet the demands of the project • Precedence given to the project in HR practices of recruiting, selecting, hiring, supporting, and retaining turnaround principals and teachers • Other indicators of LEA commitment (Board awareness and support of turnaround initiatives, direct communication between Superintendent and project staff, policy changes and procedural exceptions that provide freedom and flexibility needed)	Description contains all six major categories of capacity and commitment • LEA personnel dedicated to supporting the project • Purposeful and effective instructional arrangements to support the project • Budgeting procedures/practices adjusted to respond efficiently and effectively to the project • Customized supplementary support and resources provided to meet the demands of the project • Precedence given to the project in HR practices of recruiting, selecting, hiring, supporting, and retaining turnaround principals and teachers • Other indicators of LEA commitment (Board awareness and support of turnaround initiatives, direct communication between Superintendent and project staff, policy changes and procedural exceptions that provide freedom and flexibility needed)	Description contains all six major categories of capacity and commitment to additional management capacity criteria as needed for individual campus • LEA personnel dedicated to supporting the project • Purposeful and effective instructional arrangements to support the project • Budgeting procedures/practices adjusted to respond efficiently and effectively to the project • Customized supplementary support and resources provided to meet the demands of the project • Precedence given to the project in HR practices of recruiting, selecting, hiring, supporting, and retaining turnaround principals and teachers • Other indicators of LEA commitment (Board awareness and support of turnaround initiatives, direct communication between Superintendent and project staff, policy changes and procedural exceptions that provide freedom and flexibility needed)	Description contains detailed commitment to all six of the following capacity criteria with flexibility to adjust for student/staff needs based upon on-going assessments • LEA personnel dedicated to supporting the project • Purposeful and effective instructional arrangements to support the project • Budgeting procedures/practices adjusted to respond efficiently and effectively to the project • Customized supplementary support and resources provided to meet the demands of the project • Precedence given to the project in HR practices of recruiting, selecting, hiring, supporting, and retaining turnaround principals and teachers • Other indicators of LEA commitment (Board awareness and support of turnaround initiatives, direct communication between Superintendent and project staff, policy changes and procedural exceptions that provide freedom and flexibility needed)

6	9. **Stakeholder involvement- As appropriate, the LEA must consult with various relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools school improvement strategies in Tier III schools. Applicants must list any organization partners, providing a brief description of their roles related to the success of the project.**					
0 *Did Not Attempt*	*1* *No Evidence*	*2* *Minimal Evidence/ Limited Potential*	*3* *Some Evidence; Inconsistencies*	*4* *Some Good Examples*	*5* *Strong, relevant data; high potential*	*6* *High-level of evidence; substantiates need; high level of potential success*
	Response does not address the question	Stakeholders are not engaged, but may participate sporadically in school interventions. The school community receives limited information regarding the interventions. There are limited opportunities for family participation and involvement.	The LEA engages a group of stakeholders. The LEA periodically and sporadically may inform the school community of the interventions but does not appear to provide opportunities for community input. Families participate in activities at the building level.	The LEA engages a limited variety of stakeholders. The LEA regularly informs the school community of the interventions but does not appear to provide opportunities for community input. Families are involved at the building level in limited ways.	The LEA engages a limited variety of stakeholders in meaningful ways. The LEA regularly informs the school community of the interventions and may provide limited opportunities for community input. There are attempts to incorporate the community into the curriculum as a resource. Families are involved and engaged at the building level in a variety of ways.	The LEA engages a variety of stakeholders (including but not limited to large corporations, small businesses, law enforcement, health departments, universities, faith-based and other non-profit organizations, senior citizens, and parents, among others) in meaningful ways. The LEA has plans to regularly engage the school community to inform them of progress toward the design and implementation of the interventions and to give them an opportunity to provide input. Incorporate the community in meaningful ways into the curriculum as a resource for learning, including service learning, place-based education, and other strategies. A comprehensive family-school partnership (Epstein, 1995) addresses all types of family involvement: parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision making, and collaborating with the community.

6	**10. Stakeholder collaboration- Eligible applicants should describe joint planning that occurred as well as the level of commitment among all parties (district and building level). Applicants must describe the stakeholder roles and their contributions to the success of the project.**					
0 *Did Not Attempt*	*1* *No Evidence*	*2* *Minimal Evidence/ Limited Potential*	*3* *Some Evidence; Inconsistencies*	*4* *Some Good Examples*	*5* *Strong, relevant data; high potential*	*6* *High-level of evidence; substantiates need; high level of potential success*
	Response does not address question	Description indicates a lack of processes utilized for collaboration with stakeholders.	A process for consultation with stakeholders exists. There appears to be no commitment among the parties towards the intervention.	A process for collaboration with stakeholders exists, but there is limited opportunity for true engagement. There appears to be limited commitment from the stakeholders.	Description of processes utilized for consultation and engagement with stakeholders indicates a clear, effective process and may include many, but not all, of the elements • diverse outreach strategies • designating an employee at each school site to operate as a contact point between the stakeholders • a family and civic engagement team exists or plans to appoint such a team is in place • quality evaluation conducted regularly • school leaders receive assistance in networking • professional development for school leaders regarding effective collaboration is provided • extra resources are directed to support innovative partnerships between community partners and schools • flexibility in policies that partnerships may require are allowed and encouraged • parents are engaged in ways that directly relate to their children's academic progress, maintaining a consistent message of what is expected of parents, and reaching parents directly, personally, and with a trusting approach	Clear description of processes utilized for consultation and engagement with all relevant stakeholders regarding project organization and implementation of school improvement efforts including • diverse outreach strategies, including using personal outreach methods in a familiar language and creating an inviting environment, but the strongest motivator is showing how all services/programs ultimately help the children succeed • each partnering organization designates an employee at each school site to operate as a contact point between the school, organization, students, families, and community members, with the goal of creating sustainable and effective partnerships • a family and civic engagement team is in place and is working effectively • quality evaluations are conducted regularly, including data collected from all stakeholders, to determine strengths and weaknesses of services and programs offered to create a continuous cycle of improvement • school leaders are assisted from the district- or organization-level in networking with potential partners and in developing partnerships • professional development for school leaders regarding effective collaboration is provided • extra resources are directed to support innovative partnerships between community partners and schools • flexibility in policies that partnerships may require are allowed and encouraged • parents are engaged in ways that directly relate to their children's academic progress, maintaining a consistent message of what is expected of parents, and reaching parents directly, personally, and with a trusting approach

6	**11. Goals and Strategies (from district planning tool): The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I, II, and III schools that receive school improvement funds. The goals must be *educational* goals and stated in the CCIP planning tool. All applicants must ensure that project goals and strategies are aligned and linked to the appropriate CIP Goals.**					
0 Did Not Attempt	*1 No Evidence*	*2 Minimal Evidence/ Limited Potential*	*3 Some Evidence; Inconsistencies*	*4 Some Good Examples*	*5 Strong, relevant data; high potential*	*6 High-level of evidence; substantiates need; high level of potential success*
	Generic goals and associated strategies are given.	Goals and associated strategies are determined based upon student need.	Goals and associated strategies are determined based upon student need and are specific to the needs of the district.	Goals and associated strategies are determined based upon student need and are specific to the needs of the district. All goals are measurable and realistic. Strategies thoroughly support the attainment of the goal(s).	Goals and associated strategies are determined based upon student need and are specific to the needs of the district. Goals and strategies are specifically worded and research-based as effective school improvement strategies. All goals are measurable and realistic. Strategies thoroughly support the attainment of the goal(s)	Goals and associated strategies are determined based upon student need and are specific to the needs of the district. District-level action steps are unique to the district needs, not simply repeated. Goals and strategies are specifically worded and research-based as effective school improvement strategies. All goals are measurable and realistic. Strategies thoroughly support the attainment of the goal(s).

6	**12. Action Steps- For each school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement within the selected intervention model; information must also be given regarding instructional model to be used.**					
0 Did Not Attempt	*1 No Evidence*	*2 Minimal Evidence/ Limited Potential*	*3 Some Evidence; Inconsistencies*	*4 Some Good Examples*	*5 Strong, relevant data; high potential*	*6 High-level of evidence; substantiates need; high level of potential success*
	Action steps do not appear to be unique to each building's student needs.	Each action step is determined based upon student need and is specific to the needs of EACH building. Action steps are unique to each building's needs, not simply repeated. Action steps are specifically worded and research-based as effective school improvement strategies.	Each action step is determined based upon student need and is specific to the needs of EACH building. Action steps are unique to each building's needs, not simply repeated. Action steps are research-based as effective school improvement strategies. Few activities and school improvement strategies for each building are stated in the form of action steps.	Each action step is determined based upon student need and is specific to the needs of EACH building. Action steps are unique to each building's needs, not simply repeated. Action steps are research-based as effective school improvement strategies. Some of the activities and school improvement strategies for each building are stated in the form of action steps.	Each action step is determined based upon student need and is specific to the needs of EACH building. Action steps are unique to each building's needs, not simply repeated. Action steps are specifically worded and research-based as effective school improvement strategies. Most of the activities and school improvement strategies for each building are stated in the form of action steps.	Each action step is determined based upon student need and is specific to the needs of EACH building. Action steps are unique to each building's needs, not simply repeated. Action steps are specifically worded and research-based as effective school improvement strategies. All activities and school improvement strategies for each building are stated in the forms of action steps.

6	**13. Align other resources with the intervention: Applicants must identify the additional and supporting resources (e.g. internal building, local community, business and partner schools) that will be utilized in the project and demonstrate how these resources will impact success. Please explain how your project will leverage other and supporting resources (fiscal, human, technical, etc.) in the implementation of the intervention model.**					
0 *Did Not Attempt*	*1* *No Evidence*	*2* *Minimal Evidence/ Limited Potential*	*3* *Some Evidence; Inconsistencies*	*4* *Some Good Examples*	*5* *Strong, relevant data; high potential*	*6* *High-level of evidence; substantiates need; high level of potential success*
	Response does not address question	LEA's capacity to provide resources and related services/support to implement the project lack clarity and purpose.	LEA's capacity to provide some adequate resources is described, yet the mentioned resources are insufficient to implement the project.	LEA's capacity to provide adequate resources and related services/support to implement the project is clearly described.	LEA's capacity to provide adequate resources and related services/support to effectively implement the project is clearly described. Other resources which support the project are mentioned.	Multiple resources have been identified for alignment. Specific ways of alignment provided for each resource. The ability of LEA to align federal, state, local funding sources with the grant activities is clear; statewide systems of support are utilized. LEA's capacity to provide sufficient resources and related services/support to effectively implement the project are clearly described. Other resources support the project and are clearly described.

6	**14. Continuation, sustain- The LEA must describe how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends. (feasibility of sustaining the initiative, reasonable, resources brought to the process to continue to support over time, leveraging existing resources)**					
0 *Did Not Attempt*	*1* *No Evidence*	*2* *Minimal Evidence/ Limited Potential*	*3* *Some Evidence; Inconsistencies*	*4* *Some Good Examples*	*5* *Strong, relevant data; high potential*	*6* *High-level of evidence; substantiates need; high level of potential success*
	Response does not address question	Plans for continuation and sustainability are limited and do not realistically address the issues associated with the continuation of the project.	The LEA attempts to address the continuation of the initiative but only addresses fiscal resources.	The LEA addresses the continuation of the initiative by examining areas other than funding sources in order to sustain the project. The LEA attempts to develop a plan to address time, funding, human, and other resources. Plans to address these areas are vague, however.	The staff shares in the reform; plans are in place to deal with staffing and funding changes; other funding sources are leveraged; time is reserved and protected (but specific details are not included). To ensure sustainability, the LEA has • identified LEA resources and capabilities for sustaining the intervention • anticipated some possible changes such as changes in personnel, contraction of resources, or revisions to policy that would threaten the practices, structures, and attitudes that resulted in improved achievement and provided for contingencies that respond to such threats	Staff and wider communities share in the reform; plans are in place to deal with staffing and funding changes (including transitions in leadership); plans in place to continue data collection and usage; other funding sources are leveraged; time is reserved and protected for educator collaboration and job-embedded professional development. To ensure sustainability, the LEA has specifically and thoroughly • identified resources and capabilities (including community part-ners) for sustaining the intervention • conveyed to the school community the appropriateness and the effectiveness of the (research-based) efforts • anticipated changes in personnel, contraction of resources, or revisions to policy that would threaten the practices, structures, and attitudes that resulted in improved achievement and provided for contingencies that respond to such threats • from the beginning, the purpose and workings of the reform must be well understood by and have the support of school faculty and of the community and its leaders, including political leaders and the school board, in order to be sustained • ensured that new staff is committed to adopting the reform measures

6	**15. Timeline: The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application and services it will provide to each Tier III school. (tied to IM/M tool)**					
0 Did Not Attempt	*1 No Evidence*	*2 Minimal Evidence/ Limited Potential*	*3 Some Evidence; Inconsistencies*	*4 Some Good Examples*	*5 Strong, relevant data; high potential*	*6 High-level of evidence; substantiates need; high level of potential success*
	Response does not address question	The model and improvement activities are briefly described. There is no mention or tie-in to the IM/M Tool.	The model and improvement activities are briefly described and a timeline is discussed (but is not specific). There is no mention or tie-in to the IM/M Tool.	The model and improvement activities are described and a timeline for implementation is discussed. Reference to using the IM/M Tool is vague.	The model and improvement activities are described in detail with obtainable implementation timelines. The proposed budget supports the model and activities that are clearly stated. Use of the IM/M Tool is given.	Clearly states the model, improvement activities, and timeline in a step by step format to obtain student growth. This plan and timeline has a strategy for revision should student achievement goals dictate the need. The proposed budget each year clearly supports all aspects of the project. The process the LEA will utilize the IM/M Tool is thorough and well-thought out and provides opportunities for reflection and revision as necessary.

6	**16. Program Evaluation, Monitoring, Outcomes: The applicant must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the state's assessments in both reading/language arts and math. Applicants must demonstrate how they will evaluate the progress in achieving project goals and objectives. Applicants must detail their comprehensive evaluation process and accountability measures. Projects *must* utilize evaluation measures that directly relate to their stated educational goals and performance indicators. Goals must be stated in the form of SMART (specific, measureable, achievable, realistic, time-bound) goals. Goals will be based on the use of the Ohio Improvement Process (particularly the decision framework).**					
0 Did Not Attempt	*1 No Evidence*	*2 Minimal Evidence/ Limited Potential*	*3 Some Evidence; Inconsistencies*	*4 Some Good Examples*	*5 Strong, relevant data; high potential*	*6 High-level of evidence; substantiates need; high level of potential success*
	Response does not address question	Minimum description of assessment tools to be utilized.	Processes to identify and address problems throughout the project do not exist and are limited to summative data pieces.	Evidence of monitoring techniques, formative evaluation and data collection methods. Processes to identify and address problems throughout the project are described. Detailed description of assessment tools, with processes for utilization of information and inclusive of student needs at the site.	Identifies starting value from previous data and final value so amount of increase is clear; stretches the previous achievement level with a reasonable increase; includes all students (with the actual number of students included in the assessment). Monitoring techniques, formative evaluation and data collection methods are described. Processes to identify and address problems throughout the project are described, including strategies to modify improvement activities. Annual goal is stated is as a SMART goal.	Multiple grades addressed; linked to student achievement in Reading and/or Math; specific student populations to be measured are identified; Descriptions for on-going monitoring, formative evaluation and data collection methods are clearly described. Processes to identify and address problems throughout the project are described, including strategies to modify improvement activities. Multiple assessment tools that are understandable with rich utilization processes that can be clearly transferred into revised action plans and inclusive of student needs at the site. Annual goal is stated is as a SMART goal.

6	**17. Data Collection - Student Achievement: The applicant will need to determine how the selected intervention model will increase student achievement, and then measure the success of the intervention model. Applicants must describe the process used to select the intervention model and how the success of the implementation will be measured. Measures of success must be stated. Measures of success will be linked directly to the indicators of impact stated in the Building Overview page (reading, math, graduation rate, SI strategies, intervention models, etc.).**					
0 *Did Not Attempt*	*1* *No Evidence*	*2* *Minimal Evidence/ Limited Potential*	*3* *Some Evidence; Inconsistencies*	*4* *Some Good Examples*	*5* *Strong, relevant data; high potential*	*6* *High-level of evidence; substantiates need; high level of potential success*
	Response does not address question	Evidence of monitoring techniques, formative evaluation and data collection methods is lacking. There is no reference to the indicators of impact section of the Building Overview Page. Measures of success are given for only one of the following areas: 1. reading/ language arts 2. math 3. graduation rate (or attendance / completion for buildings without a graduation rate)	There is minimal use of assessment tools to determine progress for meeting goals. Data within the indicators of impact section are mentioned, though the alignment is lacking. Measures of success are given for only two of the following areas: 1. reading/ language arts 2. math 3. graduation rate (or attendance / completion for buildings without a graduation rate)	Multiple assessment tools, and specific processes described for determining progress for meeting goals which are aligned to campus needs are given. Data within the indicators of impact section somewhat aligned with the measures of success. Measures of success address the following areas, but limited information is provided in all of the areas of 1. reading/ language arts 2. math 3. graduation rate (or attendance / completion for buildings without a graduation rate) Processes to identify and address problems throughout the project are described.	Multiple assessment tools, and specific processes described for determining progress for meeting goals which are aligned to campus needs are given. Data within the indicators of impact section are aligned with the measures of success. Measures of success address 1. reading/ language arts 2. math 3. graduation rate (or attendance / completion for buildings without a graduation rate) Processes to identify and address problems throughout the project are described, including strategies to modify improvement activities.	Multiple assessment tools, and detailed processes described for determining progress for meeting goals which are aligned to campus needs are listed; There is a description of data and processes used to select the particular intervention model or school improvement strategy as listed in the indicators of impact section. Measures of success are given for each eligible building and are linked directly to the indicators of impact given on the Building Overview page. Measures of success thoroughly address at each grade level and for specific sub-groups 1. reading/ language arts 2. math 3. graduation rate (or attendance / completion for buildings without a graduation rate) Processes to identify and address problems throughout the project are described, including strategies to modify improvement activities. Multiple assessment tools, with rich utilization processes that can be reasonably transferred into revised action plans and are inclusive of campus needs are given.

6	**18. Budget Narrative: The LEA must include a description of how funds will be used to implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve; conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools; and support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application. (Applicants must show how these funds will be spent. The application should include an explanation for each expenditure, its source if part of the match and how each expenditure aligns with project goals in an efficient and effective manner.) Applicants will follow all current Ohio Department of Education fiscal procedures as outlined in the CCIP Project Cash Request (PCR) process.**						
0 *Did Not Attempt*	*1* *No Evidence*	*2* *Minimal Evidence/ Limited Potential*	*3* *Some Evidence; Inconsistencies*	*4* *Some Good Examples*	*5* *Strong, relevant data; high potential*	*6* *High-level of evidence; substantiates need; high level of potential success*
	Response does not address question	Budget does not address and/or does not align with student needs and stated activities.	Budget is prepared based on needs assessment and project, but lacks detail.	Budget is clearly written to justify expected costs associated with the project and supports the student outcomes. Budget is clearly written based on comprehensive needs assessment and justifies expected costs associated with the project. Budget facilitates student academic growth. Budget is clearly written to justify expected costs associated with the project and supports student outcomes. Budget works in concert with other federal, state, and local funds. Multiple resources are aligned with LEA/campus project goals and objectives.	Budget explains in detail all associated costs with the project. A cost analysis has been performed to meet expected student goals. Budget clearly supports expected student outcomes. Budget is clearly written based on comprehensive needs assessment and justifies expected costs associated with the project. Budget facilitates student academic growth. Budget is clearly written to justify expected costs associated with the project and supports student outcomes. Budget works in concert with other federal, state, and local funds. Multiple resources are aligned with LEA/campus project goals and objectives. Budget projections made for end of project funding.	Budget explains in detail all associated costs with the project. A cost analysis has been performed to meet expected student goals. Budget clearly supports expected student outcomes. Project costs and scope of grant are aligned. Detailed description of budget activities facilitates student academic growth. Budget includes all personnel, use of facilities, related/support services. Contingency funds are addressed. Funds from federal, state, and local sources are clearly coordinated to support the school improvement process. Detailed plans evident for continuing processes after the funding period ends.
Did Not Attempt	**19. Grant Availability: The LEA must project how funds will be used during the period of availability of grant funding. Budget amounts must be given for Year 1 (FY 12), Year 2 (FY 13) and Year 3 (FY 14).**					
	1 Required Evidence Not Present	2 Required Evidence Present				

6	**20. Project Summary: Applicants will provide a brief summary of the project. Applicants must provide an overview of the proposed project, including a description of the following:** • **The audience (who the project will directly impact);** • **The educational goals/need (what the project strives to ultimately accomplish); and** • **The activities (how the project will be carried out).** **The summary should be written so that readers, including peer reviewers, will understand the overall concept of the application**					
0 *Did Not Attempt*	*1* *No Evidence*	*2* *Minimal Evidence/ Limited Potential*	*3* *Some Evidence; Inconsistencies*	*4* *Some Good Examples*	*5* *Strong, relevant data; high potential*	*6* *High-level of evidence; substantiates need; high level of potential success*
	Response does not address question	It is unclear that student needs at each site were taken into account when preparing the application. There is no mention of research based practices.	Application is prepared based on needs assessment, but lacks clarity and organization. Description of research based best practices is limited or does not address identified needs.	Application is prepared based on needs assessment and intervention model chosen. Application components are organized and align with critical success factors supporting student outcomes. Federal requirements are addressed within the application. Description of research based best practices is applicable to proposed project design.	Application is clearly written based on needs assessment and justifies expected costs associated with intervention model chosen. Application components are organized and align with critical success factors supporting student outcomes. Federal requirements are addressed within the application. Description of research based best practices is utilized support to proposed project design.	Application is clearly written based on needs assessment and justifies expected costs associated with intervention model chosen. Application components are organized and align with critical success factors supporting student outcomes. Federal requirements are addressed within the application. Overall application is clearly written with few questions unanswered. Description of research-based best practices is seamlessly utilized throughout the proposed project design.