Department of Elemntary and Secondary Education

EVALUATION CRITERIA SCORECARD

| Name of Bidder:       | Name of Reviewer(s):       | Date Reviewed:       |
| --- | --- | --- |

|  |
| --- |
| **Required Qualifications Criteria (Bidder must receive a “yes” on all the following criteria to move on to the next evaluation section)** |
| Applicant must be applying from or working in partnership with one of the Commonwealth’s 26 Gateway Cities. | No [ ]  | Yes[ ]  |
| Applicant must be a non-profit organization. | No[ ]  | Yes[ ]  |
| Applicant must submit a complete application consisting of a narrative and FY18 and FY 19 budgets with justification. | No[ ]  | Yes[ ]  |

**Scoring rubric: Outstanding:** Application materials is complete, suggest exemplary qualifications, providing compelling, clear, and well-documented evidence of expertise. **Excellent:** Application materials are complete and suggest solid qualifications, providing clear and well-documented evidence of expertise. **Very Good:** Application materials are complete and suggest adequate qualifications, providing clear evidence of expertise. **Good:** Evidence of expertise or qualification in some areas is unclear or unsubstantiated by supporting documentation. Some required elements are missing. **Satisfactory:** Little evidence of qualification. Many required elements are missing. **Unsatisfactory:** Qualifications is not applicable to request; elements missing / non-responsive to request.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gateway Cities Education Agenda English Language Learners Enrichment Academies Grant Program-- Fund Code 376  | ScoreUnsatisfactory0 pts | ScoreSatisfactory1 pt | ScoreGood2 pts | ScoreVery Good3 pts | ScoreExcellent4 pts | ScoreOutstanding5 pts | Multiplier | Points Awarded(Score 0–5 x Multiplier) | MaximumPoints Available(5 x Multiplier) |
| **Additional Evaluation Criteria:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Bidder's narrative thoroughly and clearly describes the rationale for the proposed Enrichment Academy, including the population of students to be served (no less than 100 students) , why this population was selected and how specific students could be invited to participate with particular detail about middle and high school students. |       |       |       |       |       |       | (x2) |  | 10 |
| The Bidder provided a compelling description of:•Potential outreach efforts to students, family members, educators and community members.•Recruitment and selection processes.•Retention strategies, including incentives. |       |       |       |       |       |       | (x2) |  | 10 |
| The Bidder provided comprehensive information about proposed instructional strategies and curricula, including different types of learning opportunities (project-based, experiential, and/or service learning) |       |       |       |       |       |       | (x3) |  | 15 |
| The Bidder provided comprehensive information about activities to celebrate the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of students and increase cultural competency of students and teachers. |       |       |       |       |       |       | (x1) |  | 5 |
| The Bidder provided a detailed schedule - at least 6 hours/day, for a minimum of 120 hours total and provided comprehensive information about the transportation needs of students - and the services to be provided. |       |       |       |       |       |       | (x2) |  | 10 |
| The Bidder provides a robust description of how the proposed Enrichment Academies will complement/supplement existing efforts in the school, district, or community to increase the English language/literacy skills and student achievement of target population - and would be aligned to existing school and district improvement plans and statewide initiatives. |       |       |       |       |       |       | (x1) |  | 5 |
| The Bidder provides a comprehensive and compelling description of the processes for selecting instructors and the professional development and training to be provided prior to and during the programs. |       |       |       |       |       |       | (x2) |  | 10 |
| The Bidder identifies anticipated outcomes of the Enrichment Academy that are wide-ranging and clearly identified according to multiple measures, including, but not limited to: English language fluency, comprehension, reading and writing, student confidence and engagement, exit from EL status, and retention and graduation rates. |       |       |       |       |       |       | (x3) |  | 15 |
| The Bidder provides a thorough description of the pre- and post- assessment strategies for students participating in the proposed programs. The Bidder provides a thorough description of the proposed ongoing measurements of student progress on multiple outcomes. |       |       |       |       |       |       | (x3) |  | 15 |
| The Bidder’s proposed budget expenditures clearly demonstrate appropriate use of funds. The Bidder’s budget expenditures are clearly tied to the application narrative. The Bidder’s budget justification includes brief but precise descriptions that clearly justify each expense. There is clear reference to required activities and how these will benefit students. |       |       |       |       |       |       | (x1) |  | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **Total:** |  | 100 |

Comments: