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 apply in partnership with an Institution of Higher Education ( IHE) and League of Innovative Schools (LIS) | No | Yes |
| Applicant must submit completed assurance form (Part IV: District Assurance) signed by the district superintendent, the building principal. | 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.

| Bilingual Education Grant Program – All levels  Fund Code 187 | Score  Unsatisfactory  0 pts | Score  Satisfactory  1 pt | Score  Good  2 pts | Score  Very Good  3 pts | Score  Excellent  4 pts | Score  Outstanding  5 pts | Multiplier | Points Awarded  (Score 0–5 x  Multiplier) | Maximum  Points Available  (5 x Multiplier) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Additional Evaluation Criteria:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant meets the student demographics and target population. Applicant has a minimum of 1500 students and including a second district with a minimum of 400 ELs. |  |  |  |  |  |  | (x2) |  | 10 |
| Applicant describes how the new alternative program will meet students’ needs compared to or in addition to any existing program in the district. Cite data to support the district’s rationale for proposing the new alternative program. |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 10 |
| Applicant’s plan is comprehensive for the training, recruitment, and retention of their bilingual education educators through coursework or relevant professional development |  |  |  |  |  |  | (x3) |  | 15 |
| Applicant’s a proposed bilingual education program passes DESE’s review process  Applicant included the Castañeda Three-Pronged Test in their proposal. |  |  |  |  |  |  | (x3) |  | 15 |
| Applicant describes the district’s readiness for this level of participation, the district’s current initiatives and how these initiatives align and support the new alternative program and how the new alternative program *would complement or supplement existing efforts in the school, district or community* to increase the English language skills and student achievement of the target population(s) and how the new programs would be aligned to existing school and district improvement plans as well as [Massachusetts ESE’s Strategic Plan](http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/StrategicPlan-Summary.pdf). |  |  |  |  |  |  | (x3) |  | 15 |
| Applicant’s proposals include plans that engage parents and families and the community in the design and implementation of a new alternative program.  The district’s English Language Parent Advisory Council (ELPAC) has been consulted during the planning process. |  |  |  |  |  |  | (x2) |  | 10 |
| Applicants describe how the district will support schools participating in this grant. They have provided  detail how the districts plan to work with IHE and experts on bilingual education to provide relevant professional development and coursework needed to earn the bilingual education endorsement. |  |  |  |  |  |  | (x2) |  | 10 |
| Applicant’s narrative that explains the anticipated changes, including anticipated outcomes is compelling. |  |  |  |  |  |  | (x2) |  | 10 |
| The Bidder’s proposed budget expenditures clearly demonstrate appropriate use of funds, are clearly tied to the application narrative, and tthe 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: