

Scoring Rubric for Digital Resources Consortium Grant

Applicant:

Reviewer						
General Comments:						
Criteria	0	1	2	3	4	5
	No Basis	Poor	Average	Above Average	Excellent	Reviewer Score
Project Abstract (10 points) A clear and concise abstract (100-150 word limit) outlines the overall goals of the Digital Resources Grant, along with the process for implementing it across the region or state. <i>Rate 2 criteria on the 5 point scale.</i>						
1. Abstract describes Phase I of the process, including districts that would be actively involved, and the overall goals and outcomes of this first phase.						
2. Describes potential activities and resources for Phase II and a process that would be used to plan and implement throughout the state.						
Project Description (50 points) Describes project in two phases. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phase I Plan for Learning Powered with Technology, a planning grant to support a statewide conversation with districts. Includes a rationale for the overall vision and direction the project will take, as well as a timeline of regional conversations and outreach to all districts. Phase II to Purchase Supporting Resources for Learning Powered with Technology for a consortium of participating districts. Includes a "first draft" plan to respond to recommendations made and consensus built during Phase I, with intent on expansion throughout the state. <i>Rate 10 criteria on the 5 point scale.</i>						
Project description demonstrates . . .						
1. The lead district for Phase I has a plan to support a statewide conversation with interested districts throughout the state, to develop a shared vision and direction for creating 21 st century learning environments.						
2. The Phase I statewide dialogue will use the newly released National Educational Technology Plan as a key reference to develop the vision and direction.						
3. Additional current research literature on recommendations for educational transformation will also be used for informed dialogue during Phase I.						
4. All districts previously receiving ARRA Ed Tech grants in 2009 will be involved the Phase I dialogue to share what was learned from their 21 st century classrooms grants.						
5. There is a clear plan for the project manager to work with NHDOE OET and LESCEN to coordinate a series of online and on-site meetings attended by district teams, which include superintendents, principals, tech directors, library media specialists, classroom teachers, students, and others as appropriate.						
6. There is a reasonable timeline for Phase I conversations beginning in spring 2011 and concluding in time for the consortium proposal to be expanded with recommendations for Phase II, which ideally should be scheduled to begin in fall 2011.						
7. Phase I planning identifies a communication strategy, in sufficient detail for immediate action, to engage a maximum number of NH educators and other stakeholders.						
8. A "first draft" Phase II plan with sufficient detail to provide an easy transition from planning to implementation for the consortium.						

9. A "first draft" Phase II plan with clear and thoughtful strategies for best ways to purchase digital resources for the consortium.	
10. A "first draft" Phase II plan for hosting and management options for digital resources.	
Capacity for Success (30 points) Describes the capacity of each team member to achieve meaningful success at achieving the goals of the Tech Mini-Grant Program in the school or district. Clearly articulates the program and policies in place that will support success in terms of professional development, technology leadership, and how this program would meet specific achievement needs of the students. <i>Rate 6 criteria on the 5 point scale.</i>	
Proposal demonstrates . . .	
1. Evidence of thoughtful planning for success that considers the skills, available time, and continuity of the lead project director and team members.	
2. Substantial support of lead district and SAU administration to the lead project director and team that ensures members can commit time and effort necessary to successfully complete Phase I (Planning) of the project.	
3. Substantial support of lead district and SAU administration to the lead project director and team to ensure successful completion Phase II (Purchase and Implementation) of the project.	
4. Evidence of prior success in coordinating projects that span many districts and regions of the state's educational system.	
5. Substantial need for acquiring digital resources and associated professional development within the participating consortium members.	
6. Evidence of prior knowledge and district activity related to 21 st century transformational changes in education, including but not limited to emphasis on digital media literacies, restructured instructional time, project based learning, strong community outreach, and collaborative leadership approaches.	
Budget (10 points) Complete budget is provided along with a descriptive narrative that justifies expenses.	
1. Budget is formatted to clear show each item category and the calculations for item totals, along with a budget narrative clearly describing and justifying costs for successful implementation of Phase I of the project.	
2. Budget is formatted to clear show each item category and the calculations for item totals, along with a budget narrative clearly describing and justifying costs for successful implementation of Phase II of the project. Note: It is understood that the budget for Phase II is preliminary and may change after Phase I dialogue has been completed and recommendations from all regions of the state have been received.	
TOTAL SCORE (MAX is 100):	0