

GRANT EVALUATION CRITERIA EXPLANATION

The following major indicators reviewed:

STRUCTURES: Facilitating communication, input and information flow

TECHNOLOGY: Implementing for integration of authentic teaching and learning

ASSESSMENT: Guiding decisions and providing feedback for improvement

RESEARCH: Reviewing for guidance and data in decision-making

STAKEHOLDERS: inclusion for differing perspectives and ideas

STAFF DEVELOPMENT: on-going learning processes

LEADERSHIP & SERVICE: guiding and serving a common good

These **STARSS-LS** list serves as a guide and each action plan may demonstrate different combinations of these and may be included in what they have done or what they plan to do.

The bottom line questions are: *Is what they are doing or planning to do impacting student achievement and what evidence is there (or will there be) to show the impact?*

In addition, the **GRANT NARRATIVE, TECHNOLOGY, BUDGET, AND SYSTEMIC SUPPORT** facilitate the grant work.

A. STRUCTURES: Are these in place or planned for facilitating communication, input and information flow?

Examples may include committees, vertical and/or grade, planning committees, common planning times, focus groups, advisory boards or councils, review teams or leadership council. Processes may include planning, goal-setting, review, consensus building, North Central Association (NCA), Comprehensive Local Educational Plan (CLEP), Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL), Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRSD), High Schools That Work, and/or school site-based teams.

B. TECHNOLOGY: Are there ways or plans to implement ways to begin to integrate of authentic teaching and learning?

Technology planning; use of Taking a Good Look At Technology (TAGLIT is a Gates grant requirement; reviewing survey data; accessing or planning to access spreadsheets, word processing, digital cameras; Marco Polo or PassPort on-line resources; commitment to training of staff; and/or sharing of technology learning.

C. ASSESSMENT: Are decisions being or planned to be guided by data and are there mechanisms for providing feedback for improvement?

Use of TAGLIT data to inform decisions, mechanisms for review of student data, including test scores, strategies to share the data with all stakeholders; and/or use of data from software programs, such as Accelerated Reader, STAR, CCC or ABACUS; disaggregating data.

D. RESEARCH: Is there ongoing review of research or outside expertise for guidance and use of data in decision-making?

Mention of specific research; use of data from their own study or using data for decisions; bringing in outside expertise, using standards, such as International Society for Technology Education (ISTE) or Priority Academic Student Skills (PASS); and/or attending staff development conferences and sharing the learning.

E. STAKEHOLDERS: inclusion for differing perspectives and ideas

Consideration of staff, students, and community members in planning; sharing information with the community, making connections with the community for student learning; surveying stakeholders; and/or including these groups in meaningful ways.

F. STAFF DEVELOPMENT: What ways are there to support on-going learning processes for staff and how are others included?

Strategies exist or are planned for sharing best practices, staff training staff, networks, ways to share learning from conferences, technology training strategies, on-going study and outside research and feedback being reviewed, reflective time and discussions, and/or regular vertical/grade level/department meetings.

G. LEADERSHIP & SERVICE: How are the stakeholders being developed as learners and leaders and is there a guiding strategy for serving a common good?

As committee chairs, members of leadership or advisory councils, representative boards, or other skill and knowledge building organizational strategies, staff and other stakeholders develop their leadership capacity. Through reaching out to parents and community or to other schools, offering service learning opportunities, and connecting to learning with the real world, students and staff serve a common good.

H. GRANT NARRATIVE: How well is the plan developed, whether the school/district is at a beginning stage or an advanced stage in the process of renewal?

A firm rationale for the practices and processes to accomplish the goals of the grant are in place or planned; the narrative shows thought and understanding of the practices and how technology can facilitate school renewal and teacher growth, and impact student achievement.

I. TECHNOLOGY ADEQUACY AND APPROPRIATENESS: How does the technology facilitate the grant goals?

Technology requests have a purpose and are tied to the grant goals.

J. GRANT BUDGET PROPOSAL: How does the budget reflect the narrative goals and action plans?

The technology funding is reasonable and details are adequate.

K. SYSTEMIC SUPPORT: What kind of support is there for school renewal and technology integration?

Planning processes for the grant and/or technology were inclusive of stakeholders and support from staff, district, community and others is indicated in some way. Support is demonstrated for both the technology equipment and the professional development.