An evaluation of partnerships throughout the District

| | An evaluation of partiteism | ps till oughout the i | |
|--|--|--|--------------------------|
| Evaluator Name: | Karina Reggina | Role: Gran | nt Coordinator/Teacher |
| | General In | formation | |
| Grant Name | Smart Scholars-Cohort 3 | Contract Amount | \$24,600 |
| Partner/Partner | Empowering Creative Minds, LLC | Date of Service(s) | 9/1/2023-6/26/2024 |
| School Site(s) | Roosevelt High School Early Colleg | e Studies | |
| o YES (if | ree quotes for vendor services? yes, please list vendors below) no, please explain) | | |
| Empowering Crestive Minds, LL | does this vendor/partnership align to | rs with the goal to Refine the approach to | teaching |
| | ukum as well as further align classroom instruction and profession | | |
| | ofessional Learning Community Model serventilege Smart Scholars are college and caree | | sign rigorous coursework |
| o To provo To provo To provo To help o To conso To help o To sup | e of the partnership.) vide PD to a certain population of the vide programmatic support to the so vide tutoring or instructional support to assess current practices. nect the schools with other resource to develop curriculum and activities port mental and emotional health Toppowde PD to a softh population of the activated develop curriculum. | chools. t. es. | ol or classroom. |
| VES YES | ified goal(s) and objectives reached | ? | |
| Explain: | | | |
| YES | er deliver on the expected agreemer | nt and outcomes? | |

| 6. Did th | is partner supply appropriate materials and supplies necessary to accomplish goals and |
|------------|--|
| outco | mes? |
| a / | YES |
| 0 | NO (if no, please explain) |
| o | N/A |
| Explain: _ | |
| 7. Did th | is partner provide adequate feedback and support? YES |
| 0 | NO (if no, please explain) |
| 0 | N/A |
| Explain: _ | |
| 0 01 | |

8. Please complete the Vendor/Partner Assessment Criteria scale below and rank this partner on the following areas:

| | Vend | dor/Partner Asse | essment Criteria | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| Criterion | (1) Ineffective | (2) Somewhat Ineffective | (3) Somewhat Effective | (4) Effective | (5) Highly Effective |
| Preparation: | | | | | 5 |
| Provides high-quality | | | | | |
| services to meet goals | | | | | |
| Competency: | | | | | 5 |
| Knowledge of craft | | | | |) J |
| Flexibility: | | | | | 5 |
| Willingness to change | | | | | |
| or compromise | | | | | |
| Consistency: | | | | | 5 |
| Schedule & routine | | | | | 3 |
| Organization: | | | | | 5 |
| Structured, orderly, & | | | | | |
| efficient use of time | | | | | |
| management | | | | | |
| Professionalism: | | | | | 5 |
| Interactions are cordial | | | | | |
| & respectful | | | | | |
| Overall Experience with partner | | | | | 5 |

9. Please indicate specifically how the vendor/partner impacted student achievement, leadership development or district operations. Note: Please provide documentation and evidence of impact of vendor/partner services.

| common planning time and | | | obdoning obboning i | vere conducted to m | aximize the use |
|--|--------------------|---|---|---------------------|---------------------|
| | increase the know | ledge and efficiency | of teachers. | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| . Use the space below | to provide any | / additional feed | back you think w | vould be helpful | : |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | - |
| | i h | , | | | |
| nature of Evaluator _ | 100- Kb | 7/ | | Date: 9/24 | 124 |
| griature of Evaluator _ | 1000 | | • | Date: | 101 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | **** | * FOR PEER REVI | 'EW ONLY **** | • | |
| | **** | * FOR PEER REVI | EW ONLY **** | • | |
| | | | EW ONLY **** | | |
| | Vend | | ······································ | | (5) |
| Criterion | Vend | or/Partner Peer | Review Criteria | (4) | (5) Highly |
| Criterion | Vend | or/Partner Peer (2) | Review Criteria | | |
| Criterion | Vend | or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat | Review Criteria (3) Somewhat | (4) | Highly |
| | Vend | or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat | Review Criteria (3) Somewhat | (4) | Highly |
| Impact: Based on | Vend | or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat | Review Criteria (3) Somewhat | (4) | Highly |
| Impact: | Vend | or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat | Review Criteria (3) Somewhat | (4) | Highly |
| Impact: Based on artifacts/evidence/ evaluation | Vend | or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat | Review Criteria (3) Somewhat | (4) | Highly |
| Impact: Based on artifacts/evidence/ evaluation Overall Experience | Vend | or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat | Review Criteria (3) Somewhat | (4) | Highly |
| Impact: Based on artifacts/evidence/ evaluation | Vend | or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat | Review Criteria (3) Somewhat | (4) | Highly |
| Impact: Based on artifacts/evidence/ evaluation Overall Experience | Vend | or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat | Review Criteria (3) Somewhat | (4) | Highly |
| Impact: Based on artifacts/evidence/ evaluation Overall Experience | (1) Ineffective | or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat Ineffective | Review Criteria (3) Somewhat Effective | (4) | Highly Effective |