

An evaluation of partnerships throughout the District

Evaluator Name: <u></u>	r. Jason Baez		Role: Exec	utive Director
		General Infor	mation	September 1
Grant Name	Title IV		Contract Amount	\$39,480
Partner/Partner	Greg Joyner	i magqaz bine	Date of Service(s)	9-1-23 - 8-31-20
School Site(s)	District-Wide		•	23/18
YES (if y	ee quotes for vendor es, please list vendors o, please explain)			
2. In what ways do	oes this vendor/partn with our MBK Chapters at so	The second of th		vision/strategic plan? neeting and providing YPS staff
main objective To provi	of the partnership.) ide PD to a certain po	pulation of the s	chools.	st closely relates to the
To provi To help To conn To help	ide programmatic sup ide tutoring or instruc- to assess current prac- ect the schools with c to develop curriculun ort mental and emoti	ctional support. ctices. other resources. n and activities f		l or classroom.
Other: _				
YES	fied goal(s) and objec o, please explain)	tives reached?		
Explain:				and and the co
YES	deliver on the expeco, please explain)	eted agreement a		saran sa di Av. Saran sa di Saran Saran Saran di Saran sa di Saran Sara

6. Did this partner supply appropriate mail outcomes? YES	terials and supplies nece		h goals and
NO (if no, please explain)			
Explain:	es rapigitisans	STATE OF STATE	TO THE THE REAL PROPERTY.
7. Did this partner provide adequate feed	back and support?		
YES			
NO (if no, please explain) N/A			
Evoluine			

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

	Vend	lor/Partner Asse	essment Criteria	1	
Criterion	(1) Ineffective	(2) Somewhat Ineffective	(3) Somewhat Effective	(4) Effective	(5) Highly Effective
Preparation: Provides high-quality services to meet goals	group peril i re	reargu ans that Sc		X	St. Francisco
Competency: Knowledge of craft		rearyzedi in	roberugau met	vos ci el ela	X
Flexibility: Willingness to change or compromise		imag	n k-metsungen e allen og nes	X	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
Consistency: Schedule & routine	finell, schools	X	de lanta empluajo	alo de avalidado	and Q.
Organization: Structured, orderly, & efficient use of time management		X	ist a Whaliko h	e (staggbelle	
Professionalism: Interactions are cordial & respectful			101	no, please exp a	X
Overall Experience with partner		in the last house	othe histogram	X	and in the second

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.

			<u></u>		
. Use the space below	to provide any	v additional feed	back vou think w	ould be helpful	:
ving forward, we need to be o					
a school either leading an M	IBK Chapter, supp	orting a MBK Chapte	r Leader, and/or sup	porting a school's M	MBK administrator
changes in schedule will ha	ave to be approve	by MBK Executive Di	rector. Any paper wo	rk needs to be comp	oleted in timely ma
	****	* FOR PEER REVI	EW ONLY ****		
		* FOR PEER REVI			
	Vend		Review Criteria (3)		(5)
Criterion	Vend	or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat	Review Criteria (3) Somewhat	(4)	Highly
	Vend	or/Partner Peer (2)	Review Criteria (3)		
Impact:	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: Based on artifacts/evidence/	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: Based on artifacts/evidence/ evaluation	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 with partner	(1) Ineffective	or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat Ineffective	Review Criteria (3) Somewhat Effective	(4) Effective	Highly Effective
Impact: Based on artifacts/evidence/ evaluation Overall Experience	(1) Ineffective	or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat Ineffective	Review Criteria (3) Somewhat Effective	(4)	Highly Effective