Criteria	1 – Limited	2 – Basic	3 – Strong	4 – Exceptional
Partnership with schools/districts served	No partnerships.	Partnerships with schools/districts but those schools/districts do not include any economically disadvantaged schools/districts.	Serves at least one economically disadvantaged district or school; limited collaboration.	Targets economically disadvantaged districts with minimal CS access and/or a need for credentialed CS teachers; strong collaboration planned.
Program design	No intentionality in program design.	Program design seems generally aligned but may be vague or raise questions about the rationale behind design.	Clear design is aligned to the purpose of the Teach CS program.	Robust, well-designed program with potential to significantly impact CS needs in the state.
Capacity to implement effectively	Lacks infrastructure, staffing, or relevant experience. If partners, unclear why/how partners were chosen and how partnership will work.	Basic readiness; some gaps in staffing or necessary infrastructure. Team has lack of significant experience with CS or teacher education but some evidence of capacity. If partners, may be unclear why/how partner was selected or how partnership will work.	Mostly ready with clear roles, adequate infrastructure and staffing, and demonstrated experience with CS and teacher education. If partners, partners bring relevant qualifications or expertise and there is an understanding of how the partnership will function.	Fully prepared with strong infrastructure and staffing. Team has strong experience with CS and teacher education. If partners, partners are selected carefully and likely to contribute strongly to results, and the collaboration is well thought out.
Effectiveness of recruitment and selection strategies	Strategies are vague or untested	Basic recruitment/selection strategies; limited rationale	Well-defined recruitment and selection methods with moderate reach	Innovative, evidence-based recruitment and selection strategies with strong rationale and reach
Effectiveness of support strategies	No clear support mechanisms for teachers	Basic support strategies; limited evidence of their effectiveness.	Intentional support designed; supports appear likely to be effective.	Comprehensive support strategies planned proven to increase participant retention and/or success.
Workplan	Workplan is unrealistic or not well thought out.	Workplan generally achieves objectives but raises questions or is unclear.	Logical workplan that achieves objectives.	Well thought out workplan that is likely to lead to

				successful implementation.
Proposed outcomes & use of data	Outcomes unclear or not measurable, no plan for improvement.	Basic outcomes; minimal data collection; mentions improvement but lacks clear structure.	Clear outcomes with plan for data collection and analysis; plan for ongoing improvement.	Strong, measurable outcomes that will impact students, with robust data strategy & plan for continuous improvement
Efficient budget	Budget is unrealistic and inefficient	Some inefficiencies in budget	Logical budget; mostly efficient use of resources	Highly efficient, well-justified budget; reflects strategic use of time and funds
Sustainability potential	No plan or potential for sustaining.	Basic sustainability ideas. Possibility that some partnerships, deliverables, awareness, or funding will be sustained/leveraged after grant.	There appears to be some partnerships, deliverables, awareness, or funding that are likely to be sustained/leveraged after grant.	Strong plan for long-term sustainability.
Up to five priority points: Does program have a plan to incorporate artificial intelligence into program design?				
Up to five priority points: Will this program increase the number of Ohio teachers credentialed to teach computer science?				