

**OCC-Credentialing Branch-Training Proposal Evaluation Rubric**

**Directions:**

- Carefully review the training proposal package and use this scoring rubric to evaluate the proposal.
- Read each indicator description carefully and check the box (score 2-5) that matches your assessment of the proposal.
- Do Not mark in between scores
- Score exceptional indicators with a 5.
- Total the scores within each category: Organization, Content, and Presentation. Record the category totals in the space provided.
- Training Proposals cannot be approved if the score is below 75.
- Include suggestions on how that applicant can improve the training proposal in the comments section. Suggestions are required for any indicator scoring a 2 or 3.

Title of the proposed training: \_\_\_\_\_

**Category Scores:**

Organization: \_\_\_\_\_/30  
Content: \_\_\_\_\_/50  
Presentation: \_\_\_\_\_/20  
Total: \_\_\_\_\_

I, \_\_\_\_\_, have carefully evaluated the training proposal using the criteria established in the evaluation rubric.

Print name of Peer Reviewer

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Peer Reviewer

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

**OCC-Credentialing Branch – Training Proposal Evaluation Rubric**

<b>ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>SCORE</b>
<b>Uses quality writing</b>	The training proposal is very poorly written and has several errors in grammar, usage, mechanics, or spelling	The training proposal has 3 -5 grammatical, usage, mechanical or spelling errors.	The training proposal is satisfactory in that it only has 1 – 2 grammatical, usage, mechanical or spelling errors.	The training proposal is very clearly written with no errors in grammar, usage, mechanics or spelling.	
<b>Maintains consistency within the training proposal</b>	The training proposal description, learning objectives, content and methods are not at all consistent with one another.	The training proposal description, learning objectives, content and methods are somewhat consistent with one another.	The training proposal description, learning objectives, content and methods are consistent with one another.	The training proposal description, learning objectives, content and methods are highly consistent with one another.	
<b>Specifies realistic and measurable learning objectives (This category is double weighted so the score is multiplied by 2)</b>	None of the learning objectives are realistic or written in measurable terms.	Some of the learning objectives are realistic and written in measurable terms.	Most of the learning objectives are realistic and written in measurable terms.	All of the learning objectives are realistic and written in measurable terms.	____ x2= ____
<b>References/Resources cited are reputable, published within 10 years, and appropriate for use as foundation of training content</b>	None of the sources cited are reputable, published within 10 years, and appropriate.	Two of the sources cited are reputable, published within 10 years, and appropriate.	Three of the sources cited are reputable, published within 10 years, and appropriate.	All of the sources cited are reputable, published within 10 years, and appropriate.	
<b>Timeline allots adequate time for events/activities</b>	Timeline allotted for delivery of training is not at all adequate.	Timeline allotted for delivery of training is somewhat adequate.	Timeline allotted for delivery of training is adequate.	Timeline allotted for delivery of training is clearly adequate.	
<b>Objectives should reflect what the participant should know and be able to do as a result of this training (e.g. Participants will list the major developmental theories and identify characteristics of each.)</b>					
<b>Comments:</b>					
					<b>Category Total Score</b>
					<b>/30</b>

## OCC-Credentialing Branch – Training Proposal Evaluation Rubric

CONTENT	2	3	4	5	SCORE
<b>Training Description</b>	Training description does not explain the content of the training, the need for the training and the benefits to the participants.	Training description does very little to explain the content of the training, the need for the training and the benefits to the participants.	Training description explains the content of the training, the need for the training and the benefits to the participants.	Training description clearly explains the content of the training, the need for the training and the benefits to the participants.	
<b>Training Title</b>	Training title is not strength-based and/or does not appropriately refer to the subject(s) of the training.	Training title does very little in using strength-based language and/or does very little to appropriately refer to the subject(s) of the training.	Training title somewhat addresses the use of strength-based language and/or appropriately refers to subject(s) of the training.	Training title uses strength-based language and appropriately refers to the subject(s) of the training.	
<b>Training proposal provides sufficient information specific to training content and objectives.</b> (This category is double weighted so the score is multiplied by 2.)	Training content does not include sufficient information to adequately meet learning objectives.	Training content includes some information to adequately meet learning objectives.	Training content includes information to adequately meet learning objectives.	Training content clearly demonstrates alignment with learning objectives and includes sufficient and specific information.	___ x 2= ___
<b>**Incorporates learning objectives and methods to measure learning.</b> (This category is double weighted so the score is multiplied by 2.)	Learning objectives and methods to measure learning are not addressed in the content.	Learning objectives and methods to measure learning are not fully addressed in content.	Learning objectives and methods to measure learning are addressed in content.	Learning objectives and methods to measure learning are clearly addressed in content.	___ x 2= ___
<b>Content addresses special needs and inclusionary practices (using person first language) and ADA.</b>	Training content does not address special needs, inclusionary practices (using person first language) and ADA.	Training content does very little to address special needs, inclusionary practices (using person first language) and ADA.	Training content somewhat addresses special needs, inclusionary practices (using person first language) and ADA.	Training content clearly addresses special needs, inclusionary practices (using person first language) and ADA.	
<b>Content addresses cultural sensitivity and diversity.</b>	Training content does not address cultural sensitivity and diversity.	Training content does very little to address cultural sensitivity and diversity.	Training content somewhat addresses cultural sensitivity and diversity.	Training content clearly addresses cultural sensitivity and diversity.	
<b>Matches the targeted Core of Knowledge content area(s)</b>	Does not match the targeted Core of Knowledge content area(s).	Somewhat matches the targeted Core of Knowledge content area(s).	Matches the Core of Knowledge content area(s).	Clearly matches the targeted Core of Knowledge content area(s).	
<b>Reflects current national standards/guidelines, COMAR regulations, and best practice for early care and education when appropriate to content and learning objectives.</b>	Content does not reflect current national standards/guidelines COMAR regulations, and best practice for early care and education.	Content somewhat reflects current national standards/guidelines COMAR regulations, and best practice for early care and education.	Content reflects current national standards/guidelines COMAR regulations, and best practice for early care and education.	Content clearly reflects current national standards/guidelines COMAR regulations, and best practice for early care and education.	
<b>Category Total Score</b>					<b>/50</b>
<b>Comment:</b>					

OCC-Credentialing Branch – Training Proposal Evaluation Rubric

PRESENTATION	2	3	4	5	SCORE
<p><b>Provides quality materials/handouts that are appropriate and “user-friendly”.</b></p>	<p>Training materials/handouts are inappropriate, unprofessional and/or lack appropriate reference information and/or not “user-friendly”.</p>	<p>Training materials/handouts are somewhat appropriate, “user-friendly” and look professional but do not have appropriate reference information.</p>	<p>Training materials/handouts are appropriate, “user-friendly” and look professional and have appropriate reference information.</p>	<p>Training materials/handouts are clearly appropriate, “user-friendly” and look very professional and have appropriate reference information.</p>	
<p><b>Connects training content to practical application</b></p>	<p>Practical application is not linked to content.</p>	<p>Practical application is somewhat linked to content.</p>	<p>Practical application is linked to content.</p>	<p>Practical application is clearly linked to content.</p>	
<p><b>**Methods of Delivery</b> (This category is double weighted so the score is multiplied by 2.)</p>	<p>Methods used do not reflect a variety of learning styles, methods are not appropriate for adult learners, methods do not promote active learning.</p>	<p>Methods somewhat reflect a variety of learning styles, methods are somewhat appropriate for adult learners, methods somewhat promote active learning</p>	<p>Methods used reflects a variety of learning styles, methods are appropriate for adult learners, methods promote active learning</p>	<p>Methods clearly reflects a variety of learning styles, methods are clearly appropriate for adult learners, methods clearly promote active learning</p>	<p>___ x 2= ___</p>
<b>Category Total Score</b>					<b>/20</b>
<p><b>Comment</b></p>					