

OCC-Workforce Advancement Branch – Training Proposal Evaluation Rubric

Training Proposal Evaluation Rubric

✓ **Directions and Guidance:**

- ☐ Carefully review the training proposal package and use the attached scoring rubric to evaluate the proposal. (Updated May 2023)
- ☐ Read each indicator description carefully and check the box (score 0-5) that matches your assessment of the proposal.
- ☐ Do not mark in between scores (example 3.5).
- ☐ Score exceptional indicators with a 5.
- ☐ It is required that Reviewers provide a justification for a score of 0 or 3 within the comment section below each criterion within the designated category. Please include recommendations on how the applicant can improve the Training Proposal.
- ☐ Total the scores within each category under “Organization, Content, and Presentation.”
- ☐ Record the category totals in the spaces provided below.
- ☐ Training Proposals must meet a minimum score of 80 to be approved.
- ☐ Title of the proposed training: _____

Category Scores

Organization: _____/30

Content: _____/45

Presentation: _____/25

Total Score: _____/100

Print name of Peer Reviewer:

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

As the peer reviewer I am including my signature _____ and the date _____ of the completed rubric.

OCC-Workforce Advancement Branch – Training Proposal Evaluation Rubric

Training Proposal – Scoring Rubric

ORGANIZATION

ORGANIZATION CRITERIA	0	3	4	5	SCORE
Written materials including handouts, PowerPoint slides, trainer note pages, planning template, etc., use quality writing, grammar, spelling, and mechanics.	The training proposal is very poorly written and has 6 or more errors in grammar, spelling, and mechanics.	The training proposal has 3 -5 errors in grammar, spelling, and mechanics.	The training proposal has 1 – 2 errors grammar, spelling, and mechanics.	The training proposal is very clearly written with no errors in grammar, spelling, and mechanics.	
Comments:					
Written materials including PowerPoint slides, handouts, etc., are consistent with ADA approved font style, size, color, bullet points, slide numbers, readability.	Written materials including PowerPoint slides, handouts etc., do not meet any of the criteria (ADA approved font style, size, color, bullet points, slide numbers, readability).	Written materials including PowerPoint slides, handouts, etc., meet 3 of the 6 criteria: (e.g. ADA approved font style, size, color, bullet points, slides numbers, and readability).	Written materials including PowerPoint slides, handouts, etc., meet 4 of the 6 criteria: (e.g. ADA approved font style, size, color, bullet points, slides numbers, and readability).	Written materials including PowerPoint slides, handouts, etc., meet all 6 criteria: (e.g. ADA approved font style, size, color, bullet points, slides numbers, and readability).	
Comments:					

OCC-Workforce Advancement Branch – Training Proposal Evaluation Rubric

Maintains consistency throughout the training proposal description, learning objectives, content, and methods.	Fewer than 2 of the 4 criteria are consistent with one another (training proposal description, learning objectives, content, and methods).	2 of the 4 criteria are consistent with one another (training proposal description, learning objectives, content, and methods).	3 of the 4 criteria are consistent with one another (training proposal description, learning objectives, content, and methods).	All 4 criteria are consistent with one another (training proposal description, learning objectives, content, and methods).	
Comments:					
Specifies realistic and measurable learning objectives (minimum of 3; maximum of 5, and each aligns with a competency identifier).	None of the learning objectives are realistic, written in measurable terms, and align with a competency identifier.	Some of the learning objectives are realistic, written in measurable terms, and each aligns with a competency identifier.	Most of the learning objectives are realistic, written in measurable terms, and each aligns with a competency identifier.	All the learning objectives are realistic, written in measurable terms, and each aligns with a competency identifier.	
Comments:					
A minimum of 3 References/Resources cited are reputable, published within 5-7 years, from multiple source types, and appropriate for use as the foundation of training content. All handouts, videos, and documents are listed.	None of the sources cited are reputable, published within 5-7 years, and appropriate for use as the foundation of training content. None of the handouts, videos, and documents are listed.	One of the sources cited is reputable, published within 5-7 years, and appropriate for use as the foundation of training content. Some handouts, videos, and documents are listed.	Two of the sources cited are reputable, published within 5-7 years, and appropriate for use as the foundation of training content. Most handouts, videos, and documents are listed.	Three of the sources cited are reputable, published within 5-7 years, and appropriate for use as the foundation of training content. All handouts, videos, and documents are listed.	

OCC-Workforce Advancement Branch – Training Proposal Evaluation Rubric

Comments:					
Timeline allots adequate time for content, activities, assessment, and evaluation (excluding breaks).	Timeline allotted for content, activities, assessment, and evaluation is not at all adequate.	Timeline allotted for content, activities, assessment, and evaluation is somewhat adequate.	Timeline allotted for content, activities, assessment, and evaluation is adequate.	Timeline allotted for content, activities, assessment, and evaluation is clearly adequate.	
Comments:					
Organization Category Total Score					/30
Overall Comment for Organization:					

OCC-Workforce Advancement Branch – Training Proposal Evaluation Rubric

CONTENT

CONTENT CRITERIA	0	3	4	5	SCORE
Training Title is strength-based and appropriately refers to the subject(s) of the training.	Training title is not strength-based.	Training title uses strength-based language but does very little to appropriately refer to the subject(s) of the training.	Training title uses strength-based language and somewhat appropriately refers to subject(s) of the training.	Training title uses strength-based language and appropriately refers to the subject(s) of the training.	
Comments:					
Training Description clearly explains the content of the training, the need for the training, and the benefits to the participants.	Training description does not explain the content of the training, the need for the training, and the benefits to the participants.	Training description somewhat explains 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.	
Comments:					
Training proposal provides clearly sufficient information specific to training content and objectives.	Training proposal does not provide sufficient information specific to training content and objectives.	Training proposal provides somewhat sufficient information specific to training content and objectives.	Training proposal provides sufficient information specific to training content and objectives.	Training proposal provides clearly sufficient information specific to training content and objectives.	
Comments:					

OCC-Workforce Advancement Branch – Training Proposal Evaluation Rubric

Incorporates learning objectives and methods to measure learning.	Less than 50% of the learning objectives and methods to measure learning are addressed in the content.	At least 50% of the learning objectives and methods to measure learning are addressed in content.	At least 75% of the learning objectives and methods to measure learning are addressed in content.	All the learning objectives and methods to measure learning are addressed in content.	
Comments:					
Addresses special needs such as adaptations, modifications, learning styles, guidelines for both the participants and the population they serve.	Training content does not address special needs.	Special needs is addressed in 5% of the content and is explained in the trainer notes.	Special needs is addressed in 10% of the content and is explained in the trainer notes.	Special needs is addressed in 20% of the content and is explained in the trainer notes.	
Comments:					
Addresses beliefs and languages for both the participants and the population they serve.	Training content does not address beliefs and languages.	Beliefs and languages are addressed in 5% of the content and are explained in the trainer notes.	Beliefs and languages are addressed in 10% of the content and are explained in the trainer notes.	Beliefs and languages are addressed in 20% of the content and are explained in the trainer notes.	
Comments:					
Addresses housing insecurity for both the participants and the population they serve.	Training content does not address housing insecurity for both the participants and the population they serve.	Housing insecurity is addressed in 2% of the content and is explained in the trainer notes.	Housing insecurity is addressed in 5% of the content and is explained in the trainer notes.	Housing insecurity is addressed in 10% of the content and is explained in the trainer notes.	

OCC-Workforce Advancement Branch – Training Proposal Evaluation Rubric

Comments:					
Addresses the targeted Core of Knowledge area(s).	Content does not match the targeted Core of Knowledge area(s).	At least 50% of the content addresses the targeted Core of Knowledge area(s).	At least 75% of the content addresses the targeted Core of Knowledge area(s).	All of the content addresses the targeted Core of Knowledge area(s).	
Comments:					
Reflects current national standards/guidelines, COMAR regulations, best practices for early care and education, and is appropriate to content and learning objectives.	Content does not reflect current national standards/guidelines, COMAR regulations, best practices for early care and education, and is appropriate to content and learning objectives.	(Must meet 5 in this area)	(Must meet 5 in this area)	Content reflects current national standards/guidelines, COMAR regulations, best practices for early care and education, and is appropriate to content and learning objectives.	
Comments:					
Content Category Total Score					/45
Overall Comment for Content:					

OCC-Workforce Advancement Branch – Training Proposal Evaluation Rubric

PRESENTATION

PRESENTATION CRITERIA	0	3	4	5	SCORE
Provides quality materials and handouts that are appropriate, “user-friendly,” and include reference information.	Training materials/handouts are inappropriate, unprofessional, not “user-friendly,” and lacks reference information.	Training materials/handouts are somewhat appropriate, “user-friendly,” professional but do not have appropriate reference information.	Most of the training materials/handouts are appropriate, “user-friendly,” professional, and include reference information.	All the training materials/handouts are appropriate, “user-friendly,” professional, and include reference information.	
Comments:					
Content and methods of the presentation are clearly appropriate for the topic and length of the training (example: the number of PowerPoint slides and amount of information contained in each slide).	Content and methods of the presentation are not appropriate for the topic and length of the training.	Content and methods of the presentation are somewhat appropriate for the topic and length of the training.	Content and methods of the presentation are appropriate for the topic and length of the training.	Content and methods of the presentation are clearly appropriate for the topic and length of the training.	
Comments:					
Presentation and/or PowerPoint slides include the objectives and summary/wrap-up.	Presentation and/or PowerPoint slides do not include the objectives and summary/wrap-up.	(Must meet 5 in this area)	(Must meet 5 in this area)	Presentation and/or PowerPoint slides include the objectives and summary/wrap-up.	
Comments:					

OCC-Workforce Advancement Branch – Training Proposal Evaluation Rubric

Training content clearly connects to practical application and meets the needs of participants.	Practical application is not linked to content and does not meet the needs of participants.	Practical application is somewhat linked to content and the needs of participants.	Practical application is linked to content and the needs of participants.	Practical application is clearly linked to content and meets the needs of participants.	
Comments:					
Methods of delivery clearly reflect a variety of learning styles, are appropriate for adult learners, and promote active learning.	Delivery methods do not reflect a variety of learning styles, are not appropriate for adult learners, and do not promote active learning.	Delivery methods somewhat reflect a variety of learning styles, are somewhat appropriate for adult learners, and somewhat promote active learning.	Delivery methods reflect a variety of learning styles, are appropriate for adult learners, and promote active learning.	Methods of delivery clearly reflect a variety of learning styles, are appropriate for adult learners, and promote active learning.	
Comments:					
					Presentation Category Score
Overall Comment for Presentation:					/25