

An evaluation of partnerships throughout the District

Evaluator Name: Elan Kheyman		Role: Executive Director		
	Yalla -	General Infor	mation	
Grant Name	2	N/A	Contract Amount	\$1,983,740.47
Partner/Par	tner	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (HMH Education Co.)	Date of Service(s)	School Year 2023-Present
School Site(s)	All PK-6 and PK-8 Sites		
Explain.	ES (if ye O (if no /A	e quotes for vendor services? s, please list vendors below) , please explain)		
Goal 1 Studer	vays do nt Achie	es this vendor/partnership align to or vement	ur Districts mission/	vision/strategic plan?
0 100 1				
Goal 2 Profes	sional D	evelopment)		
• To	provide provid	f the partnership.) le PD to a certain population of the sole programmatic support to the schoole tutoring or instructional support. It is assess current practices. It is schools with other resources. It is develop curriculum and activities for the mental and emotional health	ols.	l or classroom.
(YE	S O (if no	ed goal(s) and objectives reached? , please explain)		
Explain:				¥
(YE	S	deliver on the expected agreement a , please explain)	nd outcomes?	

ъ.	outcomes? YES NO (if no, please explain) N/A
Ex	plain:
7.	Did this partner provide adequate feedback and support? YES NO (if no, please explain) N/A
Exp	plain:
0	Planca complete the Vander/Partner Asset 10 to 1

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

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

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.*

	ported by triree 3	30 minute profess	ional developmen	t sessions that wa	s scheduled by the
uilding administrator.					and the second s
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	·				
0. Use the space below	to provide any	additional feed	lback you think v	vould be helpfu	l:
<u> </u>			,		••
		77			
	1	6			
	5//	de		10/-	
ignature of Evaluator_	Kan/	6-6-		Date: 10/30	2/2024
			-	Date	12001
				Date	72021
			-	Date	7000
			- 		7000
			· IEW ONLY ****		7000
	****	* FOR PEER REV		•	7000
	**** Vend	* FOR PEER REV	TEW ONLY **** Review Criteria (3)		
Criterion	***** Vend	* FOR PEER REV	Review Criteria	(4)	(5) Highly
	**** Vend	* FOR PEER REV or/Partner Peel (2)	Review Criteria		(5)
Criterion Impact:	***** Vend	* FOR PEER REV or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat	Review Criteria (3) Somewhat	(4)	(5) Highly
Criterion Impact: Based on	***** Vend	* FOR PEER REV or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat	Review Criteria (3) Somewhat	(4)	(5) Highly
Criterion Impact:	***** Vend	* FOR PEER REV or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat	Review Criteria (3) Somewhat	(4)	(5) Highly
Criterion Impact: Based on	***** Vend	* FOR PEER REV or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat	Review Criteria (3) Somewhat	(4)	(5) Highly
Criterion Impact: Based on artifacts/evidence/ evaluation	***** Vend	* FOR PEER REV or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat	Review Criteria (3) Somewhat	(4) Effective	(5) Highly
Criterion Impact: Based on artifacts/evidence/ evaluation Overall Experience	***** Vend	* FOR PEER REV or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat	Review Criteria (3) Somewhat	(4)	(5) Highly
Criterion Impact: Based on artifacts/evidence/ evaluation	***** Vend	* FOR PEER REV or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat	Review Criteria (3) Somewhat	(4) Effective	(5) Highly
Criterion Impact: Based on artifacts/evidence/ evaluation Overall Experience with partner	Vend (1) Ineffective	* FOR PEER REV or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat Ineffective	Review Criteria (3) Somewhat Effective	(4) Effective	(5) Highly Effective
Criterion Impact: Based on artifacts/evidence/ evaluation Overall Experience	Vend (1) Ineffective	* FOR PEER REV or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat Ineffective	Review Criteria (3) Somewhat Effective	(4) Effective	(5) Highly Effective