

**Project Title** \_\_\_\_\_ **Lead Partner** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_

**Score** \_\_\_\_\_

**Scoring Rubric for New MSP 2017-2019 Proposals**

<b>Criterion A: Project Needs Assessment (10 Possible Points)</b>			<b>Points Awarded</b>
<p><b>Guiding Questions:</b> Are planned activities supported by current research on effective professional learning practices and mathematics or science learning? Does the proposal show evidence of a qualitative &amp; quantitative content-driven assessment of teacher professional learning needs with respect to math, science, or STEM? Is the current status of student achievement in math and/or science for the targeted grade analyzed and disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, socio-economic, ELL &amp; disability status? Are other demographic student data analyzed and used to develop the plan?</p>			
<p><b>Exceeds Standard ( 2 Pts. each)</b> Incorporates current research from multiple sources on effective professional learning practices</p>	<p><b>Meets Standard ( 1 Pt. each)</b> Cites research on effective professional learning practices</p>	<p><b>Below Standard (0 Pts. each)</b> Limited research data on effective professional learning practices is provided</p>	<b>Reviewer Notes</b>
<p>Clearly identifies gaps in current teacher practice specific to participating partners and targets these gaps with evidence-based methods/ strategies for improving classroom instruction.</p>	<p>Identifies broad trends / gaps in teacher practice and offers general strategies to improve the quality of instruction</p>	<p>Limited evidence of content-driven teacher needs assessment; planned activities are disconnected from evidence regarding the quality of instruction</p>	
<p>Student achievement data in math/science and other data for targeted grades is disaggregated in table form and analyzed in the narrative</p>	<p>Student achievement data in math and/or science is included and disaggregated for the targeted grades in table form</p>	<p>Limited student achievement data in math and/or science is included for the targeted grades</p>	
<p>Describes a strategic process and criteria for recruitment and selection of target schools/participating math or science teachers to support the goals of the project</p>	<p>Describes a process and criteria for recruitment of schools/participating math or science teachers to support the goals of the project</p>	<p>No description of a recruitment process and criteria to be used by the partnership to select schools/participating math or science teachers</p>	
<p>All LEA partners meet qualification criteria; the project prioritizes those schools in greatest need</p>	<p>All LEA partners meet qualification criteria</p>	<p>Lacks evidence of qualification criteria (<i>automatic disqualification</i>)</p>	

<b>Criterion B: Project Goals (10 Possible Points)</b>			<b>Points Awarded</b>
<p><b>Guiding Questions:</b> Does the proposal focus on increased teacher content knowledge, ability to analyze student thinking, and implementation of a high quality / Tier 1 curriculum? Are the program goals sufficiently ambitious, yet reasonable? Are the proposed goals aligned and do they include measurable outcomes correlated to the identified needs? Do proposed strategies and activities address the goals and the identified needs? Are the goals attainable and measurable?</p>			
<p><b>Exceeds Standard ( 2 Pts. each)</b> Goals/objectives are <u>specifically</u> linked to the identified professional learning needs, aligned to applicable state standards, and connected to high quality / Tier 1 curricula</p>	<p><b>Meets Standard (1 Pt. each)</b> Goals/objectives are <u>generally</u> linked to the identified professional learning needs and aligned to state standards</p>	<p><b>Below Standard (0 Pts. each)</b> Goals and objectives are not correlated with the needs assessment or aligned to state standards</p>	<b>Reviewer Notes</b>
Goals/objectives are all incremental, <u>measurable</u> , and can be evaluated both qualitatively <b>and</b> quantitatively	Goals/objective are incremental, <u>somewhat measurable</u> and would be difficult to evaluate both qualitatively and quantitatively	Goals and objectives are <u>not incremental and measurable</u> both qualitatively and quantitatively	
Goals/objectives are ambitious and realistic in scope, well defined, and related to the resources available	Goals and objectives are realistic in scope and related to the resources available	Goals and objectives are not realistic in scope or related to the resources available.	
Plans are provided to assess progress toward attainment of district goals as part of the feedback process to adjust and revise for success	Plans are provided to assess progress toward attainment of district goals but not shown as part of the feedback process to adjust and revise for success	No plans are included to assess progress toward attainment of district goals as part of the feedback process to adjust and revise for success	
Project goals/objectives reflect a robust theory of action that connects increasing teacher content knowledge and/or improving in instructional practice with increasing student achievement.	Project goals/objectives address both increasing teacher content knowledge and / or improving instructional practice and increasing student achievement.	Project goals/objectives are vaguely tied to improvements in student achievement	

<b>Criterion C: Project Design (40 Possible Points)</b>			<b>Points Awarded</b>
<p><b>Guiding Questions:</b> Are planned activities rigorous, content-focused, and supported by research on effective professional learning practices? Are planned activities likely to increase teachers' content knowledge (TCK), strengthen ability to analyze student thinking, and focused on implementing a high quality curriculum? Are planned activities meaningful and designed to facilitate improved student achievement in math and/or science?</p>			<p>_____ / 30pts</p> <p>_____ / 5pts</p> <p>_____ / 5pts</p>
<b><u>Exceeds Standard ( 4-5 Pts. each)</u></b>	<b><u>Meets Standard (2-3 Pts. each)</u></b>	<b><u>Below Standard (0-1 Pt. each)</u></b>	<b><u>Reviewer Notes</u></b>
Planned sessions are ambitious enough to create substantial and positive change in TCK and implementation of a high quality curriculum	Planned activities are somewhat ambitious enough to create positive change in TCK and improvement in classroom practice	Planned activities are weak and have limited potential to positively change TCK and improve in classroom practice	
Clear and detailed description of how and when the partnership will carry out more than 60 or more hours of training/ teacher/ year	Acceptable description of how and when the partnership will carry out at least 60 hours of training/teacher/year	Limited description of how and when the partnership will carry out sessions; Lacks evidence of 60 hours/teacher/year	
Clear and detailed evidence that the planned sessions match the specific professional learning needs and project goals	General description of how the planned sessions match the specific professional learning needs and project goals	Limited or no correlation is described between the planned sessions, the needs assessment, and project goals	
Includes evidence to recruit, serve, and retain participants from schools of greatest academic and instructional need <i>and</i> indicates efforts to impact / influence teachers beyond the immediate partnership	Includes evidence to recruit, serve, and retain participants from schools of greatest academic and instructional need	Includes some or lacks evidence of a thorough plan to recruit, serve, and retain a viable teacher cohort	
Demonstrates that building administrators will support teacher recruitment <u>and</u> implementation of the high quality curriculum / program	Demonstrates that building administrators will support teacher recruitment and support follow-up activities	Does not show evidence that administrators have committed to supporting the MSP project	
Indicates a high quality plan to effectively use program funds to improve student achievement in mathematics and/or science.	Indicates a sufficient plan to effectively use program funds to improve student achievement in mathematics and/or science	Project design lacks detail and/or evidence that program funds would improve student achievement	
<p><b>Link to Tier 1 Curriculum and Professional Development (5 pts)</b></p> <p>The project aligns to standards-based / Tier 1 curriculum and implements content-focused, job-embedded professional development linked to high-quality curriculum</p>			

**Alignment with current statewide initiatives (5 pts)**

Project expands participation in one of the following statewide initiatives:

- STEM K-16 Pathways
- Tier 1 Curriculum Implementation for Science
- Content Leader Initiative

<b>Criterion D: Project Partnership and Management Plan (20 Possible Points)</b>			<b>Points Awarded</b>
<p><b>Guiding Questions:</b> Does the project management team have the expertise to implement and sustain a math and/or science professional learning program? Is there evidence that mathematicians, scientists, and/or engineers as well as teacher training faculty are playing major roles in the design and delivery of the proposed program? Are the roles of all partners clearly identified? Does the work plan engage all partners in meaningful ways? Is there evidence that the partners share goals, responsibilities, and accountability for the proposed work? Does the governance structure describe communication, decision-making, and fiscal responsibilities among the project partners?</p>			
<b>Exceeds Standard (4-5 Pts. each)</b>	<b>Meets Standard (2-3 Pts. each)</b>	<b>Below Standard (0-1Pt. each)</b>	<b>Reviewer Notes</b>
Strong evidence of the number and quality of staff to carry out the proposed activities; qualifications are provided for key partners' staff and are exceptional	Adequate number and quality of staff to carry out the proposed activities; qualifications of key partners' staff are acceptable	Little evidence of the number and quality of staff to carry out the proposed activities; qualifications of key partners' staff appear to be limited	
Shows long term commitment of partners; specific commitment of institutional resources are provided in detail	Shows commitment of partners; general commitment of institutional resources are provided	Shows limited or no commitment of partners; Institutional resources are given but without detail	
Management plan clearly articulates how the partnership will structure and monitor collaborations among teachers, districts, and university instructors in ways that promote use of formative assessments and inform project improvements	Management plan identifies a principal partner that will be primarily responsible for implementation of the project and its ongoing cycle of feedback and improvement	Plan indicates a partnership, but fails to clearly identify a management structure for implementation	
Proposal provides evidence of communication with private schools and between partners; includes detailed letters of support and commitment from all participating LEAs and partners	Proposal includes detailed letters of support and commitment from all participating LEAs and partners	Proposal provides evidence of communication between partners	

<b>Criterion E: Evaluation Plan (10 Possible Points)</b>			<b>Points Awarded</b>
<p><b>Guiding Questions:</b> Does the evaluation plan measure the impact of the project on the specified goals and objectives? Are the procedures for measuring identified outcomes clearly identified? Will the procedures yield both qualitative and quantitative results? Will the evaluation contribute to continuous improvement? Does the plan employ a quasi-experimental or experimental design to measure impact of professional development on teacher content growth?</p>			
<p><b>Exceeds Standard (3-4 Pts. each)</b> Plan includes valid/reliable instruments to yield quantitative <u>and</u> qualitative, formative and summative indicators of project goal attainment</p>	<p><b>Meets Standard (2 Pts. each)</b> Plan utilizes instruments to yield quantitative <u>or</u> qualitative, formative and summative indicators of project goal attainment</p>	<p><b>Below Standard 0-1 Pt. each)</b> Plan lacks intention/evidence to use instruments that will yield quantitative and qualitative indicators of project's progress</p>	<b>Reviewer Notes</b>
Includes instruments and clear method to determine impact on classroom instruction <u>and</u> student achievement	Specifies ways to measure impact on classroom instruction <u>and</u> student achievement	Weak articulation of how the partnership will measure impact on classroom instruction and student achievement	
Plan articulates how activities will help the MSP program build rigorous, cumulative, reproducible, usable results	Outlines how learning gained from the planned activities will be utilized by the partnership	Lacks specification of how the learning gained from the planned activities will be utilized by the partnership	

<b>Criterion F: Budget and Cost Effectiveness (10 Possible Points)</b>		<b>Pts. Awarded</b>
<p><b>Guiding Questions:</b> Is the requested budget appropriate to achieve the proposed outcomes with regard to the number of teachers impacted by the proposed activities? Does the budget narrative present <u>detailed justification</u> for <i>all</i> expenses? Do budgeted items directly relate to the project goals and objectives?</p>		
<p><b>Meets Standard (2 Pts. each)</b> A budget is included for each of the designated partners that supports the scope and requirements of the project and provides detail and summary for the project; budget narrative clearly delineates costs and provides details concerning expenditures</p>	<p><b>Below Standard (0-1 Pt. each)</b> Provides insufficient detail for each partner and/or does not support the scope and requirements of the project or provide adequate detail for the project; budget narrative does not include a cost breakdown or includes expenditures not clearly related to the project</p>	<b>Reviewer Notes</b>
The amount included in each budget category is commensurate with the services or goods proposed, and the overall cost of the project is commensurate with the professional development provided and the number of teachers served	The amount included in each budget category is not commensurate with the services or goods proposed, or the overall cost of the project is not commensurate with the professional development provided and the number of teachers served	
Items budgeted are appropriate and allowable	Some items budgeted are inappropriate or unallowable	
There is a clear plan and timeline to expend 100% of funds within the project period	Lack of detail and/or clear timeline raises concern about whether 100% of funds will be expended within the project period	
Indirect costs do not exceed 8%; Program cost/teacher/hour is calculated and explained	Indirect costs exceed 8%; Cost/teacher/hour is not calculated and/or explained	

Scoring Category	Possible Points	Awarded Points
Abstract	--	
Project Needs Assessment	10	
Project Goals	10	
Project Design	40	
Project Partnership and Management Plan	20	
Project Evaluation	10	
Budget and Cost Effectiveness	10	
Final Score:	100	

Reviewer's Funding Recommendations:	
	I recommend funding this proposal at a full/modified level.
	I recommend funding this proposal only if resources allow.
	I do not recommend funding this proposal.
Comments:	