

Project Title _____ Lead Partner _____

Reviewer _____ Date _____

Score _____

Scoring Rubric for New MSP 2015-2016 Applicant Proposals

Criterion A: Project Needs Assessment (10 Possible Points)			Points Awarded
<p>Guiding Questions: 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 & quantitative content-driven assessment of grades K-12 teacher professional learning needs with respect to math and/or science? Is the current status of student achievement in math and/or science for the targeted grades analyzed and disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, socio-economic, ELL & disability status in table form? Are other demographic student data analyzed and used to develop the plan?</p>			
<p>Exceeds Standard (2 Pts. each) Includes current research from multiple sources on effective professional learning practices</p>	<p>Meets Standard (1Pt. each) Includes sufficient research on effective professional learning practices</p>	<p>Below Standard (0 Pt. each) Limited research data on effective professional learning practices is provided</p>	Reviewer Notes
Evidence of content-driven qualitative <u>and</u> quantitative assessment of current teacher professional learning needs	Evidence of content-driven assessment of current teacher professional learning needs	Limited evidence of content-driven teacher needs assessment	
Student achievement data in math/science and other data for targeted grades is disaggregated in table form and analyzed in the narrative	Student achievement data in math and/or science is included and disaggregated for the targeted grades in table form	Limited student achievement data in math and/or science is included for the targeted grades	
Describes an aggressive process and criteria for recruitment and selection of target schools/participating math or science teachers to support the goals of the project	Describes a process and criteria for recruitment of schools/participating math or science teachers to support the goals of the project	No description of a recruitment process and criteria to be used by the partnership to select schools/participating math or science teachers	
Evidence the applying LEA <u>and</u> partner LEA(s) meet qualification criteria	Evidence that the applying LEA or partner EA(s) meets qualification criteria	Lacks evidence of qualification criteria. <i>(automatic disqualification)</i>	

Criterion B: Project Goals (10 Possible Points)			Points Awarded
<p>Guiding Questions: Does the proposal focus on increased teacher content knowledge, ability to analyze student thinking, and make better instructional decisions? 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 are they measurable?</p>			
<p>Exceeds Standard (2 Pts. each) Goals/objectives are <u>specifically</u> linked to the identified professional learning needs and aligned to applicable state standards</p>	<p>Meets Standard (1 Pt. each) Goals/objectives are <u>generally</u> linked to the identified professional learning needs and loosely aligned to state standards</p>	<p>Below Standard (0 Pts. each) Goals and objectives are not correlated with the needs assessment or aligned to specific state standards</p>	Reviewer Notes
Goals/objectives are all <u>incremental, measurable, and</u> can be evaluated both <u>qualitatively and</u> quantitatively	Goals/objective are <u>incremental, somewhat measurable</u> and would be difficult to evaluate both <u>qualitatively and</u> quantitatively	Goals and objectives are <u>not incremental and measurable</u> both <u>qualitatively and</u> quantitatively	
Goals/objectives are realistic in scope and well defined related to the resources available	Goals and objectives are somewhat realistic in scope and well defined related to the resources available	Goals and objectives are not realistic in scope 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	
Goals for student achievement increases are specified	Student achievement is discussed without specific targets	There is no discussion of increases in student achievement	

Criterion C: Project Design (35 Possible Points)			Points Awarded
<p>Guiding Questions: 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, prepare students for changing assessments and further develop ability to make effective instructional decisions to improve classroom practice? Are planned activities meaningful and designed to facilitate improved student achievement in math and/or science?</p>			
<p>Exceeds Standard (4-5 Pts. each) Planned sessions are ambitious enough to create substantial and positive change in TCK and improvement in classroom practice</p>	<p>Meets Standard (2-3 Pts. each) Planned activities are somewhat ambitious enough to create substantial and positive change in TCK and improvement in classroom practice</p>	<p>Below Standard (0-1 Pt. each) Planned activities are weak and have limited potential of creating substantial and positive change in TCK and improvement in classroom practice</p>	Reviewer Notes
Clear and detailed description of how and when the partnership will carry out 90 or more hours of training/teacher/year	Acceptable description of how and when the partnership will carry out <u>at least 90 hours</u> of training/teacher/year	Limited description of how and when the partnership will carry out sessions; Lacks evidence of 90 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 a teacher cohort of no less than 30 participants from schools of greatest academic and instructional need	Includes evidence to recruit, serve, and retain a teacher cohort of no less than 30 participants	Lacks evidence of a thorough plan to recruit, serve, and retain a teacher cohort of 30 participants	
Demonstrates that building administrators will support teacher recruitment <u>and</u> participate in the follow-up learning activities	Demonstrates that building administrators will participate in the follow-up learning activities	Does not show evidence that administrators have committed to supporting the MSP project	
Addresses approved LDOE standards in mathematics and/or science as well as common core literacy standards for Science and Technical Subjects	Addresses approved LDOE standards in mathematics and/or science, but not common core literacy standards for Science and Technical Subjects	Fails to address LDOE standards in mathematics and/or science or common core	
Indicates a high-quality plan to effectively use program funds to improve student achievement in mathematics and/or science	Indicates a plan to use program funds to improve student achievement in mathematics and/or science	No plan to effectively use program funds for student achievement in mathematics and/or science	

Criterion D: Project Partnership and Management Plan (20 Possible Points)			Points Awarded
<p>Guiding Questions: 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>			
<p>Exceeds Standard (4-5 Pts. each) Strong evidence of the number and quality of staff to carry out the proposed activities; Qualifications are provided for key partners' staff and appear to be exceedingly strong</p>	<p>Meets Standard (2-3 Pts. each) Adequate number and quality of staff to carry out the proposed activities; Qualifications of key partners' staff are described and appear to be acceptable</p>	<p>Below Standard (0-1Pt. each) Little evidence of the number and quality of staff to carry out the proposed activities; Qualifications of key partners' staff are described but appear to be limited</p>	Reviewer Notes
Shows long term commitment of partners; Institutional resources are given in detail	Shows commitment of partners; Institutional resources are given acceptably	Shows somewhat limited or no commitment of partners; Institutional resources are given but without detail	
Project plan proposes to serve a high percentage (>50%) of teachers in need	Project plan proposes to serve an acceptable percentage (25%-50%) of teachers in need.	Project plan is likely to serve a limited percentage (<25%) of teachers	
Proposal provides evidence of deliberate communication with private schools and between partners; Includes detailed letters of support and commitment from all participating LEAs and partners	Proposal provides evidence of communication between partners; Includes detailed letters of support and commitment from all participating LEAs and partners	Proposal provides evidence of communication between partners	

Criterion E: Evaluation Plan (15 Possible Points)			Points Awarded
<p>Guiding Questions: 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? Are both pre-test and post-test measures included in the plan? Does the plan include the use of project specific assessment instruments? Does the plan employ a quasi-experimental or experimental design to measure impact of professional development on teacher content growth?</p>			
<p>Exceeds Standard (4-5 Pts. each) Plan includes valid /reliable instruments to yield quantitative <u>and</u> qualitative, formative and summative indicators of project goal attainment; Specifies pre- and post-test procedures to show differences in TCK</p>	<p>Meets Standard (2-3 Pts. each) Plan utilizes instruments to yield quantitative <u>and</u> qualitative, formative and summative indicators of project goal attainment; Specifies pre- and post-test procedures to show differences in TCK</p>	<p>Below Standard 0-1 Pt. each) Plan lacks intention/evidence to use instruments that will yield quantitative and qualitative indicators of project's progress; Lacks a plan to use procedures to show meaningful differences in teacher effectiveness</p>	Reviewer Notes
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; Plan employs design using comparison or control groups to to measure growth	Specifies how learning gained from the planned activities will be utilized by the partnership and the MSP Program	Lacks specification of how the learning gained from the planned activities will be utilized by the partnership	

Criterion F: Budget and Cost Effectiveness (10 Possible Points)		Pts. Awarded
<p>Guiding Questions: 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? Will the primary partners i.e. the high need LEAs receive and use most of the budget?</p>		
<p>Meets Standard (2 Pts. each) 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 narratives <u>clearly delineate</u> cost and details concerning expenditures</p>	<p>Below Standard (0-1 Pt. each) Provides insufficient detail for each partner and/or does not support the scope and requirements of the project or provide adequate detail and summary for the project; Budget narrative does not include a cost breakdown or includes expenditures not clearly related to the project</p>	Reviewer Notes
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	
The budget funds key staff to participate in state MSP meetings and regional US Dept. of ED-MSP meetings; Items budgeted are appropriate and acceptable uses of funding	The budget does not include funds for key staff to participate in MSP meetings; Some items budgeted are inappropriate or disallowable uses of funding	
Primary partners, i.e. the high-need LEAs receive and use most of the budget to achieve the desired impact on teacher participants	Most of the budget is not used by the primary LEA partners	
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	35	
Project Partnership and Management Plan	20	
Project Evaluation	15	
Budget and Cost Effectiveness	10	
Final Score:	100	

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