

**Maine Department of Education**  
**Improving Teacher Quality State Grant**  
**Program Narrative Scoring Rubric**



**July, 2008**

**Maine Department of Education  
Improving Teacher Quality State Grant  
Scoring Form and Rubrics**

**For the Grant Review Committee:**

- Write in the name of the school and the district making the application. Write your name on the appropriate line.
- To use a rubric, read the question and then the highest level on the rubric. On a 4-level rubric, level 4 indicates the most rigorous or the ideal criteria that should be contained in each applicant's response. After reading the ideal level, read the applicant's response to that question. If the response does not contain all the criteria found in the highest level, then compare the response to the next level. Continue this process until the appropriate level has been determined. After determining the appropriate level, consider the range of possible points and award points.
- Please be sure to write comments to support the points awarded. The written comments can be very meaningful and helpful to the applicant. The scoring rubrics and comments completed by the Grant Review Committee will be available to each applicant.
- After reviewing and rating each component, total the points you have awarded and place that number in the appropriate box (POINTS AWARDED by grant reader) on the appropriate page.

**Maine Department of Education**  
**Improving Teacher Quality State Grant**  
**Program Narrative Scoring Form**

<b>Reader's Name:</b> _____
<b>Partner Names:</b> _____
<b>Date Reviewed:</b> _____

**Program Narrative Scoring Summary**

Possible Points	Points Awarded
115	

Overall Rating of the Program Narrative (check the appropriate block below)

- Excellent (106-115)
- Strong (91-105)
- Average (76-90)
- Weak (60-75)

## Scoring Summary

Criteria	Possible Pts	Point awarded
<b>A. Evidence of Meaningful Partnership</b>	15	
a. Sustainability – demonstration of the ability to maintain the targeted activities beyond the length of the project.	5	
b. Collaboration and Commitment – Evidence of all partners participating in project planning and active, long-term involvement of all partners.	5	
c. Capacity – Evidence of quality staff and institutional resources to support activities.	5	
<b>B. Alignment of Project Goals and Objectives with Professional Development Needs</b>	15	
a. Documentation of Needs Assessment	5	
b. Evidence that planned activities will address identified measurable outcomes.	5	
c. Description of how activities will address the professional development needs identified.	5	
<b>C. Project Narrative</b>	40	
a. The scientifically based research and decision process for selection of activities.	10	
b. A description of how the activities provide instruction in literacy strategies to targeted teachers in their content areas.	10	
c. Description of how activities will be aligned with Maine’s <i>Learning Results</i> and other educational reform activities that promote student achievement.	10	
d. Description of how the project reflects Maine’s Training and Development Quality Standards.	10	
<b>D. Evaluation and Accountability Plan</b>	15	
a. Objectives to meet goals identified in needs assessment and increase “highly qualified” teachers.	5	
b. Objectives to increase the number of teachers participating in high quality professional development.	5	
c. Objectives to measure improved student achievement.	5	
<b>E. Budget and Cost Effectiveness</b>	30	
a. A description of how each partner will coordinate activities authorized under this grant with professional development activities provided through other funds.	10	
b. A demonstration of alignment with the activities described in the proposal narrative.	10	
c. High cost-effective ratio determined by the relationship between the number of teachers served and the overall project cost.	10	
<b>Total Points</b>	<b>115</b>	

A. EVIDENCE OF MEANINGFUL PARTNERSHIPS

( a) **Sustainability** (5 points possible)

Not Present (0 points)	Marginal (1-2 points)	Somewhat Rigorous (3-4 points)	Most Rigorous (5 points)
<p>This component is not addressed</p> <p>or</p> <p>None of the responses met even marginal criteria.</p>	<p>Some explanation for gaining support for the initiative is provided, but it is minimal and unclear how exactly and how well it was done.</p> <p>Stated intention to maintain activities beyond the length of the project but no description of how this would be accomplished.</p> <p>No plan for scaling up or widely disseminating project.</p>	<p>There is explanation as to how support for the initiative was obtained. Strategies and time spent are more generally stated.</p> <p>Minimal plan to maintain activities beyond the length of the project.</p> <p>Minimal plan for scaling up or widely disseminating project.</p>	<p>The narrative describes the actions taken by all principal partners to embrace the proposed program, to focus on continuous improvement of organizational processes, professional development, curriculum, and classroom instruction. Additionally, strategies are included to obtain support from the others.</p> <p>There is specific explanation as to how support for the initiative was obtained. It is clear that adequate time was spent on faculty buy-in and understanding.</p> <p>Specific, detailed plan to maintain activities beyond the length of the project and to scale- up and widely disseminate project.</p>

\_\_\_\_\_ Total Points Awarded (5 points possible)



**A. EVIDENCE OF MEANINGFUL PARTNERSHIP****(b) Collaboration and commitment (5 points possible)**

Not Present (0 points)	Marginal (1-2 points)	Somewhat Rigorous (3-4 points)	Most Rigorous (5 points)
<p>This component is not addressed</p> <p>or</p> <p>None of the responses met even marginal criteria.</p>	<p>Teacher leaders and administrators were not involved in project planning and proposal preparation.</p> <p>There is no indication that all Partners will participate in planning and active, long-term involvement. No formal agreement between all principal partners is present.</p> <p>Collaborative agreements do not include the needs of private schools, if such schools are present.</p>	<p>Teacher leaders or administrators were involved in project planning and proposal preparation.</p> <p>There is some indication that each Partner will participate in planning and active, long-term involvement. A formal agreement between some principal partners is present.</p> <p>Collaborative agreements acknowledge the needs of private schools, if such schools are present.</p>	<p>Teacher leaders and administrators were involved in project planning and proposal preparation.</p> <p>Each Partners participation in planning and active, long-term involvement is explicitly stated in a formal agreement.</p> <p>Collaborative agreements include the needs of private schools, if such schools are present.</p>

\_\_\_\_\_ Total Points Awarded (5 points possible)





**A. EVIDENCE OF MEANINGFUL PARTNERSHIP**  
**( c) Capacity (5 points possible)**

Not Present (0 points)	Marginal (1-2 points)	Somewhat Rigorous (3-4 points)	Most Rigorous (5 points)
<p>This component is not addressed</p> <p>or</p> <p>None of the responses met even marginal criteria.</p>	<p>The number of staff people carrying out activities is not addressed.</p> <p>The plan mentions resource support for the reform, or merely states that it will occur.</p> <p>The plan mentions the qualifications of professional development providers, but is not specific.</p>	<p>The number of staff people carrying out activities is unclear.</p> <p>A general explanation is given as to how resources will support the reform initiative.</p> <p>The plan describes the qualifications of the professional development providers, at least in general terms.</p>	<p>The number of staff people carrying out activities is stated.</p> <p>The plan provides a detailed explanation of how resources will support the reform initiative.</p> <p>The plan provides detailed information about the qualifications of the professional development providers.</p>

\_\_\_\_\_ Total Points Awarded (5 points possible)



**B.ALIGNMENT OF PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES WITH PD NEEDS (15 points possible)**

**(a) Documentation of Needs Assessment**

**(b) Evidence that planned activities will address measurable outcomes**

**(c) Description of how activities will address professional development needs identified.**

Not Present (0 points)	Marginal (1-4 points)	Somewhat Rigorous (5-10 points)	Most Rigorous (11-15 points)
<p>This component is not addressed</p> <p>or</p> <p>None of the responses met even marginal criteria.</p>	<p>The needs assessment process is implied but not described in concrete terms.</p> <p>The description of the process for evaluating the implementation of the program goals and measures is unclear.</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that activities will address identified measurable outcomes.</p> <p>There is no description of how the activities will address the professional development needs identified by the needs assessment.</p>	<p>A needs assessment was conducted, but it was not clearly specified and results are specified in general terms.</p> <p>There is a general description of evaluation of the program goals and measures.</p> <p>There is some evidence that activities will address identified measurable outcomes.</p> <p>There is a general description of how the activities will address the professional development needs identified by the needs assessment.</p>	<p>A description and results of a comprehensive needs assessment of teacher quality and professional development needs of the participating LEAs is included.</p> <p>A specific, practical plan exists to evaluate both short and long-term program goals and measures.</p> <p>There is ample evidence that activities will address identified measurable outcomes.</p> <p>There is a detailed description of how the activities will address the professional development needs identified by the needs assessment.</p>

\_\_\_\_\_ Total Points Awarded (15 points possible)



**C. PROJECT NARRATIVE (40 points possible)****(a) Scientifically-based research and decision process****(b) A description of how the activities provide instruction in literacy strategies to targeted teachers in their content areas.****(c) Alignment with Maine's *Learning Results*.****(d) Alignment with Maine's *Training and Development Quality Standards*.**

Not Present (0 points)	Marginal (1-12 points)	Somewhat Rigorous (13-25 points)	Most Rigorous (26-40 points)
<p>This component is not addressed</p> <p>or</p> <p>None of the responses met even marginal criteria.</p>	<p>The research supporting activities is vague and incomplete.</p> <p>The description of the decision-making process to select activities is vague.</p> <p>There is minimal plan or no plan to implement instructional and professional development activities that will model adolescent literacy and provide faculty with methodologies to effectively improve student achievement in the content areas.</p> <p>Goals are not clearly related to Maine's <i>Learning Results</i> and other identified reform activities.</p> <p>Goals are not clearly related to Maine's <i>Training and Development Quality Standards</i>.</p>	<p>The description provides a general reference to research supporting such activities.</p> <p>The description of the decision-making process to select activities is present, but is not detailed.</p> <p>There is a general plan to implement instructional and professional development activities that will model adolescent literacy and provide faculty with methodologies to effectively improve student achievement in the content areas.</p> <p>Some goals are clearly related to Maine's <i>Learning Results</i> and other identified reform activities.</p> <p>Some goals are clearly related to Maine's <i>Training and Development Quality Standards</i>.</p>	<p>The description provides clear documentation of research supporting such activities.</p> <p>The description of the decision-making process to select activities is detailed and coherent.</p> <p>There is a specific, well-defined plan to implement instructional and professional development activities that will model adolescent literacy and provide faculty with methodologies to effectively improve student achievement in the content areas.</p> <p>Goals are clearly related to Maine's <i>Learning Results</i> and other identified reform activities.</p> <p>Goals are clearly related to Maine's <i>Training and Development Quality Standards</i>.</p>

\_\_\_\_\_ Total Points Awarded (40 points possible)



**D. EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN (15 possible points)****(a) Objectives to meet goals identified and increase “highly qualified” teachers****(b) Objectives to increase the number of teachers participating in high quality professional development.****(c) Objectives to improve student performance**

Not Present (0 points)	Marginal (1-4 points)	Somewhat Rigorous (5-9 points)	Most Rigorous (10-15 points)
<p>This component is not addressed</p> <p>or</p> <p>None of the responses met even marginal criteria.</p>	<p>Objectives to achieve program goals and meet the identified professional development needs are vague.</p> <p>Some reference to “highly qualified” teachers, but no measurable objectives.</p> <p>Objectives to increase the number of teachers participating in high quality professional development are vague.</p> <p>Vague reference to student achievement is made.</p> <p>No quantitative and qualitative measures are in place.</p>	<p>Objectives to achieve program goals are not measurable or realistic and/or are inadequate to address all needs and program goals.</p> <p>An objective addressing “highly qualified” teachers is stated, but it is unrealistic or not easily measurable.</p> <p>Annual measurable objectives to increase the number of teachers participating in high quality professional development are not specific or are unrealistic.</p> <p>General goals for student achievement are described.</p> <p>Quantitative or qualitative measures are in place, but not both.</p>	<p>Specific and realistic annual measurable objectives to achieve its program goals and meet all of the identified professional development needs.</p> <p>Specific and realistic annual measurable objectives to increase the percentage of “highly qualified” teachers.</p> <p>Specific and realistic annual measurable objectives to increase the number of teachers participating in high quality professional development.</p> <p>Specific and measurable goals for student achievement are described.</p> <p>Both quantitative and qualitative measures are in place.</p>

\_\_\_\_\_ Total Points Awarded (15 points possible)





**E. BUDGET AND COST EFFECTIVENESS (30 points possible)****(a) A description of how each partner will coordinate activities under this grant with activities provided through other funds****(b) A demonstration in budget of alignment with activities described in proposal narrative****(c) High cost-effective ratio**

Not Present (0 points)	Marginal (1-9 points)	Somewhat Rigorous (10-19 points)	Most Rigorous (20-30 points)
<p>This component is not addressed</p> <p>or</p> <p>None of the responses met even marginal criteria.</p>	<p>There is no indication of how project will be integrated with existing initiatives.</p> <p>Funds and resources are not clearly identified as related to specific activities in the proposal narrative.</p> <p>There does not appear to be the potential for a high cost-effective ration determined by the relationship between the number of teachers served and the overall project cost.</p>	<p>There is some indication of how project will be integrated with existing initiatives.</p> <p>Funds and resources have been generally identified as related to activities in the proposal narrative, but plan lacks specificity in this area .</p> <p>There is some potential for a high cost-effective ration determined by the relationship between the number of teachers served and the overall project cost.</p>	<p>There is a specific plan to coordinate the project with existing initiatives.</p> <p>Funds and resources have been clearly identified as related to specific activities in the proposal narrative.</p> <p>There is the potential for a high cost-effective ration determined by the relationship between the number of teachers served and the overall project cost.</p>

\_\_\_\_\_ Total Points Awarded (30 points possible)



