

**MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION
FY 2010 (Phase 8) Improving Teacher Quality State Grants**

**Please return electronic copy of your completed Score Sheet for each proposal reviewed by
Sunday, October 18, 2009, 5 p.m. to Melinda Vann at mvann@mhec.state.md.us**

SUMMARY SCORE SHEET FOR PROPOSAL ITQ 10 - 8 __ __

Project Title:

Institution:

Reviewed by:

CATEGORY	MAX. PTS.	POINTS AWARDED
Extent of Need for Project	15	
Project Goals and Objectives	10	
Management Plan	15	
Plan of Operation	30	
Project Evaluation	20	
Budget and Cost-Effectiveness	10	
TOTAL	100	

Funding Recommendation (Check One)

N (Not Recommended) **RR** (Recommended with Revisions) **HR** (Highly Recommended- may/may not request revisions)

Project Strengths:

Project Weaknesses:

Suggested Revisions/ Improvements:

**FY 2010 (Phase 8) Improving Teacher Quality State Grants
Review Scoring Rubric**

The questions listed under each category serve as a guide to help you assess the various proposal components. It is not necessary that you address each question in your comments or that each question within a category be assigned a particular number of points.

To ensure a uniform approach to scoring, assume that all grants start at the midpoint of the maximum score for each section, where the midpoint represents “meets expectations” for that section. Add or deduct points accordingly, based on the degree to which the application addresses the RFA expectations for that section. A score guide provides point ranges with a corresponding description to assist you with scoring each application.

Please make liberal use of constructive comments to help both MHEC and the applicant understand the final score assignment and any recommended revisions to the project. Summarized reviewer comments are provided to each applicant. Reviewer identity is kept confidential.

I. EXTENT OF NEED FOR THE PROJECT (15 Points)

- Does the project address describe a significant and well-documented need (s) related to teacher or principal professional development *in the high need LEA to be served?* In any other LEAs to be served?
- Is it clear how the needs were determined?
- Does the data reflect local, regional and/or State specific issues?
- Is it clear that activities have been planned cooperatively to respond to this need? Does the project show the extent to which K-12 teachers and administrators were involved in the selection of the problem area to be addressed and in the formulation of the solution?
- Does the project explain how the proposed activities respond to the professional development needs related to student achievement in the core academic area(s) to be addressed?

Scoring Guide: 0-3 (fails to meet most expectations) 4-6 (meets some expectations)
7 (meets expectations) 8-12 (exceeds expectations) 13-15 (substantially exceeds expectations)

Comments/Notes

NEEDS SECTION Score _____

II. PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES (10 Points)

- Does the proposal have clearly defined goals and corresponding objectives?
- Do the goals and objective address the primary aim of the grant program – to increase the number of highly qualified teachers which in turn should improve student achievement?
- Do the objectives address teacher, student, and/or school performance tied to MD content and performance standards?
- Is it clear what will be achieved, how it will be achieved and for whom?
- Do the objectives
 - identify the target population?
 - reference quantifiable indicators?
 - seem realistic?
 - have clear outcomes?
 - have deadlines?
 - reference state, local, or school-define baseline data and standards?

Scoring Guide: 0-2 (fails to meet most expectations) 3-4 (meets some expectations)
5 (meets minimum expectations) 6-8 (exceeds expectations) 9-10 (substantially exceeds expectations)

Comments/Notes

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES SECTION Score _____

III. MANAGEMENT PLAN (15 Points)

- Does the management plan demonstrate adequacy to achieve the objectives on time and within budget?
- Is there a strong recruitment and retention plan?
- Does the management plan clearly define who will do what, when, and where?
- Do the services provided involve collaboration of appropriate partners to maximize the effectiveness of the project?
- Are project duties appropriately reflected in the budget request?
- Are most or all key staff identified and his/her expertise appropriate for his/her role in the project?

Scoring Guide: 0-3 (fails to meet most expectations) 4-6 (meets some expectations)
7 (meets minimum expectations) 8-12 (exceeds expectations) 13-15 (substantially exceeds expectations)

Comments/Notes

MANAGEMENT PLAN SECTION Score _____

IV. PLAN OF OPERATION (30 Points)

- Are the instructional activities and services proposed appropriate to the needs of the target participants?
- Do the instructional activities and services reflect best practices (i.e., scientifically based research on what works in professional development)?
- Is the professional development to be provided of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration (including follow-up) to be likely to lead to improvement in the teaching practices of those being served?
- Are 90 or more total contact hours planned?
- Is it clear how, when, where, and by whom strategies/activities will be implemented?
- Is it clear how, when, and where follow-up will take place?
- Timeline: Does the timeline indicate when major activities will take place (recruiting, professional development delivery, follow-up)? Exact dates may not be possible—but is it clear that appropriate amounts of time are allotted for activities?

Scoring Guide: 0-5 (fails to meet most expectations) 6-14 (meets some expectations)
15 (meets minimum expectations) 16-24 (exceeds expectations) 25-30 (substantially exceeds expectations)

Comments/Notes

PLAN OF OPERATION SECTION SCORE _____

V. PROJECT EVALUATION (20 Points)

- Is the evaluation integral to the project? Does it provide formative data over the course of the project as well as summative data on the results?
 - Does the evaluation include a means for acquiring participant feedback/data throughout the project?
 - If the evaluation process is not included in the timeline noted above, is it otherwise clear when evaluation activities will take place?
 - Does the proposal describe how and by whom data will be collected and analyzed?
- Does the evaluation describe how the baseline was established?
- Does the evaluation provide information on how project objectives will be evaluated?
- Does the proposal provide information on ongoing and final evaluation measures using quantitative and qualitative data? Are these useful evaluation instruments?
- Is the evaluation tied, when possible, to student achievement?
- How will the results be shared and communicated to interested parties?

Scoring Guide: 0-4 (fails to meet most expectations) 5-9 (meets some expectations)
10 (meets minimum expectations) 11-15 (meets and exceeds expectations) 16-20 (substantially exceeds expectations)

Comments/Notes

PROJECT EVALUATION SCORE _____

VI. BUDGET AND COST EFFECTIVENESS (10 Points)

- Is the budget accurate? Do the budget summary worksheet and the budget narrative match?
- Does the budget narrative clearly explain how the summary figures were calculated what purposes the costs serve?
- Is the budget adequate to the activities proposed?
- Does the budget reflect the planned project activities?
- Are all activities accounted for in the budget, either through costs to the grant or matching contributions (cash or in-kind)?
- Are budget costs reasonable and adequate to the project objectives and design?
 - Is the budget reasonable for the number of participants served?

- Is there adequate support from the lead institution and other partners, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources? (*Note that match is not required.*)
- Are administrative costs kept to a minimum? (Indirect rate cannot exceed 8%.)
- Do planned expenditures comply with the Special Rule (50% Rule)?

It should also be noted whether the proposal contains some discussion of how it abides by section 2132(c), the special rule, which says that no partner may “use” more than 50% of the grant funds? (Note that per USDE there is much flexibility in this area and that “use” is not limited to financial allocation.)

Scoring Guide: 0-3 (fails to meet most expectations) 4-5 (meets some expectations)
 5 (meets minimum expectations) 6-7 (exceeds expectations) 8-10 (substantially exceeds expectations)

Comments/Notes

EVALUATION PLAN SECTION SCORE _____