

Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning

Improving Teacher Quality State Grant Program Narrative Scoring Rubric



Prepared by the Office of Academic and Student Affairs
MS Institutions of Higher Learning
3825 Ridgewood Road
Jackson, Mississippi 39211
Phone: 601-432-6522
Email: slee@mississippi.edu
MS Institutions of Higher Learning

Improving Teacher Quality State Grant Scoring Form and Rubrics

Steps to be followed in reviewing of grant proposals:

1. Grant Proposals will be sent electronically to each grant reviewer. Write in the name and other requested information of the institution making the application. Write your name on the appropriate line.
2. To use a rubric, read the question and then the highest level on the rubric. On a four level rubric, level four 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.
3. Please be sure to include comments to support the points awarded. The written comments can be very meaningful and helpful to the applicant. Scoring rubrics and comments completed by the Grant Review Committee will be available to each applicant upon request. Reviewer names will not be included on these documents.
4. After reviewing and rating each component, total the points awarded and place that number in the appropriate box (POINTS AWARDED by grant reader) on the appropriate page. Place an "X" on the line next to the appropriate rating received.
5. Rubrics for each proposal are to be submitted electronically as attachments to slee@mississippi.edu

**Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning
Improving Teacher Quality State Grant
Proposal Scoring Form**

Reviewer's Name: _____
Applicant Name(s):

Program Narrative Scoring Summary

Possible Points	Points Awarded
115	

Overall Rating of the Program Narrative (Place an "X" on the appropriate line below)

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

2010-2011 Improving Teacher Quality Summer Institutes Evaluation Sheet

Project Title: _____

College/University Project Director(s): _____

Discipline Area: _____

Scoring Summary

Criteria	Possible Points	Points Awarded
A. Abstract	10	
B. Project Narrative	85	
C. Resources	20	
Total Points	115	

Scoring Rubric

A. Abstract (Possible Points - 10)

1. An abstract of **500 words maximum** should begin the text of the application. (2 points)
2. The abstract should state whether this proposal **renews** a project or **proposes a new** project. (1 point)
3. The abstract should summarize **the goals** of the project, **the need** for the proposed project, **the expected outcomes** and **the anticipated target populations**. (4 points)
4. The abstract should list by name all **local educational agencies or other participating organizations** included in the project. (2 points)
5. The abstract should indicate the **total dollar amount** of the grant request. (1 point)

Not Present (0 points)	Present (1-4 Points)
Abstract exceeds 500 words	Abstract contains a maximum of 500 words and begins the text of the application (2 points)
Abstract does not address type of proposal	Abstract states whether the proposal renews a project or proposes a new project (1 point)
Abstract does not summarize goals, needs, expected outcomes, and anticipated target populations	Abstract summarizes goals, needs, expected outcomes, and anticipated target populations (1-4 points)
Abstract does not list all local educational agencies or other participating organizations included in the project.	Abstract lists by name all local educational agencies or other participating organizations included in the project. (2 points)
Abstract does not indicate the total dollar amount of the grant request	Abstract indicates the total dollar amount of the grant request (1 point)

_____ Total Points Awarded (10 points possible)

Component A – Reviewer’s Comments:

B. Project Narrative (Possible Points - 85)

1. **Project Goals and Objectives Aligned with Professional Development Need (20 Points)**
Clarify in this section the merits of the proposal, quality of the goals and objectives, the population(s) to be served, and the impact of the proposal activities. **The impact of the proposed activities should show direct correlation with the evaluation process.**

2. **Scientifically-based Research and Decision Process**

3. **Proposed Activities (20 Points)**
Present in this section a clear description of the procedures to be implemented and the projected time line for proposal accomplishment.

4. **Cooperative Agreements (10 Points)**
Include a description of the proposed region=s schools professional development plans and how this proposal will assist them in achieving the objectives of their plan in partnership with this project. Letters of intent to cooperate from school districts, local businesses, other state or federally funded projects with similar goals, and other organizations should be enclosed with the grant application. **(Letters of intent and all necessary documents needing original signatures are on file in the office of the State Title II Director.)** Cooperative agreements are required as a part of the regulations of the Act.

5. **Evaluation and Dissemination (20 Points)**
Explain how the proposal will be monitored throughout its duration and how its level of final success will be determined. Will participants (teachers) in this project be expected to serve as professional development staff for their local schools? Describe plans to disseminate and publicize proposal activities and/or research findings at the state or national level.

Not Present (0 points)	Marginal (1-39 points)	Somewhat Rigorous (40-69 points)	Most Rigorous (70-85 points)
This component is not addressed or None of the responses met even marginal criteria.	The needs assessment process is implied but not described in concrete terms.	A needs assessment was conducted, but it was not clearly specified and results are specified in general terms.	A description and results of a comprehensive needs assessment of teacher quality and professional development needs of the participating LEAs is included.
	The research supporting activities is vague and incomplete.	The description provides a general reference to research supporting such activities.	The description provides clear documentation of research supporting such activities.
	The description of the decision-making process to select activities is vague.	The description of the decision-making process to select activities is present, but is not detailed.	The description of the decision-making process to select activities is detailed and coherent.
	Objectives to achieve program goals and meet the identified professional development needs are vague.	Objectives to achieve program goals are not measurable or realistic and/or are inadequate to address all needs and program goals.	Specific and realistic annual measurable objectives to achieve program goals and meet all of the identified professional development needs.

<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>There is minimal plan or no plan to implement instructional and professional development activities that will provide faculty with methodologies to effectively improve student achievement in the content areas.</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>No description of how the activities will address professional development needs has been identified by the needs assessment.</p> <p>The merits of the proposal, quality of the goals and objectives, the population(s) to be served, and the impact of the proposal activities is implied, but not described in concrete terms.</p> <p>A description of the procedures to be implemented is present, but the projected time line for proposal accomplishment is unclear.</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>There is a general plan to implement instructional and professional development activities that will provide faculty with methodologies to effectively improve student achievement in the content areas.</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>A general description of how the activities will address the professional development needs has been identified by the needs assessment.</p> <p>A description is given of the merits of the proposal, quality of the goals and objectives, the population(s) to be served, and the impact of the proposal activities.</p> <p>A general description of the procedures to be implemented and the projected time line for proposal accomplishment is evident.</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> <p>There is a specific, well-defined plan to implement instructional and professional development activities that will provide faculty with methodologies to effectively improve student achievement in the content areas.</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>A detailed description of how the activities will address the professional development needs has been identified by the needs assessment.</p> <p>A clear description is given of the merits of the proposal, quality of the goals and objectives, the population(s) to be served, and the impact of the proposal activities. The impact of the proposed activities shows direct correlation with the evaluation process.</p> <p>A clear description of the procedures to be implemented and the projected time line for proposal accomplishment is evident.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>There is little or no evidence that the proposal will assist partner schools in achieving the objectives of their school development plans</p> <p>Teacher leaders and administrators were not involved in project planning and proposal preparation.</p> <p>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>A description of how the activities will address the professional development needs is identified but the needs assessment is unclear.</p> <p>No plan evident for scaling up or widely disseminating project.</p>	<p>There is some evidence of how the proposal will assist partner schools in achieving the objectives of their school development plans, but plans have not been included with the proposal. Letters of intent to cooperate from all school districts, local businesses, other state or federally funded projects with similar goals and other organizations are not included with the grant application.</p> <p>Teacher leaders <u>or</u> administrators were involved in project planning and proposal preparation.</p> <p>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>A general description of how the proposal will be monitored throughout its duration and how its level of final success will be determined has been included.</p> <p>Minimal plan for scaling up or widely disseminating project.</p>	<p>A clear description of the proposed partner schools' professional development plans and how the proposal will assist them in achieving the objectives of their plan in partnership with this project is evident. Letters of intent to cooperate from school districts, local businesses, other state or federally funded projects with similar goals, and other organizations are included with the grant application.</p> <p>Teacher leaders <u>and</u> 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> <p>A clear description of how the proposal will be monitored throughout its duration and how its level of final success will be determined has been included. Additionally, a description of plans to disseminate and publicize proposal activities and/or research findings at the state or national level has been included. There is specific explanation as to the plan to maintain activities beyond the length of the project and to scale-up and widely disseminate project.</p>
--	--	--	---

_____ Total Points Awarded (85 points possible)

Component B – Reviewer’s Comments:

C. Resources (Possible Points - 20)

1. Resource Management (5 Points)

Explain what resources the educational entity currently has that can be used to support proposal activities in terms of equipment, services, budget management, consultant services, etc.

2. Key Personnel (5 Points)

Outline in narrative form the depth of experience and expertise of key personnel. Complete vitae of all professional staff actively associated with the project and/or accountable for its performance should be attached to the proposal. The vitae should not exceed two pages and should reflect activities that are related to the implementation and success of the proposal.

3. Budget (10 Points)

Budget categories should reflect the requirements of the proposed activity. However, the following categories will be typically included as separate expenditure objects: personnel services, contractual services, and commodities. Institutions are encouraged to cost share to the maximum extent possible to increase the number of grants that can be funded. Consultant fees should not exceed \$250 per day plus reimbursement for travel, food, lodging, etc. When teachers are participating in renewal activities, the stipend for teachers will be no more than \$80 per day. (See Appendix B)

Not Present (0 points)	Marginal (1-39 points)	Somewhat Rigorous (40-69 points)	Most Rigorous (70-85 points)
<p>This component is not addressed</p> <p>or</p> <p>None of the responses met even marginal criteria.</p>	<p>No indication is evident 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>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 it is not specific.</p>	<p>Some indication is evident 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>The number of staff people carrying out activities is unclear. The plan provides a general explanation as to how resources will support the reform initiative.</p> <p>The plan describes the qualifications of the professional development providers in general terms.</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> <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 (20 points possible)

Component C – Reviewer’s Comments:

--