Oklahoma State Department of Education

Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Program Statewide Projects

Request for Proposals (RFP)
2015-2016

Title II Part B
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001
http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg26.html

RFP Published: Friday, October 9, 2015

Question and Answer Period Closes: October 16, 2015

Letter of Intent to Apply Due: Friday, October 23, 2015 by 5:00 p.m.

Two-Day Grant Writing and Management Workshop (Not Required): November 2-3, 2015

Proposals Due to OSDE (Suite 315): Friday, December 18 , 2015 by 5:00 p.m.

Grant Award Notification: January 2016

Grant Period: February 1, 2016 - January 31, 2017; February 1, 2017 - January 31, 2018; and February 1, 2018 - January 31, 2019

First Annual Performance Report Due to OSDE: Tuesday, February 28, 2017

Question and Answer Period
Beginning September 25, 2015 and ending October 16, 2015, questions related to the 2015-2016 Oklahoma Mathematics and Science Partnership grant may be submitted by email to Levi.Patrick@sde.ok.gov or by phone (405-522-3525). Questions and answers will be made publically available at https://goo.gl/Xdrn4f.

Notification of Award
Upon completion of the review process, the OSDE MSP Team will present funding recommendations to the State Board of Education (SBE) for its consideration. Once final funding decisions have been approved by the SBE, project directors will be notified of the status of their proposal in writing. A required meeting of all project directors and leadership teams of funded partnerships will be held by the OSDE MSP Team on **March 10, 2016.** If you submit a proposal to OSDE, please save this date in case your grant is awarded.

View the MSP Program Regional Projects Request for Proposals at
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VP9UK08rrimARFoWdFqDrrKJ_sthLSy48KWsB8XpymU/edit?usp=sharing.

View all Oklahoma MSP Resources at http://www.ok.gov/sde/math-and-science-partnership-msp-grant.

Table of Contents

Section 1: Goals of the Oklahoma Mathematics and Science Partnership Program

The Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) is responsible for administering the Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) program (funded under Title II, Part B of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001) and is authorized to award approximately $1,650,000 in competitive grants as of February 1, 2016 to meet the identified statewide goals.

The purpose of the Oklahoma Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Program is to improve the content knowledge and pedagogical practices of mathematics and science teachers to increase the achievement of their students. These improvement efforts are to be designed, implemented, and evaluated by strong partnerships between college and university faculty, high-need school districts, and other qualifying partners.

The Oklahoma Statewide MSP Program seeks to provide substantial continued funding for projects that will address significant needs of the state of Oklahoma. Three focal areas have been identified for the statewide competitive grant process and the Oklahoma Statewide MSP Program is poised to offer $550,000 per focal area project, per year for up to three years, subject to (a) compliance with program requirements, (b) demonstration of effectiveness, and (c) availability of federal funding. The focal areas are as follows:

Focal Area 1. Develop, research, and implement mathematics instructional tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving and diagnostic assessment probes that elicit evidence of student thinking to assess progress toward mathematical understanding.

Focal Area 2. Develop, research, and implement science instructional tasks that promote the exploration of natural phenomena and three-dimensional learning and diagnostic assessment probes that elicit evidence of student thinking to assess progress toward scientific understanding.

Focal Area 3. Develop, research, and implement mentoring and support structures to improve the content and pedagogical expertise of new (1st-5th year) mathematics and science teachers, also providing special attention to the unique needs of alternative and emergency certified teachers.

As projects address their selected Focal Area, they must develop a three-year plan for meeting the **following goals by immersing teacher cohort groups in sustained, creative, and strategic professional learning that extends beyond commonplace approaches to improve mathematics and science achievement**:

Goal 1. Increase the capacity of mathematics and/or science teachers to improve student achievement.

Goal 2. Increase the capacity of mathematics and/or science teachers to implement research-based instructional strategies.

Goal 3. Partner with OSDE to ensure produced resources are accessible to all Oklahoma teachers.

Goal 4. Partner with OSDE to support all produced resources with virtual coursework accessible to all Oklahoma teachers.

Some limitations are set by the federal law and the OSDE regarding the nature of:
(1) partnership eligibility,
(2) high-need criteria,
(3) proposal limits,
(4) authorized activities,
(5) fiscal responsibilities, and
(6) allowable expenditures

(1) Partnership Eligibility

Partnership is critical to the success of individual MSP projects. Partnerships eligible to apply for an MSP Program grant *must* include:

- at least one high-need school district and
- the science, engineering, or mathematics department of an accredited 2 or 4 year college or university in Oklahoma.
    - *Requests to partner with universities outside of Oklahoma will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Send inquiries to Levi Patrick (Levi.Patrick@sde.ok.gov).*

Partnerships *may* also include:

- another engineering, mathematics, science or teacher preparation unit of an IHE;
- additional LEAs, public charter schools, public or private elementary schools or secondary schools, or a consortium of such schools;
- a business; or
- a nonprofit or for-profit organization of demonstrated effectiveness in improving the quality of mathematics and science teachers.

The roles and responsibilities of each partner must be well-defined and do not necessarily include presenting in the professional learning experiences.

(2) High-Need Criteria

A school district is considered to be high-need by the Oklahoma MSP Program if it meets one of the following criterion:

- has at least **40 percent** of the children are from families with incomes below the poverty line based on the LEA's Free and Reduced Lunch Count; **OR**
- has **20 percent** poverty determined by the census; **OR**
- has been designated **Priority or Focus School** for the 2014 school year*; **OR**
- has any mathematics and/or science **classes not taught by highly qualified teachers**. (All teachers providing direct instruction in mathematics or science, including special education teachers, need to meet the highly qualified requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act.)*

* As determined by the list available here: http://ok.gov/sde/school-improvement (priority / focus). If a district qualifies because of school improvement status or because of a percentage of mathematics and/or science classes not taught by highly qualified teachers, the application must target the area that is the qualifying factor.

(3) Proposal Limit

For this competition, an organization may submit **only one proposal as the lead partner** of an MSP project. That organization may be included as a secondary partner on MSP Regional or Statewide proposals by other partnerships that do not seek funding in the same Focal Area.

(4) Authorized Activities

According to federal law (Title II, Part B of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001), an eligible partnership shall use funds provided under this part for **one or more** of the following activities related to elementary schools or secondary schools. These activities should serve as guidance in developing the proposal to meet the Focal Area for which the partnership is applying. The nature of the Focal Areas 1 and 2 already address activities 1, 2, and 5, while Focal Area 3 addresses activities 1, 2, and 7. Incorporation of other activities that add a strategic advantage to the project activities are allowed.

Activity	Description
1) Ongoing Professional Development	Creating opportunities for enhanced and ongoing professional development of mathematics and science teachers that improves the subject matter knowledge of such teachers.
2) Research-Based Teaching Methods	Promoting strong teaching skills for mathematics and science teachers and teacher educators, including integrating reliable scientifically based research teaching methods and technology-based teaching methods into the curriculum.

3) Summer Workshops	Establishing and operating mathematics and science summer workshops or institutes, including follow up training, for elementary school and secondary school mathematics and science teachers that —
	
	 shall —
	 1. directly relate to the curriculum and academic areas in which the teacher provides instruction, and focus only secondarily on pedagogy;
	 2. enhance the ability of the teacher to understand and use the challenging State academic content standards for mathematics and science and to select appropriate curricula; and
	 3. train teachers to use curricula that are —
	    a. based on scientific research;
	    b. aligned with challenging State academic content standards; and
	    c. object-centered, experiment-oriented, and concept- and content-based; and
	 may include —
	 1. programs that provide teachers and prospective teachers with opportunities to work under the guidance of experienced teachers and college faculty;
	 2. instruction in the use of data and assessments to inform and instruct classroom practice; and
	 3. professional development activities, including supplemental and follow-up activities, such as curriculum alignment, distance learning, and activities that train teachers to utilize technology in the classroom;

4) Recruitment	Recruiting mathematics, engineering, and science majors to teaching through the use of — 1. stipends provided to mathematics and science teachers for certification through alternative routes; and 2. scholarships for teachers to pursue advanced coursework in mathematics, engineering, or science;
5) Curricula Design	Developing or redesigning more rigorous mathematics and science curricula that are aligned with challenging State and local academic content standards and with the standards expected for postsecondary study in mathematics and science.

6) Distance Learning	Establishing distance learning programs for mathematics and science teachers using curricula that are innovative, content-based, and based on scientifically based research that is current as of the date of the program involved.
7) Train the Trainer	Designing programs to prepare a mathematics or science teacher at a school to provide professional development to other mathematics or science teachers at the school and to assist beginning and other teachers at the school, including (if applicable) a mechanism to integrate the teacher's experiences from a summer workshop or institute into the provision of professional development and assistance.
8) Interaction with Scientists, Mathematicians and Engineers	Establishing and operating programs to bring mathematics and science teachers into contact with working scientists, mathematicians, and engineers, to expand such teachers' subject matter knowledge of and research in science and mathematics.
9) Exemplary K-8 Teachers	Designing programs to identify and develop exemplary mathematics and science teachers in the kindergarten through grade 8 classrooms.
10) Under-represented Populations in STEM	Training mathematics and science teachers and developing programs to encourage young women and other underrepresented individuals in mathematics and science careers (including engineering and technology) to pursue postsecondary degrees in majors leading to such careers.

(5) Fiscal Responsibilities
The OSDE has determined that fiscal responsibility for the grant must rest with the lead district partner, which must have a **Fund 11** established.

If an eligible partner is determined by the entirety of the partnership to have the greater capacity to serve in that role, requests for modification may be submitted, along with the proposal, directly to Levi Patrick (Levi.Patrick@sde.ok.gov). Requests will be reviewed by the full OSDE MSP Team on a case-by-case basis. Requests should indicate whether the partnership would accept the award if the exception is not made.

Indirect costs may not exceed 8 percent (or the institution's federally negotiated indirect cost rate, whichever is lower) for its role as fiscal agent. (EDGAR §76.564(c)(2))

(6) Allowable Expenditures
Oklahoma MSP Program funds must be spent **exclusively** on costs associated with meeting the stated purposes of the Math and Science Partnership grant. All costs must be reasonable and allocable (see 2 C.F.R §200.404-405), and must abide by the Cost Principles set out in 2 C.F.R §200.E. Further guidance regarding Budget Design Considerations and Maximum Eligible Costs are provided in *Appendix A* and *B*, respectively.

Section 2: Responsibilities of the Partnership

Partnerships must have a management structure in which each partner is fully represented and engaged, **including project leaders from each of the remaining organizations**. In addition, it is recommended that one teacher from each participating school/district serve on an advisory committee. This project management team must meet regularly to oversee all phases of the project, including design of the project, recruitment and retention of the teacher cohort group, implementation of the project plan, and collection and analysis of data related to its impact on teaching and learning. Monthly meetings with OSDA MSP Team and related consultants will be planned once awards are made.

Key elements for the Partnerships:
- partners are equal and make collaborative decisions;
- roles for scientists and mathematicians are clearly defined;
- consistent vision, values, goals and objectives are shared by all partners;
- communication is consistent and deliberate;
- there are benefits to teachers;
- there are benefits to students;
- there are benefits to scientists and mathematicians; and
- the partners are strategically selected for achieving the goals of the grant.

Additionally, the project management team has collective program responsibilities:
- designate a Project Manager or two at no less than .50 FTE total and no more than 1.0 FTE combined;
- Project Manager(s) and project management team will be expected to meet virtually and/or in-person with OSDE MSP Team to discuss the progress of the project;
- utilize the PRISM Partnership Rubric as a guide to establish and facilitate stakeholder partnerships http://prism.mspnet.org/index.cfm/10013;
- set aside funds and designate participants to the Annual MSP Conference hosted by U.S. Dept. of ED;
- participate in Project Management Teamwork sessions facilitated by the OSDE MSP Team;
- represent the partnership at the Governor's STEM Summit;
- provide images, anecdotes, and participant data for OSDE publications;
- ensure that the OSDE MSP Team is kept current as to when and where the professional learning sessions will take place to allow for site visits for fiscal and programmatic monitoring from the OSDE MSP Team;
- submit the following reports:
  - Evidence of regular Project Management Team meetings. *Upon award notification of the grant, each partnership shall submit a proposal for meeting this requirement.*
  - Quarterly Budget summary reports detailing expenditures and showing evidence of timely drawdown of funds; and
- submit an annual performance report to the OSDE by 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 28, 2017.

Partnership Qualities:
The success of individual MSP projects rests squarely on the strength of the partner relationship. Each member of the project management team is expected to be actively engaged in the project effort at the institutional and individual levels, as well as share goals, responsibilities, and accountability for the program. The project management team must be convened regularly to oversee the design, implementation, and evaluation of the project. Evidence of Project Management Team meetings will be required and shall include agendas and sign-in sheets.

In addition to the expectations described above, partnerships should provide clear evidence of the following characteristics:

- **Commitment:** Partnership members should demonstrate commitment to project goals and projected outcomes unique to its proposal. Commitment is illustrated by each partner's clear description of the expertise, time, and resources it will provide to support the goals of the partnership. Commitment is also evidenced by the descriptions of anticipated benefits included in each partner's submitted Letter of Support. While matching funds are not required, in-kind support is highly desirable and preference will be given to proposals in which partners contribute their own resources, including the coordination of other applicable grants, toward the project's success. Commitment is also evidenced in project management team meeting minutes and attendance records.
- **Sustainability:** Partnerships must provide a clear description of long-term plans to use project data to determine its impact on teaching and learning and to support the continuation of the project model beyond the duration of the grant.
- **Capacity:** Each project must designate a **Project Manager or two at no less than .50 FTE total and no more than 1.0 FTE combined**. Further capacity must be detailed through specific and achievable plans to recruit, serve, and retain a teacher cohort group with increased ability to improve student achievement in mathematics and science content areas. Further, proposals must provide a detailed description of the project staff, administrative support, and institutional resources available to conduct the project's activities and how the expertise of each will contribute to the achievement of the project's goals.

Section 3: Expectations for Project Activities

MSP partnerships are expected to immerse teachers in a three year program of professional learning experiences that provide coherent study to meet the identified Focal Area and MSP Goals detailed in Section 1. Such programming must incorporate the following elements:

Element 1: Scientifically-based Research
- All Focal Areas:
  - Project design must be informed by current research and studies on teaching and learning. Scientifically-based research involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs. This research base should provide a rationale for the professional learning model designed to meet the Focal Area.
  - *Each project will provide their assurance to collaborate with selected consultants provided by the OSDE through a separate competitive process.*

Element 2: Cohort Approach
- All Focal Areas:
  - Projects must be designed to provide sustained professional learning opportunities to a cohort of teachers over the course of the three years. Specific actions should be taken to recruit and retain no less than 60 participants.

Element 3: Grade Bands
- Focal Areas 1 and 2:
  - Projects will focus their efforts on mathematics or science teachers of grades 3 through 8, plus Algebra 1 and Algebra 2 or Physical Science and Biology 1, respectively. Projects must identify how they intend to address the vertical progression of content strands across the target grades and courses, taking special care to create meaningful content and pedagogical learning experiences for all participants related to the development and implementation of instructional tasks and diagnostics assessment probes.
- Focal Area 3:
  - Projects will focus their efforts on mathematics and science teachers of all grades, K-12. Projects must identify how they intend to address both the shared and unique needs of the various subsets of target teachers, taking special care to create meaningful mentoring structures that lead to increased content and pedagogical knowledge of participants, and increased likelihood of teacher retention.

Element 4: Professional Learning Plan Design
- All Focal Areas:
  - MSP projects must be designed to deliver **at least 80 hours** of ongoing professional learning to **each participant** in the form of both intensive professional learning activities and follow-up training and classroom support. Classroom follow-up support and training must be directly related to the focus of the intensive training.
  - Members from each of the partnership organizations must actively participate in both the classroom-level follow-up support as well as the intensive learning activities. Participants from non-partnering schools can also be invited to participate.

○ Follow-up activities should utilize research-based methods and protocols to analyze and revise program implementation and developed interventions.

Element 5: Scale and Sustainability Design
- <u>All Focal Areas:</u>
    ○ Projects will develop a strategic plan for utilizing project evaluation feedback to develop virtual coursework that mirrors the in-person professional development experienced by participating teachers in the program. In conjunction with the resources developed through the program, virtual coursework will then be made available to all Oklahoma teachers.
    ○ Projects will develop a strategic plan for sustaining the essential work of the program with participants and partner schools based on feedback from project evaluation. Particular attention should be given to the use of project developed resources in partner schools and the orientation and support provided for teachers new to partner schools after the grant has concluded.
    ○ *Projects will provide their assurance to partner with the OSDE to ensure produced resources are accessible to all Oklahoma teachers and provide workshop sessions at a minimum of one state sponsored conference (i.e., EngageOK).*

Section 4: Expectations for Project Evaluation

Oklahoma's MSP projects must be evaluated by an external evaluator.

Expectations of the External Evaluator:
- Projects will use both formative and summative assessment methods to evaluate changes in teacher practices and improvement of student learning.
- In the formative sense, evaluation should provide evidence of the strengths and weaknesses of the program, informing the partnership's understanding of what works and what does not in order to guide program modifications as needed.
- In the summative sense, each project should determine which assessment tools will be utilized or developed (and validated) to evaluate and provide feedback on the overall success of the project as well as to inform individual partnerships of the effectiveness of the totality of their work.
    - A list of resources is provided in *Appendix C*. Resources such as the National Science Foundation's Math and Science Partnership Network (http://hub.mspnet.org) provides users access to program evaluations, assessment resources, and more.
- Each project will provide their assurance to partner with the OSDE to meet all Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) criteria as defined in the **Guide for Summarizing MSP Evaluation Designs and Results** (*Appendix D*).
- Each project will provide their assurance to partner with the OSDE **to carefully plan the design and analysis of the data once the project has been awarded**.

Section 5: Proposal Submission

Proposals submitted in response to this RFP **must** be prepared using the **Proposal Framework** provided by the OSDE and submitted in accordance with the following guidelines.

Access the Proposal Framework here: http://sde.ok.gov/stem

Format Requirements: Proposals that do not comply with these formatting requirements will not be reviewed or considered for funding.
- ● Typewritten and saved as a Microsoft Word read-only document or pdf file on a thumbdrive
- ● Footer on each page with the page number and lead partner name
- ● Stapled or clipped in the upper left hand corner; no binders or folders
- ● Include a cover page and a table of contents, which can be found in the framework document
- ● Required forms that are to be included in the body of the proposal are not subject to page limitations. Page limitations apply to narrative sections only.

Proposal Delivery: Partnerships must send one original of the complete proposal along with a thumbdrive containing **one complete proposal file** in Microsoft Word (read-only) or PDF format.
- ● All proposals must be physically received by the OSDE by **5:00 p.m. on Friday, December 18, 2015**.
- ● Incomplete, late, or incorrectly formatted proposals will not be scored or considered for funding.
- ● Applicants are encouraged to use express, certified, or registered mail.
- ● **Faxed proposals will not be accepted.**
- ● Mail proposals to:

  Oklahoma Math and Science Partnership
  ℅ Levi Patrick
  2500 N. Lincoln Blvd., Suite 315
  OKC, OK 73105

Section 6: Proposal Framework Contents

Access the Proposal Framework here: http://sde.ok.gov/stem

The OSDE has prepared a comprehensive **Proposal Framework** to be used by **ALL** partnerships in preparing a proposal for funding consideration. All proposals must include the following components, presented in the sequence specified below.

The Proposal Framework contents and expectations are provided below:

1. Grant Application Cover Page

2. Partner List

3. Application Preparation Checklist

   3.1. Partnerships that have received previous MSP Program funding previously must include a 3-page, single-spaced abstract of prior work. It should include project's intended goals; amount of funding received; number of teachers it intended to serve and actually served; explanation of budget spending for the year; evidence of progress towards goals using teacher and student data; description of partnership roles, and an indication of how the proposed work differs from, builds on, or is otherwise informed by prior efforts.

4. Project Abstract

   4.1. **All** partnerships must provide a **2-page, single-spaced** abstract of the proposal that concisely describes the program to be implemented and summarizes the intended results of the program. It should identify the project partners, the selected Focal Area, the number of teachers it intends to serve, the academic/instructional need of the schools in which they provide instruction, and an overview of the strategy being employed to address the identified Focal Area and to meet the goals of the Oklahoma MSP program.

5. Results of Needs Assessment (Criterion B)

   5.1. This section will identify and prioritize baseline professional learning needs of teachers in partner school districts, disaggregated by grade level and content area. It must identify specific gaps or weaknesses in teacher content knowledge. This baseline information must be determined using a current (within the past 12 months) quantitative **and** qualitative content-driven assessment of teacher professional learning needs. It should also include a description of the methods used to collect this information. **Additionally**, the needs assessment must include the current status of student achievement in mathematics and/or science for the targeted grades and should be disaggregated in table form by gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic factors, English language learners (ELL), and disability and then analyzed in narrative form.

   5.2. The results of the teacher and student needs assessments must be used to identify gaps, and the proposed goals and objectives of the grant proposal should address identified gaps while aligning to the expectations of the selected Focal Area.

   5.3. Resource links to support the development of a Needs Assessment tool are provided in *Appendix C*.

6. Project Narrative

6.1. Logic Model (Component C.2) – The logic model must illustrate how the project action plan and resources will be designed to achieve the goals and objectives. *Resource links to support the development of a logic model can be found in Appendix C.*

6.2. Goals and Objectives (Component C.3) – The project narrative must use the results of the content-driven needs assessment to identify **measurable** project objectives for increasing teacher content knowledge and changing teacher practice. It should also describe the recruitment and retention strategies that will be used with the teacher cohort group. Objectives should be written at least as frequently as **quarterly increments** so projects may assess progress towards goals qualitatively and quantitatively.

6.3. Project Action Plan (Components A.1, B.1, C.1, D.1-D.4) –The project action plan should:

6.3.1. address all corresponding Elements from Section 3;

6.3.2. describe the ambitious proposed activities that extend beyond commonplace approaches and how they provide deeper content understanding than they are expected to teach to students while ensuring the content presented is not beyond connections to their classroom;

6.3.3. describe content-specific instructional strategies that will provide teachers with the methodologies to effectively improve student achievement;

6.3.4. describe how the professional learning activities are specifically aligned to the appropriate Oklahoma Academic Standards;

6.3.5. describe in detail how the partnership will achieve the objectives and anticipated quantitative outcomes by means of a coherent plan. This description should include the research or evidence base connected to the Focal Area of the proposal and additional proposed work based on the needs assessment; and

6.3.6. provide a timeline that correlates with the proposed action plan and the quantitative outcome goals and benchmarks.

6.4. Project Management Plan (Component A.3) – This portion of the narrative should describe the management plan by which all partners are fully engaged to realize the partnership's outcomes. It should describe in detail the specific roles, responsibilities, and time commitments of the project management team, including how the project will determine the Project Manager(s), at what FTE rate that Project Manager(s) will work on the project. The proposal should detail the roles and responsibilities of the project manager and demonstrate how the identified roles and responsibilities warrant a .50 FTE to 1.0 FTE.

6.4.1. The narrative should provide evidence of

6.4.1.1. an effective partnership among all organizations that works together to realize the project's vision and goals,

6.4.1.2. the participation of the entire management team in planning, design, and implementation, and

6.4.1.3.   sufficient capacity of the partners to support the scale and scope of the project.

7.   Evaluation and Accountability Plan (Criterion E)

7.1.   The evaluation and accountability plan should be described in terms of how it will guide project progress and will measure the impact of the work described in the action plan, including a description of the instruments/metrics by which the project will measure its progress towards objectives. It should describe both formative and summative assessment methods that will be used.

7.2.   Formative evaluation should provide evidence of the strengths and weaknesses of the project and help the partnership identify the extent to which the lessons learned from the activities are being applied by teacher participants at the classroom level.

7.3.   Summative evaluation should determine which assessment tools will be utilized or developed (and validated) to evaluate and provide feedback on the overall success of the project as well as to inform individual partnerships of the effectiveness of the totality of their work.

7.4.   Although the evaluation will be developed with input from the partnership, objective analyses and findings **must** be determined by an external evaluator who is clearly separate and distinct from the partnership participants and their respective departments. A timeline for the evaluation should be included, and the qualifications of the evaluator should be provided in a one-page vitae in the appendix of the proposal.

8.   Budget and Budget Narrative (Criterion F)

8.1.   Partnerships must submit **one** budget form for the entire proposed project. The amounts requested for each budget line item should be documented and justified in the budget justification as specified below. Amounts and expenses budgeted also must be consistent with the proposing district's policies and procedures and cost accounting practices used in accumulating and reporting costs. All costs must be reasonable and allocable (see 2 C.F.R §200.404-405), and must abide by the Cost Principles set out in 2 C.F.R §200.E.

8.2.   The budget narrative/justification should be aligned with the activities described in the proposal narrative; show evidence of effective, appropriate, and efficient use of funds; and describe clearly the full range of resources that will be used to accomplish the goals and objectives of the project.

9.   Appendices: Within the appendix of the proposal, partnerships should provide additional project information including but not limited to:

9.1.   partner identification forms (Component A.2),

9.2.   statement of assurances (Including the Equitable Participation form)

9.3.   affirmation of partnerships consultation,

9.4.   bibliography of works cited,

9.5.   1-page vitae of appropriate partnership personnel,

9.6.   Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) from each partner* (Component A.2),

9.7.   letter of commitment and support from the lead applicant's authorized representative (Component A.2), and

9.8.   additional proposal support information submitted at the discretion of the partnership, such as samples of instruments used to conduct needs assessments, etc.

** Each MOU should clearly outline the role and contributions of the partner and provide evidence that the proposed partnership activities are integral to the partner's instructional mission. It should be signed by the authorized authority (dean, VP, etc.) of each department of a higher education partner, the Superintendent of each partner school district, or the head of any other partner organization. All MOUs from school districts should clearly indicate their **willingness to share aggregate student data of participating teacher based on the selected evaluation instruments identified by the project in a timely fashion** for annual reports to the Oklahoma State Department of Education and US Department of Education.*

Section 7: Proposal Review

The OSDE MSP Team will review proposals as they are received for eligibility, completeness, and compliance with application requirements. If, in the judgment of the OSDE MSP Team, a proposal is late or significantly incomplete, or if an applicant cannot establish its eligibility, the proposal will be omitted from consideration. In such cases, applicants will be notified of the decision in writing, and the decision of the OSDE MSP Team is final.

An external review panel whose members have substantive expertise in mathematics and science will then be convened to review all eligible proposals. The OSDE MSP Team will recruit in-state and out-of-state panelists who bear no conflict of interest towards any of the partnerships. The review panel will use scoring rubrics correlated to each Focal Area to evaluate the merits of each eligible proposal, assign a score, and make recommendations to the OSDE MSP Team in terms of program, budget, and efficacy.

The review panel's scores and recommendations will be the primary determinant of successful proposals and will form the basis for negotiation and final selection. Proposals will be ranked according to the final score assigned by the review panel. The OSDE MSP Team will submit award recommendations to the Oklahoma State Board of Education for the funding of those proposals that show the most promise for improving teacher content knowledge and instructional practice in mathematics and science. Projects may be asked to revise the project budget and/or scope of project work based on review panel recommendations.

Review Criteria

The detailed scoring rubrics that will be used by the review panel to assess applicant proposals can be found in *Appendices E, F, and G* of this RFP; however, the general review criteria are included on the following page. **Any proposal that earns a score of zero in any of the Efficacy of Plan components on the scoring rubric(s) will be disqualified from funding consideration.**

Scoring Rubric Summary (see Appendices E-G for Focal Area specific rubrics)

Categories	Points Possible
Commitment and Capacity of Partnership	9
Demonstration of Need and Research Base	12
Alignment of Goals/Objectives with Professional Learning Needs	18
Efficacy of Plan	32
Evaluation and Accountability Plan	20
Budget and Cost Effectiveness	9

Section 8: Services to Nonpublic Schools

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation, Section 9501, requires all applicants for certain discretionary grant programs to include and provide services to eligible nonpublic school students and/or teachers. Title 2 Part A is subject to the requirements of Sections 9501-9504 of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 regarding the equitable participation of nonpublic school teachers in this grant program.

- **Nonpublic School Eligibility:** Nonpublic school eligibility is based on the location of the nonpublic school(s), the design of the specific grant program and the needs of the nonpublic school(s). The needs must be able to be met via the discretionary grant program's specific program design.* Generally, the nonpublic school must be located within the communities or geographic boundaries of the applicant agency or partner agency if applicable. According to the parameters of the grant program and available funding, the applicant agency determines the area to be served.

Example: *If the design of the grant program is to provide math instruction for seventh and eighth grade teachers, then the nonpublic school(s) must serve seventh and eighth grade teachers who are in need of math instruction and must be in the geographic area served by participating public schools.*

- **Timely and Meaningful Consultation:**
  - The applicant agency is responsible to **identify** all appropriate nonpublic schools **and to contact** the appropriate nonpublic school officials to begin the consultation process. The nonpublic school(s) must be **given a genuine opportunity to participate** in the grant program. The NCLB legislation requires all applicants to conduct *timely* and *meaningful* consultation with the appropriate nonpublic school officials **prior to** the development of the local project's grant application and **prior to any decision** being made regarding the design of the local project that could affect the ability of nonpublic school students, teachers and other education personnel to receive benefits. Consultation **must continue** throughout the implementation and assessment of activities.
- **Considerations:** Listed below are the considerations that must be taken into account by all applicants when assessing the needs of the nonpublic school students and teachers and when determining in consultation with the nonpublic school(s) whether those needs fit the grant's program design. Consultation generally must include discussion on such issues as:
  - what services will be provided;
  - how, when, where, and by whom the services will be provided;
  - how the services will be assessed and how the results of the assessment will be used to improve those services;
  - the amount of funds available for services; and
  - how and when decisions about the delivery of services will be made.
- **NOTE**: A unilateral offer of services by an applicant agency with no opportunity for discussion on the part of the nonpublic school representative **is not adequate consultation.**
- **Consistent and Comparable Services and Benefits:** The NCLB legislation requires that the participation and involvement of the nonpublic school partners and participants be consistent (closely parallel, be similar) with the number of eligible children enrolled in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools within the geographic boundaries of the applicant agency or partner agency if applicable. The grant-related services and benefits must be comparable (having a similar effect) to those provided to public school children and teachers participating in the program, and they must be provided in a timely manner. All services to nonpublic school students and teachers must be secular, neutral, and non-ideological.

The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) §76.652 states that the applicant agency shall give appropriate representatives a **genuine opportunity** to express their views regarding **each matter** subject to

the consultation requirements outlined above. By following this course of action, a successful consultation will result in a well-matched agreement between the applicant and the eligible nonpublic school(s). This agreement should:

- ○ be appropriate for the specific grant program;
- ○ allow for the orderly and efficient integration of the services for the nonpublic school students/teachers into the operation of the local project; and
- ○ result in benefits which have similar effects for the applicant and the nonpublic school students and/or teachers.

- ● **Use of Funds Requirements** (*EDGAR §76.650 - §76.662*): When providing benefits to nonpublic school students with federal funds, the following must be addressed:
  - ○ The grantee must maintain administrative control over all funds and property. (No funds can flow directly to the nonpublic school via a subgrant).
  - ○ The grantee may place equipment and supplies in the nonpublic school for the period of time needed for the grant. The grantee must ensure that the materials are used only for the purposes of the grant and can be removed from the nonpublic school without remodeling the nonpublic school facility.
  - ○ Funds cannot be used for construction of nonpublic school facilities.
  - ○ Funds must be used to meet specific needs of students and staff, but not used directly by students. (Funds cannot supplant benefits normally provided by the nonpublic school).
  - ○ Funds may be used to pay for services of an employee of the nonpublic school if the employee performs the services outside of his or her regular hours and the employees performs the services under the supervision of the grantee.
  - ○ All benefits provided, including equipment and materials, must be secular, neutral and non-ideological. (*IASA, Sec 14503*)
- ● **Required Forms:** The applicant must provide, as part of the application, the signed *Equitable Participation of Nonpublic Schools* found in the OSDE *MSP Proposal Framework 2015-2016* posted at http://sde.ok.gov/stem.

** An applicant agency may be disqualified from funding if it fails to provide this form. **

Section 9: FERPA

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99) is a Federal law that protects the privacy of student education records. The law applies to all schools that receive funds under an applicable program of the U.S. Department of Education. Generally, schools must have written permission from the parent or eligible student in order to release any information from a student's education record. However, FERPA allows schools to disclose those records, without consent, to the following parties or under the following conditions (34 CFR § 99.31):

- school officials with legitimate educational interest;
- other schools to which a student is transferring;
- specified officials for audit or evaluation purposes;
- appropriate parties in connection with financial aid to a student;
- organizations conducting certain studies for or on behalf of the school;
- accrediting organizations;
- to comply with a judicial order or lawfully issued subpoena;
- appropriate officials in cases of health and safety emergencies; and
- State and local authorities, within a juvenile justice system, pursuant to specific State law.

MSP Research is typically done in an established educational setting, involving normal educational practices, such as research on the effectiveness of instructional techniques [Section 97.101(b)(1)] involving the use of educational tests. Information is recorded in such a manner that human subjects cannot be identified [Section 97.101(b)(2)] and therefore does not require IRB (institutional review board) approval or parental notification. Please refer to the following website for additional information: http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/ferpa/index.html.

Appendix A: Budget Design Considerations

Salary Paid by Grant

For full-time employees working a part or all of their regular work day on the grant, applicants must describe the actual professional development instruction or coaching (instructional salaries) duties to be performed and to whom they are providing the services. **Applicants must** be sure to include an appropriate cost basis such as the hourly rate and the number of hours worked. For salaries, show the annual salary (if less than 12 months be sure to identify the percentage of time covered by the salary) and the percentage of that salary being paid by the grant.

No Reallocation

The OSDE will disallow all ineligible costs, as well as costs not supported by the Project Activity Plan. These funds will not be eligible for reallocation.

Subgranting: The Lead LEA must be aware that subgranting this award is not allowable.

Supplement, Not Supplant

Grant funds must be used to **supplement and not supplant** existing efforts of the LEA. Federal funds cannot be used to pay for anything that a grant applicant would normally be required to pay for with either local or state funds. This requirement also covers services previously provided by a different person or job title. The exceptions are for activities and services that are not currently provided or statutorily required, and for component(s) of a job or activity that represent an expansion or enhancement of normally provided services.

Persons with Administrative and Instructional Services Require Separate Budgets

For any person whose project duties include both administrative and instructional services, create separate budget entries showing the requested amount for each set of services. Describe the grant-related services to be provided, as well as whether or not the person is working outside regular hours and describe each benefit and its percentage when benefits other than FICA are being requested.

Project Management Professional Development: Project Directors and up to one other project member are required to attend one MSP Annual Meeting that is conducted by the U.S. Department of Education. MSP funds can be used to support travel expenses. MSP funds should be budgeted for these events. The trips are usually held in Washington, D.C. Travel per diems can be found at http://www.gsa.gov/portal/content/104877.

Appendix B: Maximum Eligible Costs

2 C.F.R. §200.E sets forth Cost Principles that are in effect for State-Administered Grants awarded after December 26, 2014 (see **Vol. 79 Federal Register No. 244**).

Stipends: Funds may not be used to augment the total salary or salary rate of faculty/staff members during the period covered by the term of faculty appointment or to reimburse faculty members for consulting or other time in addition to a regular full-time organizational salary covering the same general period of employment. Exceptions may be considered for weekend, evening classes, or for administrative work done as overloads. The names of the Project Manager, faculty, and other senior personnel and the estimated number of full-time-equivalent academic-year, summer, or calendar-year person-months for which funding is requested and the total amount of stipends requested per year must be listed. Stipends requested must be consistent with the organization's regular practices. The budget justification should detail the rates of pay by individual. It is permissible for the Project Manager to budget for project management as time required in addressing the specifically named goals and objectives of the project. As with all uses of federal grant funds, the grantee will need to maintain records to document that payment of stipends is reasonable and necessary to the approved project. (2 C.F.R §200.430)

Teachers' Compensation: The grant program's **maximum allowable contribution** to teacher compensation is **$25** per hour no matter what the length of the overall day.

Funds Linked to Grant Activities and Funding Rate
The **applicant must** provide a direct link for each cost to the goals and objectives in the project Activity Plan. For example, if 50 teachers work for 80 hours at a Funding Rate of $45 to $55 per teacher, the range of expected costs will be $180,000 to $220,000, where Total Cost = # of Teachers x Total Contact Hours x Funding Rate Per Teacher.

Contract Services: Costs must be reasonable and consistent with costs normally associated with such services. Consultant expenses should be calculated according to the state regulations governing travel and lodging expenses (Time and Effort Logs Required). For guidance on when obligations are made, see EDGAR §76.707.

Except for the procurement of such items as commercially available supplies, materials, or general support services allowable under the grant, no significant part of the substantive effort under the grant may be contracted or otherwise transferred to another organization without prior authorization.

The intent to enter into such arrangements must be disclosed in the proposal, and a separate budget should be provided for each contract, if already identified, along with a description of the work to be performed. Otherwise, the disclosure should include a clear description of the work to be performed, and the basis for selection of the contractor.

External Evaluation Services: No more than 6 percent of the total award can be used for external evaluation services. **External evaluators should not be affiliated with any of the institutions in the partnership.** If conducting a quasi-experimental or experimental evaluation design, additional funds may be justified for an evaluator.

Tuition: Annual tuition payment (payable to the IHE where the credits will be earned and coded) for graduate course credits is permissible if the course and participant meet all four of the following criteria:

1. the course is directly related to the MSP participants' professional development plan;
2. the course will lead to the completion of an accredited graduate education program/endorsement;
3. the participant successfully completes the course with a grade of B or better; and
4. the tuition for a course is not already provided by the LEA. (See 2 C.F.R. §200.466)

Travel: Travel expense reimbursement is limited to the state-approved rate per mile and per diems. Other travel arrangements should be made by the least expensive means available. Travel and its relation to the proposed activities must be specified and itemized by destination and cost. Funds may be requested for field work, attendance at meetings and conferences, and other travel associated with the proposed work, including subsistence. In order to qualify for support, however, attendance at meetings or conferences must be necessary to accomplish proposal objectives, or disseminate its results. Allowance for air travel normally will not exceed the cost of round-trip, economy airfares. Persons traveling under project must travel by US-Flag air carriers, if available. **Out-of-state conference travel must be limited to the MSP Annual Conference only.** (See 2 C.F.R. §200.474)

Materials and Supplies: Funds may be spent on materials and supplies to facilitate the professional learning of teachers. The proposal budget justification should indicate the general types of expendable materials and supplies required. Materials and supplies are defined as tangible personal property, other than equipment, costing less than $5,000, or other lower threshold consistent with the policy established by the proposing organization. Cost estimates must be included for items that represent a substantial amount of the proposed line item cost. **Instructional materials can only be purchased for the teacher attending the professional development for the purposes of the program (federal funds may not be used to purchase equipment or instructional materials for the students of the teacher).**

Restricted Indirect Costs: 8 percent is the **maximum** restricted, indirect cost rate allowed (EDGAR §76.564(c)(2)). The indirect cost rate applies only to direct costs, not the total award amount received. Applicants must use one of the two following indirect cost rates, **whichever is lower**:

1. 8 percent; or
2. the lead LEA's indirect cost rate.

Ineligible Costs (see General Provisions for Selected Items of Cost for Clarification on Unlisted Items - 2 C.F.R. §200.420-475):

● Costs associated with writing the application;
● Equipment (all equipment requested is subject to review and approval by the OSDE);
● Full salaries of clerical personnel;
● Tuition charges and/or university/activity fees already covered in the higher education partners' salary and fringe;
● Capital improvements;
● Food;
● Supporting the research of individual scholars or faculty members;
● Providing compensation for IHE faculty attending workshops or conferences other than U.S. Department of Education Mathematics and Science Partnership Conferences;
● Supporting travel to out-of-state professional meetings, unless it is demonstrated that attendance at a meeting will directly and significantly advance a project.

- Costs that are not directly related to the educational program and that are unsupported by the proposal; and
- Entertaining

Summary of Guidelines for Allowable Expenses [2, 3]

Category	Guidelines
Project Management Team Stipends	Project Manager must be paid at a rate of no less .05 FTE consistent with 2 C.F.R §200.430. A secondary Project Lead from the university partner may be bought at at no more than .50 FTE. Total funding allowable for Project Manager must not exceed 1.0 FTE. Teachers serving on the management team may be paid an honorarium at the same rate allowable for teacher stipends.
Contract Services	Not to exceed $50/presentation hour and $25/planning and preparation time for consultants or presenters ($800/day maximum); not to exceed $35/presentation hour and $17.50/planning and preparation time for district personnel ($560/day maximum). Only 2 hours prep time per hour of presentation time funded. (Time and Effort Logs Required.)
Higher Education Faculty	Regular salary per hour of contact time; 50% of salary per hour of planning/preparation time. Only 2 hours prep time per hour of presentation time funded.
Project Management PD	Reimburse travel expenses for management team participation in U.S. Dept. of ED and OSDE-hosted MSP events according to state/district guidelines.
External Evaluation Services	Not to exceed 6% of total project budget may be spent on a formal project external evaluator. OSDE will allow additional funds for a plan that successfully conducts a quasi- or experimental study following U.S. Dept. of ED guidelines/requirements. [4]
Teacher's Compensation	Not to exceed $25 per hour during off-contract time; teacher fringe benefits may be covered by MSP grant funds. Teachers must be eligible to work in the United States.
Tuition	Annual tuition payment (payable to the IHE where the credits will be earned and coded) for graduate course credits is permissible if the course and participant meet all four of the following criteria: (1) the course is directly related to the MSP participants' professional development plan; (2) the course will lead to the completion of an accredited graduate education program/endorsement; (3) the participant successfully completes the course with a grade of B or better; and (4) the tuition for a course is not already provided by the LEA.
Travel	Reimburse mileage, meals, and lodging according to state/district guidelines for project-related travel.

Materials and Supplies	Funds may be spent on materials and supplies to facilitate professional learning of teachers, not on classroom instructional materials for students of teacher participants.
Substitutes	Determined by district substitute policy when MSP training sessions take place during teacher contract time.
Indirect Costs	Not to exceed 8% of direct costs. (EDGAR §76.564(c)(2))

[2] **All costs must be necessary, reasonable, and allocable.**

[3] *MSP Program funds received must be used to **supplement and not to supplant** funds that would otherwise be used to support proposed activities.*

[4] Quasi-experimental Study - A rubric designed by the U.S. Department of Education is used to determine whether a grantee's evaluation meets the minimum criteria that need to be met for an evaluation to be successfully conducted and yield valid data. Evaluation components covered in the rubric include sample size, quality of measurement instruments, quality of data collection methods, data reduction rates, relevant statistics reported, and baseline equivalence of groups. The rubric is included in *Appendix D* of this document and is also posted at www.ed-msp.net under "Resources."

Appendix C: Resources for Proposal Preparation

Resource: Link	MSP	Planning	Evaluation	Math	Science
U.S. Department of Education/MSP Program - http://www.ed.gov/programs/mathsci/index.html	X				
U.S. Department of Education's Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) - http://www.ed-msp.net	X	X	X		
National Science Foundation's MSP Network - http://hub.mspnet.org/index.cfm/home	X	X	X	X	X
How Logical is Your Logic Model? Presentation and webinar availble at http://teams.mspnet.org/index.cfm/webinars/webinar_info?id=300	X	X	X		
The Oklahoma Department of Education http://sde.ok.gov and http://www.ok.gov/sde/oklahoma-academic-standards		X		X	X
The Oklahoma Science Teachers Association http://www.oklahomascienceteachersassociation.org/					X
The Oklahoma Council of Teachers of Mathematics http://okctm.org				X	
American Association for the Advancement of Science Project 2061 Science Assessment - http://assessment.aaas.org		X	X		X
Learning Mathematics for Teaching (LMT) - http://sitemaker.umich.edu/lmt/links		X	X	X	
The Mathematics Assessment Program (MAP) - http://map.mathshell.org/materials/index.php		X	X	X	
Horizon Research, Incorporated (HRI) - http://www.horizon-research.com/		X	X	X	X
Learning Forward (Formerly the National Staff Development Council) - http://learningforward.org		X			
Project MOSART - https://www.cfa.harvard.edu/smgphp/mosart			X		X
National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) - http://www.nctm.org		X		X	
National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) - http://www.nsta.org		X			X
National Academies and Board on Science Education - http://sites.nationalacademies.org/DBASSE/BOSE/Framework_K12_Science/index.htm		X			X

The following excerpt is from the Guide for Summarizing MSP Evaluation Designs and Results. The full document can be viewed at
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1TxAlHXjyPT1BzmuFrbIvyO6_-wJ0Z3Opnxj5eWKVba4/edit?usp=sharing.

One of the goals of the Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) program is to contribute to the knowledge base on effective professional development in mathematics and science. To this end, the MSP legislation (Title II, Part B of the No Child Left Behind Act) requires every MSP project to design and implement an evaluation and accountability plan that allows for a rigorous assessment of its effectiveness, and which includes information on the project's impact on teachers and students. In order to ensure that projects are providing high-quality information on program outcomes, the Criteria for Classifying Designs of MSP Evaluations (printed after this document /part of Appendix B), was developed as part of the Data Quality Initiative through the Institute for Education Sciences (IES) at the U.S. Department of Education. The criteria that comprise the rubric specify conditions that projects that use experimental designs and quasi-experimental designs must meet in order to be deemed rigorous evaluations.

In 2008, the rubric was applied to the final evaluation reports of completed MSP projects for the first time. In doing so, it became apparent that most projects evaluate more than one component of their project (e.g., teacher content knowledge in mathematics and/or science, teacher attitudes and beliefs, student content knowledge in mathematics and/or science), that different evaluation techniques are often applied to the different components, and that some components meet all the criteria for being classified as a rigorous evaluation while other components do not. It also became apparent that while most projects collect most of the information needed to assess their evaluation design(s), few report the information in a manner that allows it to be easily evaluated with the rubric.

This Guide was developed to provide Project Directors and Evaluators with guidance on how best to summarize their evaluation data to facilitate the review and assessment of their evaluation design(s). We recommend that you present the results for each of the criteria discussed below in an Executive Summary at the beginning of your final evaluation report.

Screening Process
MSP evaluations undergo a two-stage screening process. They are first screened for the type of evaluation design and then for the strength of the implementation of the individual elements of the design. Below we present the criteria that are used in each stage of the screening process followed by recommended summary tables or narrative reporting guidelines, where relevant, for presenting information about your evaluation.

Evaluation Design
To be classified as having a strong design, only one component of the evaluation has to be either 1) an experimental study that compares the outcomes of a randomly assigned treatment and control group or 2) a quasi-experimental study that compares the outcomes of a treatment and comparison group that meets one of two design criteria:
1. comparison group study with equating (matching) — statistical controls or matching techniques were used to make the treatment and comparison groups similar on their pre-intervention characteristics; or

2. regression-discontinuity study — individuals (or other units such as classrooms or schools) were assigned to treatment or comparison groups on the basis of a "cutoff" score on a pre-intervention non-dichotomous measure.

Summary Information

List each outcome that your are evaluating and the participant group to whom it applies, and check the type of evaluation design applied to that group. The table below provides an example of a project that evaluated five outcomes using three different designs.

Table 1: Evaluation Design Type				
Participant Group and Outcome	Experimental Design	Quasi-Experimental Design		Other Design
		with equating (matching)	regression discontinuity	
Elementary teachers science knowledge	X			
Elementary teachers mathematics knowledge	X			
Elementary students science achievement		X		
Elementary students mathematics achievement		X		
Elementary teacher classroom practice science				X
Elementary teacher classroom practice mathematics				X

Experimental Designs

For each participant group and outcome that was evaluated using an experimental design, please describe how units (i.e., participants, classroom schools, or districts) were randomly assigned to groups.

1. Participant Group/Outcome: _____: (describe random assignment)

2. Participant Group/Outcome: _____: (describe random assignment)

3. Participant Group/Outcome: _____: (describe random assignment)

Elements of the Design

To be classified a strong design each participant group/outcome that was evaluated using a quasi-experimental design must meet all of the following six criteria. Participant group/outcomes that were evaluated using an experimental design must meet every criterion except the first, baseline equivalence of groups, as randomly assigned groups are assumed to be equivalent at baseline.

Appendix E: Scoring Rubric for Focal Area 1

Focal Area 1 Criterion A: Commitment and Capacity of Partnership	Points Awarded
Guiding Questions: Does the project management team have the expertise to implement and sustain a math professional learning program? Do individuals who planned the project represent the primary partners i.e. LEA and IHEs? Is there evidence that faculty from colleges of mathematics, science, and/or engineering are playing major roles in the design of the proposed program? Is there evidence that other partners, which may include education faculty, business representatives, and for-profit/non-profit representatives, are playing major roles in the design 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 establish a Project Manager who will engage the project management team in ongoing communication and decision-making, and manage fiscal responsibilities among the project partners?	_____ **out of 9**

Exceeds Standard (3 Pts. each)	Meets Standard (2 Pts. each)	Below Standard (0-1 Pt. each)	Component Score
Component A.1: Project Team Expertise			
• Strong evidence of the number and quality of staff from the primary partners to carry out the proposed activities • Qualifications are provided for key partners' staff and are strong and strategic • Evidence of the strategic advantage of partners is strong	• Adequate evidence of the number and quality of staff from the primary partners to carry out the proposed activities • Qualifications of key partners' staff are described and appear to be acceptable • Evidence of the strategic advantage of partners is vague or limited	• Little evidence of the number and quality of staff from the primary partners to carry out the proposed activities • Qualifications of key partners' staff are described but appear to be limited • Evidence of the strategic advantage of partners is limited primarily to convenience	
Component A.2: Project Team Commitment			
• Shows long term commitment of partners • Institutional resources are given in detail	• Shows commitment of partners • Institutional resources are given acceptably	• Shows somewhat limited commitment of partners • Institutional resources are given but without detail	
Component A.3: Project Management			
• Establishes regular meetings for key partners • Clearly defines responsibilities of all partners • Project manager qualifications are well-defined to ensure goals of the the project are met • The roles and responsibilities of the Project Manager are well defined and meet the expectation of an individual devoted to the management of the project at 0.5-1.0 FTE	• Project management meetings are described without established timeline • Responsibilities of some partners are defined • Project manager qualifications are partially defined to ensure goals of the the project are met • The roles and responsibilities of the Project Manager are well defined but do not meet the expectation of an individual devoted to the management of the project at 0.5-1.0 FTE	• Project management meetings are described minimally • Responsibilities of partners are poorly defined • Project manager qualifications are not addressed clearly in a way that would ensure goals of the project are met • The roles and responsibilities of the Project Manager are weak or poorly defined	
Reviewer Comments (please provide substantial details regarding the assigned ratings):			

Focal Area 1 Criterion B: Demonstration of Need and Research Base	Points Awarded
Guiding Questions: Are planned activities supported by current research on effective professional learning practices and mathematics learning? Is that research meaningfully utilized in the design of the program? Does the proposal show evidence of a qualitative and quantitative content-driven assessment of grades 3rd-8th grades and Algebra 1 teacher professional learning needs? Is the current status of student achievement in math for the targeted grades and courses analyzed and disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, socio-economic, ELL & disability status in table form in order to inform the development of the project? Are other student data analyzed and used to develop the plan?	**out of 12**

Exceeds Standard (4 Pts. each)	Meets Standard (2-3 Pts. each)	Below Standard (0-1 Pt. each)	Component Score
Component B.1: Research Basis			

● Includes current scientifically-based research from multiple sources on effective professional learning practices
● Project design is driven by scientifically-based research regarding both:
  ○ the nature of instructional tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving
  ○ the nature of diagnostic assessment probes that elicit evidence of student thinking to assess progress toward mathematical understanding
	● Includes sufficient research on effective professional learning practices
	● Project design references scientifically-based research regarding both:
	  ○ the nature of instructional tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving
	  ○ the nature of diagnostic assessment probes that elicit evidence of student thinking to assess progress toward mathematical understanding
		● Limited research data on effective professional learning practices is provided
		● Limited scientifically-based research regarding either:
		  ○ the nature of instructional tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving
		  ○ the nature of diagnostic assessment probes that elicit evidence of student thinking to assess progress toward mathematical understanding	

Component B.2: Teacher Needs Assessment			
● Evidence of content-driven qualitative and quantitative assessment of current teacher professional learning needs ● Explicit connections are made from the current needs of teachers to the research and then to the project activities	● Evidence of content-driven assessment of current teacher professional learning needs ● Loose connections are made from the current needs of teachers to the research and then to the project activities	● Limited evidence of content-driven teacher needs assessment ● Weak or missing connections from the current needs of students to the research and then to the project activities	
Component B.3: Student Needs Assessment			
● Student achievement data in mathematics is disaggregated in table form and analyzed in the narrative ● Explicit connections are made from the current needs of students to the research and then to the project activities	● Student achievement data in mathematics is included and disaggregated for the targeted grades in table form ● Loose connections are made from the current needs of students to the research and then to the project activities	● Limited student achievement data in mathematics included for the targeted grades ● Weak or missing connections from the current needs of students to the research and then to the project activities	
Reviewer Comments (please provide substantial details regarding the assigned ratings):			

Focal Area 1 Criterion C: Alignment of Goals and Objectives with Professional Learning Needs			Points Awarded
Guiding Questions: Are the proposed objectives aligned to applicable Oklahoma Academic Standards (OAS), and do they include measurable outcomes correlated to the identified needs? Do proposed strategies and activities address the identified needs? Are the objectives attainable and are they measurable? 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?			**_____** **out of 18**
Exceeds Standard (5-6 Pts. each)	Meets Standard (2-4 Pts. each)	Below Standard (0-1 Pt. each)	Component Score
Component C.1: Alignment to Standards			
● Goals and objectives are specifically linked to the identified professional learning needs and aligned to applicable OAS	● Goals and objectives are generally linked to the identified professional learning needs and loosely aligned to OAS	● Goals and objectives are not correlated with the needs assessment or aligned to specific OAS	
Component C.2: Logic Model			
● The logic model clearly and convincingly illustrates how the project action plan and resources will be designed to achieve the goals and objectives	● The logic model illustrates how the project action plan and resources will be designed to achieve the goals and objectives	● The logic model does not illustrate how the project action plan and resources will be designed to achieve the goals and objectives	
Component C.3: Goals and Objectives			
● Goals and objectives are very realistic in scope and well defined related to the resources available ● Objectives are all incremental, measurable, and can be evaluated both qualitatively and quantitatively	● Goals and objectives are somewhat realistic in scope and well defined related to the resources available ● Objective are incremental, somewhat measurable and would be difficult to evaluate both qualitatively and quantitatively	● Goals and objectives are not realistic in scope related to the resources available ● Objectives are not incremental nor measurable both qualitatively and quantitatively	
Reviewer Comments (please provide substantial details regarding the assigned ratings):			

Focal Area 1 Criterion D: Efficacy of Plan	Points Awarded
Guiding Questions: Are planned activities rigorous, content-focused, and supported by research on effective professional learning practices? Are planned activities reflective of the five elements identified in Section 3? Is there sufficient evidence to suggest the likely increase in teachers' content knowledge (TCK), strengthened ability to analyze student thinking, and further developed ability to make effective instructional decisions and improve classroom practice? Are planned activities likely to facilitate improved student achievement in math? Does the timeline sufficiently indicate that the activities of the project will be accomplished within the duration of the grant?	_____ **out of 32**

Exceeds Standard (6-8 Pts. each)	Meets Standard (3-5 Pts. each)	Below Standard (0-2 Pts. each)	Component Score
Component D.1: Plan Scope and Research			
• Planned activities are ambitious enough to create substantial change in TCK and improvement in classroom practice • Clear and detailed research-based evidence that the planned activities match the specific professional learning needs and project goals	• Planned activities are somewhat ambitious enough to create substantial and positive change in TCK and improvement in classroom practice • General description and research-base that planned activities match the specific professional learning needs and project goals	• Planned activities are weak and have limited potential of creating substantial and positive change in TCK and improvement in classroom practice • Limited or no correlation is described between the planned activities, the needs assessment, and project goals	
Component D.2: Participants and Professional Learning Plan Design			
• Clear and detailed description of how and when the partnership will carry out more than 80 hours of training per teacher for at least 60 teachers • Includes strong evidence to recruit, serve, and retain teacher cohort groups	• Acceptable description of how and when the partnership will carry out at least 80 hours of training per teacher for at least 60 teachers • Includes evidence to recruit, serve, and retain teacher cohort groups	• Limited description of how and when the partnership will carry out activities; Lacks evidence of 80 hours per teacher for at least 60 teachers • Lacks evidence of a thorough plan to recruit, serve, and retain teacher cohort groups	
Component D.3: Timeline			
• Timeline provides detailed activities • Exceptional evidence that the scope of the project has been well defined	• Timeline provides some details for activities • Sufficient evidence that the scope of the project has been well defined	• Timeline is lacking in details for activities • Minimal evidence that the scope of the project has been well defined	
Component D.4: Scale and Sustainability			
• Plan for sustaining the essential work of the program with participants and partner schools based on feedback from project evaluation is strong and feasible • Well-defined plan to continue the use of project developed resources in partner schools and to provide orientation and support for teachers new to partner schools after the grant has concluded indicating successful sustainability • Plan for utilizing project evaluation feedback to develop virtual coursework that mirrors the in-person professional development experienced by participating teachers in the program is strong and feasible	• Plan for sustaining the essential work of the program with participants and partner schools based on feedback from project evaluation is provided • Includes plan to continue the use of project developed resources in partner schools and to provide orientation and support for teachers new to partner schools after the grant has concluded • Plan for utilizing project evaluation feedback to develop virtual coursework that mirrors the in-person professional development experienced by participating teachers in the program is provided	• Plan for sustaining the essential work of the program with participants and partner schools based on feedback from project evaluation is weak or absent • Ill-defined or absent plan to continue the use of project developed resources in partner schools and to provide orientation and support for teachers new to partner schools after the grant has concluded • Plan for utilizing project evaluation feedback to develop virtual coursework that mirrors the in-person professional development experienced by participating teachers in the program is weak or absent.	
Reviewer Comments (please provide substantial details regarding the assigned ratings):			

Focal Area 1 Criterion E: Evaluation and Accountability Plan	Points Awarded
Guiding Questions: Does the evaluation plan measure the impact of the project on the specified objectives? Does the plan include personnel with expertise to implement the evaluation design? 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 pretest and posttest measures included in the plan? Does the plan employ a quasi-experimental or experimental design to measure impact of professional development on teacher content growth?	_____ **out of 20**

Exceeds Standard (4-5 Pts. each)	Meets Standard (2-3 Pts. each)	Below Standard (0-1 Pt. each)	Component Score
Component E.1: External Evaluator			
● Plan demonstrates expertise of external evaluator to use or develop valid/reliable instruments to yield quantitative and qualitative, formative and summative indicators of goal attainment	● Plan demonstrates expertise of external evaluator to use or develop valid/reliable instruments to yield quantitative and qualitative, formative and summative indicators of goal attainment	● Plan lacks intention/evidence to use an evaluator and/or instruments that will yield quantitative and qualitative indicators of project's progress	
Component E.2: Teacher Content Knowledge			
● Plan specifies multiple measures and pre- and post-test procedures to show differences in TCK	● Plan specifies pre and post procedures to show differences in TCK	● Plan lacks a plan to use procedures to show meaningful differences in teacher effectiveness	
Component E.3: Student Achievement			
● Plan includes instruments and clear method to determine impact on classroom instruction and student achievement, including student misconceptions	● Plan specifies ways to measure impact on classroom instruction and student achievement, providing limited attention to student misconceptions	● Plan weakly articulates how the partnership will measure impact on classroom instruction and student achievement, not addressing student misconceptions	
Component E.4: Broad Impact of Findings			
● Plan articulates how activities will help the MSP Program build rigorous, cumulative, reproducible, usable findings ● Plan employs a quasi-experimental or an experimental design using comparison or control groups to measure growth	● Plan specifies how learning gained from the planned activities will be utilized by the partnership and the MSP Program	● Plan lacks specification of how the learning gained from the planned activities will be utilized by the partnership	
Reviewer Comments (please provide substantial details regarding the assigned ratings):			

Focal Area 1 Criterion F: Budget and Cost Effectiveness	Points Awarded
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 detailed justification for all expenses? Do budgeted items directly relate to the project goals and objectives? Will the primary partners i.e. the high-need LEA and IHE receive and use most of the budget?	_____ **out of 9**

Meets Standard (2-3 Pts. each)	Below Standard (0-1 Pt. each)	Component Score
Component F.1: Budget and Budget Narrative		
● The budget included provides sufficient detail 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 clearly delineate cost and details concerning expenditures	● The budget included 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	
Component F.2: Appropriateness of Budget		
● The items included in budget category is directly related to project goals. ● 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 items included in budget category is not directly related to project goals. ● 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	
Component F.3: Cost Principles		
● The budget includes approximately 6% for an evaluation ● 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 ● Indirect costs do not exceed 8% ● Program cost per teacher per hour is calculated and explained	● The budget is well under the suggested 6% for an evaluation ● Funds for key staff to participate in MSP meeting not designated ● Some items budgeted are inappropriate or not allowable uses of funding ● Indirect costs exceed 8% ● Cost per teacher per hour is not calculated and/or explained	
Reviewer Comments (please provide substantial details regarding the assigned ratings):		

Scoring Category	Possible Points	Awarded Points
Criterion A: Commitment and Capacity of Partnership	9	
Criterion B: Demonstration of Need and Research Base	12	
Criterion C: Alignment of Goals/Objectives with Professional Learning Needs	18	
Criterion D: Efficacy of Plan	32	
Criterion E: Evaluation and Accountability Plan	20	
Criterion F: Budget and Cost Effectiveness	9	
Final Score:	**100**	**Total: _____**

Reviewer's Funding Recommendations:	
☐	I recommend funding this proposal **as is**.
☐	I recommend funding this proposal with **minor** revisions.
☐	I recommend funding this proposal with **major** revisions.
Comments addressing nature of revisions anticipated and strengths of the proposal:	
☐	I **do not recommend funding** this proposal.
Comments regarding why the project should not be funded:	
☐	I certify that I have given this proposal a fair and reasonable consideration. Any possible conflicts of interest that might require my recusement from this review process is listed below.
Provide any possible conflicts of interest here:	

Appendix F: Scoring Rubric for Focal Area 2

Focal Area 2 Criterion A: Commitment and Capacity of Partnership	Points Awarded
Guiding Questions: Does the project management team have the expertise to implement and sustain a science professional learning program? Do individuals who planned the project represent the primary partners i.e. LEA and IHEs? Is there evidence that faculty from colleges of mathematics, science, and/or engineering are playing major roles in the design of the proposed program? Is there evidence that other partners, which may include education faculty, business representatives, and for-profit/non-profit representatives, are playing major roles in the design 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 establish a Project Manager who will engage the project management team in ongoing communication and decision-making, and manage fiscal responsibilities among the project partners?	_____ **out of 9**

Exceeds Standard (3 Pts. each)	Meets Standard (2 Pts. each)	Below Standard (0-1 Pt. each)	Component Score
Component A.1: Project Team Expertise			
• Strong evidence of the number and quality of staff from the primary partners to carry out the proposed activities • Qualifications are provided for key partners' staff and are strong and strategic • Evidence of the strategic advantage of partners is strong	• Adequate evidence of the number and quality of staff from the primary partners to carry out the proposed activities • Qualifications of key partners' staff are described and appear to be acceptable • Evidence of the strategic advantage of partners is vague or limited	• Little evidence of the number and quality of staff from the primary partners to carry out the proposed activities • Qualifications of key partners' staff are described but appear to be limited • Evidence of the strategic advantage of partners is limited primarily to convenience	
Component A.2: Project Team Commitment			
• Shows long term commitment of partners • Institutional resources are given in detail	• Shows commitment of partners • Institutional resources are given acceptably	• Shows somewhat limited commitment of partners • Institutional resources are given but without detail	
Component A.3: Project Management			
• Establishes regular meetings for key partners • Clearly defines responsibilities of all partners • Project manager qualifications are well-defined to ensure goals of the the project are met • The roles and responsibilities of the Project Manager are well defined and meet the expectation of an individual devoted to the management of the project at 0.5-1.0 FTE	• Project management meetings are described without established timeline • Responsibilities of some partners are defined • Project manager qualifications are partially defined to ensure goals of the the project are met • The roles and responsibilities of the Project Manager are well defined but do not meet the expectation of an individual devoted to the management of the project at 0.5-1.0 FTE	• Project management meetings are described minimally • Responsibilities of partners are poorly defined • Project manager qualifications are not addressed clearly in a way that would ensure goals of the project are met • The roles and responsibilities of the Project Manager are weak or poorly defined	
Reviewer Comments (please provide substantial details regarding the assigned ratings):			

Focal Area 2 Criterion B: Demonstration of Need and Research Base	Points Awarded

Guiding Questions: Are planned activities supported by current research on effective professional learning practices and science learning? Is that research meaningfully utilized in the design of the program? Does the proposal show evidence of a qualitative and quantitative content-driven assessment of grades 3rd-8th grades and Physical Science and Biology teacher professional learning needs? Is the current status of student achievement in science for the targeted grades and courses analyzed and disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, socio-economic, ELL & disability status in table form in order to inform the development of the project? Are other student data analyzed and used to develop the plan?

out of 12

Exceeds Standard (4 Pts. each)	Meets Standard (2-3 Pts. each)	Below Standard (0-1 Pt. each)	Component Score
Component B.1: Research Basis			
● Includes current scientifically-based research from multiple sources on effective professional learning practices ● Project design is driven by scientifically-based research regarding both: 　○ the nature of science instructional tasks that promote the exploration of natural phenomena and three-dimensional learning 　○ the nature of diagnostic assessment probes that elicit evidence of student thinking to assess progress toward three dimensional learning in science	● Includes sufficient research on effective professional learning practices ● Project design references scientifically-based research regarding both: 　○ the nature of science instructional tasks that promote the exploration of natural phenomena and three-dimensional learning 　○ the nature of diagnostic assessment probes that elicit evidence of student thinking to assess progress toward three dimensional learning	● Limited research data on effective professional learning practices is provided ● Limited scientifically-based research regarding either: 　○ the nature of science instructional tasks that promote three-dimensional learning 　○ the nature of diagnostic assessment probes that elicit evidence of student thinking to assess progress toward three dimensional learning	
Component B.2: Teacher Needs Assessment			
● Evidence of content-driven qualitative and quantitative assessment of current teacher professional learning needs ● Explicit connections are made from the current needs of teachers to the research and then to the project activities	● Evidence of content-driven assessment of current teacher professional learning needs ● Loose connections are made from the current needs of teachers to the research and then to the project activities	● Limited evidence of content-driven teacher needs assessment ● Weak or missing connections from the current needs of students to the research and then to the project activities	
Component B.3: Student Needs Assessment			
● Student achievement data in science is disaggregated in table form and analyzed in the narrative ● Explicit connections are made from the current needs of students to the research and then to the project activities	● Student achievement data in science is included and disaggregated for the targeted grades in table form ● Loose connections are made from the current needs of students to the research and then to the project activities	● Limited student achievement data in science included for the targeted grades ● Weak or missing connections from the current needs of students to the research and then to the project activities	
Reviewer Comments (please provide substantial details regarding the assigned ratings):			

Focal Area 2 Criterion C: Alignment of Goals and Objectives with Professional Learning Needs	Points Awarded
Guiding Questions: Are the proposed objectives aligned to applicable Oklahoma Academic Standards (OAS), and do they include measurable outcomes correlated to the identified needs? Do proposed strategies and activities address the identified needs? Are the objectives attainable and are they measurable? 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?	_____ **out of 18**

Exceeds Standard (5-6 Pts. each)	Meets Standard (2-4 Pts. each)	Below Standard (0-1 Pt. each)	Component Score
Component C.1: Alignment to Standards			
• Goals and objectives are specifically linked to the identified professional learning needs and aligned to applicable OAS	• Goals and objectives are generally linked to the identified professional learning needs and loosely aligned to OAS	• Goals and objectives are not correlated with the needs assessment or aligned to specific OAS	
Component C.2: Logic Model			
• The logic model clearly and convincingly illustrates how the project action plan and resources will be designed to achieve the goals and objectives	• The logic model illustrates how the project action plan and resources will be designed to achieve the goals and objectives	• The logic model does not illustrate how the project action plan and resources will be designed to achieve the goals and objectives	
Component C.3: Goals and Objectives			
• Goals and objectives are very realistic in scope and well defined related to the resources available • Objectives are all incremental, measurable, and can be evaluated both qualitatively and quantitatively	• Goals and objectives are somewhat realistic in scope and well defined related to the resources available • Objective are incremental, somewhat measurable and would be difficult to evaluate both qualitatively and quantitatively	• Goals and objectives are not realistic in scope related to the resources available • Objectives are not incremental nor measurable both qualitatively and quantitatively	
Reviewer Comments (please provide substantial details regarding the assigned ratings):			

Focal Area 2 Criterion D: Efficacy of Plan	Points Awarded
Guiding Questions: Are planned activities rigorous, content-focused, and supported by research on effective professional learning practices? Are planned activities reflective of the five elements identified in Section 3? Is there sufficient evidence to suggest the likely increase in teachers' content knowledge (TCK), strengthened ability to analyze student thinking, and further developed ability to make effective instructional decisions and improve classroom practice? Are planned activities likely to facilitate improved student achievement in science? Does the timeline sufficiently indicate that the activities of the project will be accomplished within the duration of the grant?	_____ **out of 32**

Exceeds Standard (6-8 Pts. each)	Meets Standard (3-5 Pts. each)	Below Standard (0-2 Pts. each)	Component Score
Component D.1: Plan Scope and Research			
• Planned activities are ambitious enough to create substantial change in TCK and improvement in classroom practice • Clear and detailed research-based evidence that the planned activities match the specific professional learning needs and project goals	• Planned activities are somewhat ambitious enough to create substantial and positive change in TCK and improvement in classroom practice • General description and research-base that planned activities match the specific professional learning needs and project goals	• Planned activities are weak and have limited potential of creating substantial and positive change in TCK and improvement in classroom practice • Limited or no correlation is described between the planned activities, the needs assessment, and project goals	
Component D.2: Participants and Professional Learning Plan Design			
• Clear and detailed description of how and when the partnership will carry out more than 80 hours of training per teacher for at least 60 teachers • Includes strong evidence to recruit, serve, and retain teacher cohort groups	• Acceptable description of how and when the partnership will carry out at least 80 hours of training per teacher for at least 60 teachers • Includes evidence to recruit, serve, and retain teacher cohort groups	• Limited description of how and when the partnership will carry out activities; Lacks evidence of 80 hours per teacher for at least 60 teachers • Lacks evidence of a thorough plan to recruit, serve, and retain teacher cohort groups	
Component D.3: Timeline			
• Timeline provides detailed activities • Exceptional evidence that the scope of the project has been well defined	• Timeline provides some details for activities • Sufficient evidence that the scope of the project has been well defined	• Timeline is lacking in details for activities • Minimal evidence that the scope of the project has been well defined	
Component D.4: Scale and Sustainability			
• Plan for sustaining the essential work of the program with participants and partner schools based on feedback from project evaluation is strong and feasible • Well-defined plan to continue the use of project developed resources in partner schools and to provide orientation and support for teachers new to partner schools after the grant has concluded indicating successful sustainability • Plan for utilizing project evaluation feedback to develop virtual coursework that mirrors the in-person professional development experienced by participating teachers in the program is strong and feasible	• Plan for sustaining the essential work of the program with participants and partner schools based on feedback from project evaluation is provided • Includes plan to continue the use of project developed resources in partner schools and to provide orientation and support for teachers new to partner schools after the grant has concluded • Plan for utilizing project evaluation feedback to develop virtual coursework that mirrors the in-person professional development experienced by participating teachers in the program is provided	• Plan for sustaining the essential work of the program with participants and partner schools based on feedback from project evaluation is weak or absent • Ill-defined or absent plan to continue the use of project developed resources in partner schools and to provide orientation and support for teachers new to partner schools after the grant has concluded • Plan for utilizing project evaluation feedback to develop virtual coursework that mirrors the in-person professional development experienced by participating teachers in the program is weak or absent.	
Reviewer Comments (please provide substantial details regarding the assigned ratings):			

Focal Area 2 Criterion E: Evaluation and Accountability Plan	Points Awarded
Guiding Questions: Does the evaluation plan measure the impact of the project on the specified objectives? Does the plan include personnel with expertise to implement the evaluation design? 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 pretest and posttest measures included in the plan? Does the plan employ a quasi-experimental or experimental design to measure impact of professional development on teacher content growth?	_____ **out of 20**

Exceeds Standard (4-5 Pts. each)	Meets Standard (2-3 Pts. each)	Below Standard (0-1 Pt. each)	Component Score
Component E.1: External Evaluator			
● Plan demonstrates expertise of external evaluator to use or develop valid/reliable instruments to yield quantitative and qualitative, formative and summative indicators of goal attainment	● Plan demonstrates expertise of external evaluator to use or develop valid/reliable instruments to yield quantitative and qualitative, formative and summative indicators of goal attainment	● Plan lacks intention/evidence to use an evaluator and/or instruments that will yield quantitative and qualitative indicators of project's progress	
Component E.2: Teacher Content Knowledge			
● Plan specifies multiple measures and pre- and post-test procedures to show differences in TCK	● Plan specifies pre and post procedures to show differences in TCK	● Plan lacks a plan to use procedures to show meaningful differences in teacher effectiveness	
Component E.3: Student Achievement			
● Plan includes instruments and clear method to determine impact on classroom instruction and student achievement, including student misconceptions	● Plan specifies ways to measure impact on classroom instruction and student achievement, providing limited attention to student misconceptions	● Plan weakly articulates how the partnership will measure impact on classroom instruction and student achievement, not addressing student misconceptions	
Component E.4: Broad Impact of Findings			
● Plan articulates how activities will help the MSP Program build rigorous, cumulative, reproducible, usable findings ● Plan employs a quasi-experimental or an experimental design using comparison or control groups to measure growth	● Plan specifies how learning gained from the planned activities will be utilized by the partnership and the MSP Program	● Plan lacks specification of how the learning gained from the planned activities will be utilized by the partnership	
Reviewer Comments (please provide substantial details regarding the assigned ratings):			

Focal Area 2 Criterion F: Budget and Cost Effectiveness	Points Awarded
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 detailed justification for all expenses? Do budgeted items directly relate to the project goals and objectives? Will the primary partners i.e. the high-need LEA and IHE receive and use most of the budget?	_____ **out of 9**

Meets Standard (2-3 Pts. each)	Below Standard (0-1 Pt. each)	Component Score
Component F.1: Budget and Budget Narrative • The budget included provides sufficient detail 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 clearly delineate cost and details concerning expenditures	• The budget included 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	
Component F.2: Appropriateness of Budget • The items included in budget category is directly related to project goals. • 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 items included in budget category is not directly related directly to project goals. • 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	
Component F.3: Cost Principles • The budget includes approximately 6% for an evaluation • 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 • Indirect costs do not exceed 8% • Program cost/teacher/hour is calculated and explained	• The budget is well under the suggested 6% for an evaluation • Funds for key staff to participate in MSP meeting not designated • Some items budgeted are inappropriate or not allowable uses of funding • Indirect costs exceed 8% • Cost/teacher/hour is not calculated and/or explained	
Reviewer Comments (please provide substantial details regarding the assigned ratings):		

Scoring Category	Possible Points	Awarded Points
Criterion A: Commitment and Capacity of Partnership	9	
Criterion B: Demonstration of Need and Research Base	12	
Criterion C: Alignment of Goals/Objectives with Professional Learning Needs	18	
Criterion D: Efficacy of Plan	32	
Criterion E: Evaluation and Accountability Plan	20	
Criterion F: Budget and Cost Effectiveness	9	
Final Score:	**100**	**Total: _____**

Reviewer's Funding Recommendations:	
☐	I recommend funding this proposal **as is**.
☐	I recommend funding this proposal with **minor** revisions.
☐	I recommend funding this proposal with **major** revisions.
Comments addressing nature of revisions anticipated and strengths of the proposal:	
☐	I **do not recommend funding** this proposal.
Comments regarding why the project should not be funded:	
☐	I certify that I have given this proposal a fair and reasonable consideration. Any possible conflicts of interest that might require my recusement from this review process is listed below.
Provide any possible conflicts of interest here:	

Appendix G: Scoring Rubric for Focal Area 3

Focal Area 3 Criterion A: Commitment and Capacity of Partnership	Points Awarded
Guiding Questions: Does the project management team have the expertise to implement and sustain a mathematic and science professional learning program? Do individuals who planned the project represent the primary partners i.e. LEA and IHEs? Is there evidence that faculty from colleges of mathematics, science, and/or engineering are playing major roles in the design of the proposed program? Is there evidence that other partners, which may include education faculty, business representatives, and for-profit/non-profit representatives, are playing major roles in the design 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 establish a Project Manager who will engage the project management team in ongoing communication and decision-making, and manage fiscal responsibilities among the project partners?	_____ **out of 9**

Exceeds Standard (3 Pts. each)	Meets Standard (2 Pts. each)	Below Standard (0-1 Pt. each)	Component Score
Component A.1: Project Team Expertise			
- Strong evidence of the number and quality of staff from the primary partners to carry out the proposed activities - Qualifications are provided for key partners' staff and are strong and strategic - Evidence of the strategic advantage of partners is strong	- Adequate evidence of the number and quality of staff from the primary partners to carry out the proposed activities - Qualifications of key partners' staff are described and appear to be acceptable - Evidence of the strategic advantage of partners is vague or limited	- Little evidence of the number and quality of staff from the primary partners to carry out the proposed activities - Qualifications of key partners' staff are described but appear to be limited - Evidence of the strategic advantage of partners is limited primarily to convenience	
Component A.2: Project Team Commitment			
- Shows long term commitment of partners - Institutional resources are given in detail	- Shows commitment of partners - Institutional resources are given acceptably	- Shows somewhat limited commitment of partners - Institutional resources are given but without detail	
Component A.3: Project Management			
- Establishes regular meetings for key partners - Clearly defines responsibilities of all partners - Project manager qualifications are well-defined to ensure goals of the the project are met - The roles and responsibilities of the Project Manager are well defined and meet the expectation of an individual devoted to the management of the project at 0.5-1.0 FTE	- Project management meetings are described without established timeline - Responsibilities of some partners are defined - Project manager qualifications are partially defined to ensure goals of the the project are met - The roles and responsibilities of the Project Manager are well defined but do not meet the expectation of an individual devoted to the management of the project at 0.5-1.0 FTE	- Project management meetings are described minimally - Responsibilities of partners are poorly defined - Project manager qualifications are not addressed clearly in a way that would ensure goals of the project are met - The roles and responsibilities of the Project Manager are weak or poorly defined	
Reviewer Comments (please provide substantial details regarding the assigned ratings):			

Focal Area 3 Criterion B: Demonstration of Need and Research Base	Points Awarded
Guiding Questions: Are planned activities supported by current research on effective professional learning practices and math and science learning? Is that research meaningfully utilized in the design of the program? Does the proposal show evidence of a qualitative and quantitative content-driven assessment of teacher professional learning needs? Is the current status of student achievement in math and science for the all grades and courses analyzed and disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, socio-economic, ELL & disability status in table form in order to inform the development of the project? Are other student data analyzed and used to develop the plan?	**out of 12**

Exceeds Standard (4 Pts. each)	Meets Standard (2-3 Pts. each)	Below Standard (0-1 Pt. each)	Component Score
Component B.1: Research Basis			

● Includes current scientifically-based research from multiple sources on effective professional learning practices
● Project design is driven by scientifically-based research regarding both:
  ○ effective mentoring practices in mathematics and science education
  ○ improving content and pedagogical expertise in mathematics and science teachers
	● Includes sufficient research on effective professional learning practices
	● Project design references scientifically-based research regarding both:
	  ○ the nature of science instructional tasks that promote three dimensional learning
	  ○ the nature of diagnostic assessment probes that elicit evidence of student thinking to assess progress toward three dimensional learning
		● Limited research data on effective professional learning practices is provided
		● Limited scientifically-based research regarding either:
		  ○ effective mentoring practices in mathematics and science education
		  ○ improving content and pedagogical expertise in mathematics and science teachers	

Component B.2: Teacher Needs Assessment			
● Evidence of content-driven qualitative and quantitative assessment of current teacher professional learning needs ● Explicit connections are made from the current needs of teachers to the research and then to the project activities	● Evidence of content-driven assessment of current teacher professional learning needs ● Loose connections are made from the current needs of teachers to the research and then to the project activities	● Limited evidence of content-driven teacher needs assessment ● Weak or missing connections from the current needs of students to the research and then to the project activities	
Component B.3: Student Needs Assessment			
● Student achievement data in math and science is disaggregated in table form and analyzed in the narrative ● Explicit connections are made from the current needs of students to the research and then to the project activities	● Student achievement data in math and science is included and disaggregated for the targeted grades in table form ● Loose connections are made from the current needs of students to the research and then to the project activities	● Limited student achievement data in math and science included for the targeted grades ● Weak or missing connections from the current needs of students to the research and then to the project activities	
Reviewer Comments (please provide substantial details regarding the assigned ratings):			

Focal Area 3 Criterion C: Alignment of Goals and Objectives with Professional Learning Needs	Points Awarded
Guiding Questions: Are the proposed objectives aligned to applicable Oklahoma Academic Standards (OAS), and do they include measurable outcomes correlated to the identified needs? Do proposed strategies and activities address the identified needs? Are the objectives attainable and are they measurable? 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?	**_____** **out of 18**

Exceeds Standard (5-6 Pts. each)	Meets Standard (2-4 Pts. each)	Below Standard (0-1 Pt. each)	Component Score
Component C.1: Alignment to Standards			
• Goals and objectives are specifically linked to the identified professional learning needs and aligned to applicable OAS	• Goals and objectives are generally linked to the identified professional learning needs and loosely aligned to OAS	• Goals and objectives are not correlated with the needs assessment or aligned to specific OAS	
Component C.2: Logic Model			
• The logic model clearly and convincingly illustrates how the project action plan and resources will be designed to achieve the goals and objectives	• The logic model illustrates how the project action plan and resources will be designed to achieve the goals and objectives	• The logic model does not illustrate how the project action plan and resources will be designed to achieve the goals and objectives	
Component C.3: Goals and Objectives			
• Goals and objectives are very realistic in scope and well defined related to the resources available • Objectives are all incremental, measurable, and can be evaluated both qualitatively and quantitatively	• Goals and objectives are somewhat realistic in scope and well defined related to the resources available • Objective are incremental, somewhat measurable and would be difficult to evaluate both qualitatively and quantitatively	• Goals and objectives are not realistic in scope related to the resources available • Objectives are not incremental nor measurable both qualitatively and quantitatively	
Reviewer Comments (please provide substantial details regarding the assigned ratings):			

Focal Area 3 Criterion D: Efficacy of Plan	Points Awarded
Guiding Questions: Are planned activities rigorous, content-focused, and supported by research on effective professional learning practices? Are planned activities reflective of the five elements identified in Section 3? Is there sufficient evidence to suggest the likely increase in teachers' content knowledge (TCK), strengthened ability to analyze student thinking, and further developed ability to make effective instructional decisions and improve classroom practice? Are planned activities likely to facilitate improved student achievement in math? Does the timeline sufficiently indicate that the activities of the project will be accomplished within the duration of the grant?	_____ **out of 32**

Exceeds Standard (6-8 Pts. each)	Meets Standard (3-5 Pts. each)	Below Standard (0-2 Pts. each)	Component Score
Component D.1: Plan Scope and Research			
● Planned activities are ambitious enough to create substantial change in TCK and improvement in classroom practice ● Clear and detailed research-based evidence that the planned activities match the specific professional learning needs and project goals	● Planned activities are somewhat ambitious enough to create substantial and positive change in TCK and improvement in classroom practice ● General description and research-base that planned activities match the specific professional learning needs and project goals	● Planned activities are weak and have limited potential of creating substantial and positive change in TCK and improvement in classroom practice ● Limited or no correlation is described between the planned activities, the needs assessment, and project goals	
Component D.2: Participants and Professional Learning Plan Design			
● Clear and detailed description of how and when the partnership will carry out more than 80 hours of training per teacher for at least 60 teachers ● Includes strong evidence to recruit, serve, and retain teacher cohort groups	● Acceptable description of how and when the partnership will carry out at least 80 hours of training per teacher for at least 60 teachers ● Includes evidence to recruit, serve, and retain teacher cohort groups	● Limited description of how and when the partnership will carry out activities; Lacks evidence of 80 hours per teacher for at least 60 teachers ● Lacks evidence of a thorough plan to recruit, serve, and retain teacher cohort groups	
Component D.3: Timeline			
● Timeline provides detailed activities ● Exceptional evidence that the scope of the project has been well defined	● Timeline provides some details for activities ● Sufficient evidence that the scope of the project has been well defined	● Timeline is lacking in details for activities ● Minimal evidence that the scope of the project has been well defined	
Component D.4: Scale and Sustainability			
● Plan for sustaining the essential work of the program with participants and partner schools based on feedback from project evaluation is strong and feasible ● Well-defined plan to continue the use of project developed resources in partner schools and to provide orientation and support for teachers new to partner schools after the grant has concluded indicating successful sustainability ● Plan for utilizing project evaluation feedback to develop virtual coursework that mirrors the in-person professional development experienced by participating teachers in the program is strong and feasible	● Plan for sustaining the essential work of the program with participants and partner schools based on feedback from project evaluation is provided ● Includes plan to continue the use of project developed resources in partner schools and to provide orientation and support for teachers new to partner schools after the grant has concluded ● Plan for utilizing project evaluation feedback to develop virtual coursework that mirrors the in-person professional development experienced by participating teachers in the program is provided	● Plan for sustaining the essential work of the program with participants and partner schools based on feedback from project evaluation is weak or absent ● Ill-defined or absent plan to continue the use of project developed resources in partner schools and to provide orientation and support for teachers new to partner schools after the grant has concluded ● Plan for utilizing project evaluation feedback to develop virtual coursework that mirrors the in-person professional development experienced by participating teachers in the program is weak or absent.	
Reviewer Comments (please provide substantial details regarding the assigned ratings):			

Focal Area 3 Criterion E: Evaluation and Accountability Plan	Points Awarded
Guiding Questions: Does the evaluation plan measure the impact of the project on the specified objectives? Does the plan include personnel with expertise to implement the evaluation design? 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 pretest and posttest measures included in the plan? Does the plan employ a quasi-experimental or experimental design to measure impact of professional development on teacher content growth?	_____ **out of 20**

Exceeds Standard (4-5 Pts. each)	Meets Standard (2-3 Pts. each)	Below Standard (0-1 Pt. each)	Component Score
Component E.1: External Evaluator			
● Plan demonstrates expertise of external evaluator to use or develop valid/reliable instruments to yield quantitative and qualitative, formative and summative indicators of goal attainment	● Plan demonstrates expertise of external evaluator to use or develop valid/reliable instruments to yield quantitative and qualitative, formative and summative indicators of goal attainment	● Plan lacks intention/evidence to use an evaluator and/or instruments that will yield quantitative and qualitative indicators of project's progress	
Component E.2: Teacher Content Knowledge			
● Plan specifies multiple measures and pre- and post-test procedures to show differences in TCK	● Plan specifies pre and post procedures to show differences in TCK	● Plan lacks a plan to use procedures to show meaningful differences in teacher effectiveness	
Component E.3: Student Achievement			
● Plan includes instruments and clear method to determine impact on classroom instruction and student achievement, including student misconceptions	● Plan specifies ways to measure impact on classroom instruction and student achievement, providing limited attention to student misconceptions	● Plan weakly articulates how the partnership will measure impact on classroom instruction and student achievement, not addressing student misconceptions	
Component E.4: Broad Impact of Findings			
● Plan articulates how activities will help the MSP Program build rigorous, cumulative, reproducible, usable findings ● Plan employs a quasi-experimental or an experimental design using comparison or control groups to measure growth	● Plan specifies how learning gained from the planned activities will be utilized by the partnership and the MSP Program	● Plan lacks specification of how the learning gained from the planned activities will be utilized by the partnership	
Reviewer Comments (please provide substantial details regarding the assigned ratings):			

Focal Area 3 Criterion F: Budget and Cost Effectiveness	Points Awarded
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 detailed justification for all expenses? Do budgeted items directly relate to the project goals and objectives? Will the primary partners i.e. the high-need LEA and IHE receive and use most of the budget?	**_____** **out of 9**

Meets Standard (2-3 Pts. each)	Below Standard (0-1 Pt. each)	Component Score
Component F.1: Budget and Budget Narrative		
● The budget included provides sufficient detail 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 clearly delineate cost and details concerning expenditures	● The budget included 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	
Component F.2: Appropriateness of Budget		
● The items included in budget category is directly related to project goals. ● 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 items included in budget category is not directly related directly to project goals. ● 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	
Component F.3: Cost Principles		
● The budget includes approximately 6% for an evaluation ● 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 ● Indirect costs do not exceed 8% ● Program cost/teacher/hour is calculated and explained	● The budget is well under the suggested 6% for an evaluation ● Funds for key staff to participate in MSP meeting not designated ● Some items budgeted are inappropriate or not allowable uses of funding ● Indirect costs exceed 8% ● Cost/teacher/hour is not calculated and/or explained	
Reviewer Comments (please provide substantial details regarding the assigned ratings):		

Scoring Category	Possible Points	Awarded Points
Criterion A: Commitment and Capacity of Partnership	9	
Criterion B: Demonstration of Need and Research Base	12	
Criterion C: Alignment of Goals/Objectives with Professional Learning Needs	18	
Criterion D: Efficacy of Plan	32	
Criterion E: Evaluation and Accountability Plan	20	
Criterion F: Budget and Cost Effectiveness	9	
Final Score:	**100**	**Total: _____**

Reviewer's Funding Recommendations:	
☐	I recommend funding this proposal **as is**.
☐	I recommend funding this proposal with **minor** revisions.
☐	I recommend funding this proposal with **major** revisions.
Comments addressing nature of revisions anticipated and strengths of the proposal:	
☐	I **do not recommend funding** this proposal.
Comments regarding why the project should not be funded:	
☐	I certify that I have given this proposal a fair and reasonable consideration. Any possible conflicts of interest that might require my recusement from this review process is listed below.
Provide any possible conflicts of interest here:	

Appendix H: Professional Development Standards for the Teacher

Learning Communities

Standard 1: Professional development that improves the learning of all students organizes adults into learning communities whose goals are aligned with those of the school and district.

Objective 1.1: The teacher meets regularly with colleagues during the school day to plan instruction.

Objective 1.2: The teacher aligns collaborative work with school improvement goals.

Objective 1.3: The teacher participates in learning teams, some of whose membership extends beyond the school.

Leadership

Standard 2: Professional development that improves the learning of all students requires skillful school and district leaders who guide continuous instructional improvement.

Objective 2.1: The teacher participates in instructional leadership development experiences.

Objective 2.2: The teacher serves in a variety of instructional leadership roles.

Objective 2.3: The teacher contributes to the planning of school-based professional learning.

Objective 2.4: The teacher articulates the intended results of professional development programs on teacher practice.

Objective 2.5: The teacher advocates for support of professional development.

Objective 2.6: The teacher articulates the benefits of professional learning.

Resources

Standard 3: Professional development that improves the learning of all students requires resources to support adult learning and collaboration.

Objective 3.1: The teacher participates in professional development during the workday.

Objective 3.2: The teacher accesses funds to support learning priorities.

Objective 3.3: The teacher receives external and internal support related to learning priorities.

Data-Driven

Standard 4: Professional development that improves the learning of all students uses disaggregated student data to determine adult learning priorities, monitor progress, and help sustain continuous improvement.

Objective 4.1: The teacher analyzes disaggregated student data to identify adult learning priorities at the classroom, school, and district levels.

Objective 4.2: The teacher analyzes a variety of disaggregated data to identify learning need of professionals.

Objective 4.3: The teacher works with colleagues to use disaggregated data to establish professional learning goals.

Objective 4.4: The teacher analyzes relevant student data in order to monitor and revise school and classroom improvement strategies.

Evaluation

Standard 5: Professional development that improves the learning of all students uses multiple sources of information to guide improvement and demonstrate its impact.

Objective 5.1: The teacher contributes a variety of data to evaluate the impact of professional development.

Objective 5.2: The teacher collects and analyzes classroom data to determine the impact of professional development.

Research-Based

Standard 6: Professional development that improves the learning of all students prepares educators to apply research to decision making.

Objective 6.1: The teacher uses educational research when making instructional decisions.

Design
>
> Standard 7: Professional development that improves the learning of all students uses learning strategies appropriate to the intended goal.
>> Objective 7.1: The teacher participates in a variety of appropriate professional development designs aligns with expected improvement outcomes.
>> Objective 7.2: The teacher participates in long-term and in-depth professional learning.
>> Objective 7.3: The teacher implements new classroom practices as a result of follow-up support.
>> Objective 7.4: The teachers uses technology as a component of professional learning when appropriate.

Learning
>
> Standard 8: Professional development that improves the learning of all students applies knowledge about human learning and change.
>> Objective 8.1: The teacher participates in professional development that mirrors expected instructional methods.
>> Objective 8.2: The teacher participates in professional learning that impacts depth of understanding.
>> Objective 8.3: The teacher participates in a variety of professional development experiences appropriate to career stage.
>> Objective 8.4: The teacher engages in professional development that considers participant concerns about new practices.

Collaboration
>
> Standard 9: Professional development that improves the learning of all students provides educators with the knowledge and skills to collaborate.
>> Objective 9.1: The teacher participates in a school culture that is characterized by collegiality and shared responsibility.
>> Objective 9.2: The teacher develops knowledge about effective group process.
>> Objective 9.3: The teacher collaborates successfully with colleagues.
>> Objective 9.4: The teacher uses effective conflict management skills with colleagues.
>> Objective 9.5: The teacher uses technology to support collegial interactions.

Equity
>
> Standard 10: Professional development that improves the learning of all students prepares educators to understand and appreciate all students, create safe, orderly, and supportive learning environments, and hold high expectations for their academic achievement.
>> Objective 10.1: The teacher analyzes the impact of attitude, background, culture, and social class on the teaching process.
>> Objective 10.2: The teacher develops skills that communicate high expectations for each student.
>> Objective 10.3: The teacher establishes a learning environment that is emotionally and physically safe.
>> Objective 10.4: The teacher demonstrates respect and appreciation for students and families and for their cultural backgrounds.

Quality Teaching
>
> Standard 11: Professional development that improves the learning of all students deepens educators' content knowledge, provides them with research-based instructional strategies to assist students in meeting rigorous academic standards, and prepares them to use various types of classroom assessments appropriately.
>> Objective 11.1: The teacher demonstrates a deep understanding of subject matter that helps students to meet rigorous standards.
>> Objective 11.2: The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies that help students meet rigorous standards.
>> Objective 11.3: The teacher uses various classroom assessment strategies to monitor student progress toward meeting standards.

<u>Family Involvement</u>

Standard 12: Professional development that improves the learning of all students provides educators with knowledge and skills to involve families and other stakeholders appropriately.

Objective 12.1: The teacher develops partnerships with families and other community stakeholders.

Objective 12.2: The teacher implements strategies to increase family and caregiver involvement.

Objective 12.3: The teacher uses technology to increase communication between school and home about student learning.