

**2014-2015 Mathematics Science Partnership Competitive Grant
Scoring Rubric**

To be competitive, each criterion must rate at least a “2.” However, to become highly competitive, proposals must also include elements rated “3.” The bottom right hand corner of each cell indicates where information on that particular criterion will most likely to be found. Projects will be funded from high score to low score until the money runs out. Proposals that have not met one or more of the criteria will not be considered for funding on the first round. If there is money left after competitive and highly competitive applications have been funded, the rest of the proposals may be asked to resubmit after correcting weaknesses.

Plan of Work

The proposal convincingly demonstrates how the planned activities are expected to **deepen teachers' content knowledge, promote strong teaching skills** so that they are able to **improve student academic achievement** for all students and **close achievement gaps**. A sufficiently detailed and realistic management plan is included that describes a minimum of 50 hours of activities per year that propose to improve the mathematics content knowledge and teaching skills of K-8 teachers utilizing the Intel® Math professional development program; K-12 teachers with the goal of integrating mathematics, science and engineering; or K-5 teachers utilizing Math Recovery. Opportunities are available to support the individual learning needs of participants. **Continuing** proposals provide reviewers with a succinct summary of the current project; what has been learned from this work so far, including evaluation outcomes for teachers and students, and modifications made based on early evaluation findings; and a description of a plan that explains how the proposed professional development will and should continue the work already started, including how the lessons learned will be incorporated into the project.

- Not met Competitive (2 pts) Highly Competitive (3 pts)

[Narrative, Management Plan]

Partnership

A partnership with **STEM faculty, eligible schools and Math/Science Centers** is clearly evident throughout the proposal. The proposal describes how the partners will share the work and how their work will be integrated into the on-going work of both the local schools and the departments of the STEM faculty. The submitting team's expertise in the content area and the capacity to manage the project, organize the work, and meet deadlines is evident.

- Not met Competitive (2 pts) Highly Competitive (3 pts)

[Management Plan, Partner Information, Appendix]

Needs Assessment

The proposal describes the teacher **professional development needs** of each **eligible** building, supported with qualitative and/or quantitative data and how the proposed activities will address these needs. A description of how this project fits into the school improvement plan(s) of the **eligible** school(s) is included and supported with academic goals from the school improvement plan of each eligible school or district.

- Not met Competitive (2 pts)

[Partner Information]

Program Alignment

There is evidence that the activities **align** with the state standards in mathematics and science, and with other educational reform activities that promote student academic achievement in mathematics. There is also evidence that the project activities are aligned with the Michigan Department of Education [Standards for Professional Learning](#).

- Not met Competitive (2 pts)

[Program Alignment]

**2014-2015 Mathematics Science Partnership Competitive Grant
Scoring Rubric**

Sustainability

The proposal describes how the partnership will continue the activities funded under this part after the original grant period has expired and encourage teacher participants to continue activities related to the project in their classroom and school.

- Not met Competitive (2 pts)

[Sustainability]

Evaluation Plan

The evaluation design describes a **rigorous evaluation methodology**. Appropriate and rigorous measures of **teacher and student content learning** are identified as are measures of change in teachers' classroom instruction and the **narrowing of any achievement gap**. Also included are meaningful measures of impact on Mathematics/Science Center(s), STEM partners, and other partners as appropriate; and intended timeline for evaluation activities. In **continuation** proposals, the evaluation builds on successes evidenced by data collected in the original grant proposal, which should include outcomes for both teachers and students from the original program.

- Not met Competitive (2 pts) Highly Competitive (3 pts)

[Research/Evaluation Design Abstract]

Budget Detail

The proposed budget has sufficient detail, is realistic for the described plan and enables the partnership to obtain the expected outcomes.

- Not met Competitive (2 pts) Highly Competitive (3 pts)

[Budget, Management Plan]

Maximum of 18 points