

**OHIO DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PROGRAM
FY 2016 PROPOSAL RATING RUBRIC**

Please submit completed form electronically in Microsoft WORD or Adobe Acrobat .pdf

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY

PROPOSAL ID NUMBER

16-

REVIEWER ID NUMBER

REVISED RATING SCALE FOR ITQ FY 2016 PROPOSALS

To provide emphasis on certain sections of the proposal, a categorical rating scale will be used. Each section of the proposal is listed according to the rating scale to be used.

0-3 RATING SCALE	0-5 RATING SCALE	0-7 RATING SCALE
0 – Non Responsive	0 – Non Responsive	0 – Non Responsive
1 – Poor	1 – Poor	1 - Poor
2 – Good	2 – Fair	2 - Fair
3 – Outstanding	3 – Good	3 - Moderate
	4 – Very Good	4 - Good
	5 - Outstanding	5 – Very Good
		6 – Excellent
		7 - Outstanding
PROPOSAL SECTIONS		
A. Proposal Format		
	B. Cooperative Planning Document and Collaborative Structure	
	C. Demonstrated Need and the Improvement of Instruction	
		D. Goals and Anticipated Outcomes
		E. Operations Planning and Proposed Activities
	F. Alignment with Ohio Learning Standards and Ohio Standards for Professional Development	
	G. Impact of Previous Project(s) (if applicable)	
	H. Plan for Recruitment of Participants	
		I. Evaluation Plan
	J. Replication and Dissemination	
	K. & L. Proposal Budget Summary and Budget Explanation	
M. Curricula Vitae		
N. Current Funded Projects and Pending Proposals		
O. References Cited		
P. Additional Emphasis		
		Part II: Overall Proposal Quality

**OHIO DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PROGRAM
FY 2016 PROPOSAL RATING RUBRIC**

Please submit completed form electronically in Microsoft WORD or Adobe Acrobat .pdf

0-3 Rating Scale	0-5 Rating Scale	0-7 Rating Scale
0 – Non Responsive	0 – Non Responsive	0 – Non Responsive
1 – Poor	1 – Poor	1 – Poor
2 – Good	2 – Fair	2 – Fair
3 – Outstanding	3 – Good	3 – Moderate
	4 – Very Good	4 – Good
	5 – Outstanding	5 – Very Good
		6 - Excellent
		7 - Outstanding

PART I – Please enter **rating in the **yellow box/cell** to the left of each item and provide evaluative comments in the larger box below the criteria for each item. Comments may be shared with the project directors.**

0-3 Rating Scale

A. PROPOSAL FORMAT

- Proposal format meets the requirements provided in Section VI. Proposal Format in the RFP.
- Proposal is complete, informative, and includes: (A) Cover Page with signatures; (B) Abstract; (C) Cooperative Planning Document and Collaborate Structure with signatures; (D) All requisite elements in Narrative provided in Section V. Preparation of Proposal (Table of Contents, Demonstrated Need and the Improvement of Instruction, Goals and Anticipated Outcomes, Operations Planning and Proposed Activities, Alignment with Ohio Learning Standards and Ohio Standards for Professional Development, Impact of Previous Project(s), Plan for Recruitment of Participants, Evaluation Plan and Replication and Dissemination).

Comments:

0-5 Rating Scale

B. COOPERATIVE PLANNING DOCUMENT AND COLLABORATIVE STRUCTURE

Proposal must include:

- identification of the three principal partner members;
- a description of the role and contribution of the teacher education unit, the arts and science unit, the high-need LEA and others involved in the partnership;
- demonstration of collaboration and planning, including meeting dates, places and participants; and
- verification of electronic signatures from all partners involved in the project planning.

Comments:

**OHIO DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PROGRAM
FY 2016 PROPOSAL RATING RUBRIC**

Please submit completed form electronically in Microsoft WORD or Adobe Acrobat .pdf

0-3 Rating Scale	0-5 Rating Scale	0-7 Rating Scale
0 – Non Responsive	0 – Non Responsive	0 – Non Responsive
1 – Poor	1 – Poor	1 – Poor
2 – Good	2 – Fair	2 – Fair
3 – Outstanding	3 – Good	3 – Moderate
	4 – Very Good	4 – Good
	5 – Outstanding	5 – Very Good
		6 - Excellent
		7 - Outstanding

0-5 Rating Scale

C. DEMONSTRATED NEED AND THE IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION

Proposal must include evidence of:

- specific content that the project would address and the significance of these needs, including the alignment to the Ohio Learning Standards;
- data relative to qualifying as a high-need LEA, as defined in Section III. Program Guidelines, A. Eligible Partnerships;
- research-based evidence that the project design and evaluation would produce measurable improvement in teacher content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge and classroom practice;
- research-based evidence that the project design and evaluation would provide measurable increases in PK-12 student learning;
- a project design that would meet the needs and improve participation rates of under-qualified and out-of-field teachers; and
- the project’s ability to serve as a model that other colleges or universities and schools could use to meet similar local needs.

Comments:

0-7 Rating Scale

D. GOALS AND ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES

Proposal must include evidence of:

- goals and anticipated outcomes that utilize a Logic Model to assess the causal relationships between the elements of the program and the goals and anticipated outcomes, including outcomes for the educator participants and the PK-12 students they teach;
- goals that are specific, measurable and realistic for the term of project. Measurement must include Ohio School Report Card and School Achievement Data; and
- anticipated outcomes that address the effect of the project on the understanding and performance of the target audience and also address anticipated outcomes of student achievement. Outcomes must be demonstrated through Ohio School Report Card and School Achievement Data.

Comments:

**OHIO DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PROGRAM
FY 2016 PROPOSAL RATING RUBRIC**

Please submit completed form electronically in Microsoft WORD or Adobe Acrobat .pdf

0-3 Rating Scale	0-5 Rating Scale	0-7 Rating Scale
0 – Non Responsive	0 – Non Responsive	0 – Non Responsive
1 – Poor	1 – Poor	1 – Poor
2 – Good	2 – Fair	2 – Fair
3 – Outstanding	3 – Good	3 – Moderate
	4 – Very Good	4 – Good
	5 – Outstanding	5 – Very Good
		6 - Excellent
		7 - Outstanding

0-7 Rating Scale



E. OPERATIONS PLANNING AND PROPOSED ACTIVITIES

Proposal must include a:

- rationale for the proposed activities, describing how the project director would accomplish the project goals;
- detailed description of the proposed activities including:
 - instructional content (e.g., subject matter, teaching strategies and student assessment techniques);
 - timeline and roles/responsibilities chart;
 - relationship to project goals; and
 - number of contact hours and credit hours offered;
- description of the type of follow-up sessions planned, including the number of days and contact hours; and
- research-based evidence that the proposed activities would meet specific and realistic needs of teachers and schools in the principal partner high need LEA.

Comments:

0-5 Rating Scale



F. ALIGNMENT WITH OHIO LEARNING STANDARDS AND OHIO STANDARDS FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- Proposal must include a detailed description of how goals, outcomes, and activities align with Ohio Learning Standards, Ohio Achievement Assessment outcomes and Ohio Standards for Professional Development.

Comments:

**OHIO DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PROGRAM
FY 2016 PROPOSAL RATING RUBRIC**

Please submit completed form electronically in Microsoft WORD or Adobe Acrobat .pdf

0-3 Rating Scale	0-5 Rating Scale	0-7 Rating Scale
0 – Non Responsive	0 – Non Responsive	0 – Non Responsive
1 – Poor	1 – Poor	1 – Poor
2 – Good	2 – Fair	2 – Fair
3 – Outstanding	3 – Good	3 – Moderate
	4 – Very Good	4 – Good
	5 – Outstanding	5 – Very Good
		6 - Excellent
		7 - Outstanding

0-5 Rating Scale

G. IMPACT OF PREVIOUS PROJECT(S) (if applicable)

- If the proposed project is an expansion or continuation of an earlier project conducted by the Project Director or the proposing college or university, specific evidence shows that the previously funded project improved teachers' content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge and classroom practice.
- If the proposed project is an expansion or continuation of an earlier project, additional quantitative and qualitative evidence demonstrate that the previously funded project increased PK-12 student learning outcomes as the result of teacher participation.
- If the proposed project is intended to serve the same schools or districts, historical evidence shows improved teacher knowledge and increased PK-12 student learning.
- If the previous project is still in progress, updated information of the accomplishments to date has been provided.

Comments:

0-5 Rating Scale

H. PLAN FOR RECRUITMENT OF PARTICIPANTS

Proposal must include evidence of:

- a detailed strategy, timetable, and method for recruiting teacher participants from the principal partner high-need LEA and other schools;
- plans for recruitment of under-qualified and/or out-of-field teachers; and a
- projection of the number of participants who would be served by the project.

As relevant, the proposal may include evidence of:

- inclusion of teachers of children with special needs or limited English proficiency;
- plans to recruit participants from several high-need LEAs from surrounding counties; and/or
- plans for recruitment of participants from the same schools if the proposed project is an expansion or continuation of an earlier project.

Comments:

**OHIO DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PROGRAM
FY 2016 PROPOSAL RATING RUBRIC**

Please submit completed form electronically in Microsoft WORD or Adobe Acrobat .pdf

0-3 Rating Scale	0-5 Rating Scale	0-7 Rating Scale
0 – Non Responsive	0 – Non Responsive	0 – Non Responsive
1 – Poor	1 – Poor	1 – Poor
2 – Good	2 – Fair	2 – Fair
3 – Outstanding	3 – Good	3 – Moderate
	4 – Very Good	4 – Good
	5 – Outstanding	5 – Very Good
		6 - Excellent
		7 - Outstanding

0-7 Rating Scale



I. EVALUATION PLAN

Proposal must include:

- Internal and External Evaluation Plans that include appropriate measures/data sources for each output and outcome related to impact on PK-12 student learning;
- research basis (with citations) for the evaluation plan design;
- a description of the data analysis methods, and timelines for data collection and analysis; and
- projections of improvement over baseline data, including citations for the basis of these projections.
 - Outcomes must include but are not limited to:
 - student achievement on focus content through State assessments or valid and reliable student tests administered by the LEA; and
 - teacher content knowledge.

Proposal must detail an **Internal Evaluation Plan**, including:

- means or methods for evaluating project objectives, processes or instruments to be used, how baseline data are to be obtained, how improvement goals are set;
 - Required elements include:
 - formative and summative feedback from teachers on the content and pedagogy included in summer and academic year activities;
 - description of validity and reliability measures of any non-State assessments administered by the LEA; and
 - commitment from LEAs to conduct standardized tests and provide access to student scores for purposes of program evaluation.
- a description of internal evaluation team members and their respective roles in the evaluation; and
- plan timeline, beginning with the gathering and reporting of baseline data.

Proposal must detail an **External Evaluation Plan** that includes all elements of the Internal Evaluation Plan in addition to the following:

- assurance that the external evaluator does not have close ties to the project or project director; and
- inclusion of the curriculum vitae for the external evaluator.

Comments:

**OHIO DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PROGRAM
FY 2016 PROPOSAL RATING RUBRIC**

Please submit completed form electronically in Microsoft WORD or Adobe Acrobat .pdf

0-3 Rating Scale	0-5 Rating Scale	0-7 Rating Scale
0 – Non Responsive	0 – Non Responsive	0 – Non Responsive
1 – Poor	1 – Poor	1 – Poor
2 – Good	2 – Fair	2 – Fair
3 – Outstanding	3 – Good	3 – Moderate
	4 – Very Good	4 – Good
	5 – Outstanding	5 – Very Good
		6 – Excellent
		7 – Outstanding

0-5 Rating Scale

J. REPLICATION AND DISSEMINATION

Proposal must include evidence of:

- methods and/or plans for replication of exemplary features; and
- plans for dissemination of results to other educators.

Comments:

0-5 Rating Scale

K. (K. AND L.) BUDGET SUMMARY AND BUDGET EXPLANATION

Proposal must include:

- the itemized budget that reflects both Ohio Department of Higher Education-requested support and any cost-sharing and/or in-kind support;
- a narrative for each expenditure in the budget, including the time involvement, roles, and responsibilities of the project director and staff members;
- any cost-sharing (e.g., university in-kind support, school district support, leveraged funds from other state and national sources); and
- adherence to Special Rule - "no single participant in an eligible partnership may use more than 50 percent of the funds made available to the partnership."

Comments:

**OHIO DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PROGRAM
FY 2016 PROPOSAL RATING RUBRIC**

Please submit completed form electronically in Microsoft WORD or Adobe Acrobat .pdf

0-3 Rating Scale	0-5 Rating Scale	0-7 Rating Scale
0 – Non Responsive	0 – Non Responsive	0 – Non Responsive
1 – Poor	1 – Poor	1 – Poor
2 – Good	2 – Fair	2 – Fair
3 – Outstanding	3 – Good	3 – Moderate
	4 – Very Good	4 – Good
	5 – Outstanding	5 – Very Good
		6 - Excellent
		7 - Outstanding

0-3 Rating Scale

M. CURRICULA VITAE

Proposal must include:

- curriculum vitae for each of the following: project director, college or university faculty, project staff, external evaluator, graduate students, and teacher leaders who have a major role in the project;
- contact information (mobile number and email address) for all key personnel and the external evaluator; and
- listings of publications, papers, abstracts, and honors related to the proposed project.

Comments:

0-3 Rating Scale

N. CURRENT FUNDED PROJECTS AND PENDING PROPOSALS (if applicable)

The proposal provides:

- a list of current funded projects and pending proposals in which the project director and the associated staff members are involved.
 - Details include: Title of project, project period, percent of individual's annual time or support, total award, and funding agency.

Comments:

**OHIO DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PROGRAM
FY 2016 PROPOSAL RATING RUBRIC**

Please submit completed form electronically in Microsoft WORD or Adobe Acrobat .pdf

0-3 Rating Scale	0-5 Rating Scale	0-7 Rating Scale
0 – Non Responsive	0 – Non Responsive	0 – Non Responsive
1 – Poor	1 – Poor	1 – Poor
2 – Good	2 – Fair	2 – Fair
3 – Outstanding	3 – Good	3 – Moderate
	4 – Very Good	4 – Good
	5 – Outstanding	5 – Very Good
		6 – Excellent
		7 – Outstanding

0-3 Rating Scale

O. REFERENCES CITED

The proposal provides:

- a list of all scientifically-based research cited that support the proposal design, including references for any materials cited in the narrative.

Comments:

0-3 Rating Scale

P. ADDITIONAL EMPHASES

The extent to which the proposal provides the following elements:

- plan to scale up a previously funded project or to replicate and/or disseminate a previously funded project in other regions of the state;
- ways to help teachers assess student performance in the context of the project’s activities;
- appropriate meeting site that encourages teacher participation from the principal partner high-need LEA;
- plan to recruit participants from several high-need LEAs from the surrounding counties (Refer to Appendix II);
- plan to recruit teams of teachers from the same school or district;
- deployment of highly qualified teachers in the planning of, assistance with and instruction of the project’s activities;
- historical evidence of improvement in teachers’ content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and classroom practice; and/or
- historical evidence of increased PK-12 student learning outcomes as the result of teacher participation in previously funded projects.

Comments:

**OHIO DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PROGRAM
FY 2016 PROPOSAL RATING RUBRIC**

Please submit completed form electronically in Microsoft WORD or Adobe Acrobat .pdf

0-3 Rating Scale	0-5 Rating Scale	0-7 Rating Scale
0 – Non Responsive	0 – Non Responsive	0 – Non Responsive
1 – Poor	1 – Poor	1 – Poor
2 – Good	2 – Fair	2 – Fair
3 – Outstanding	3 – Good	3 – Moderate
	4 – Very Good	4 – Good
	5 – Outstanding	5 – Very Good
		6 – Excellent
		7 – Outstanding

PART II - Overall Proposal Quality

0-7 Rating Scale



OVERALL PROPOSAL QUALITY

This score represents the rater's *overall* evaluation of the proposal's quality.

Points to Consider:

- Is the proposal well-written, organized, and complete?
- Is there evidence of collaboration between all of the partners?
- Does it meet the real needs of teachers from designated High-Need LEA schools?
- Does the proposed project support sustained and intensive high quality professional development activities for teachers that are aligned with Ohio Learning Standards, Ohio Achievement Assessment outcomes and Ohio Standards for Professional Development?
- Is the proposed project well-conceived?
- Is the dollar cost per participant reasonable?
- Is there a strong potential for success with long-term impact on our educational system?
- Does the project have the potential to serve as a model for high quality professional development?
- Is the project consistent with major reform efforts in STEM and other relevant content areas?
- Is the project consistent with scientifically-based research?
- Is there a realistic evaluation plan to measure **teacher participant outcomes**?
- Is there a realistic evaluation plan to measure PK-12 **student learning outcomes** as the result of teacher participation?

Comments:

**OHIO DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PROGRAM
FY 2016 PROPOSAL RATING RUBRIC**

Please submit completed form electronically in Microsoft WORD or Adobe Acrobat .pdf

Total Part I (Sections A-P)	Total Part II (Overall Proposal Quality)	Total of G & N (Applies to Previous Funded Proposals Only)	Overall Total Categories applicable to <i>all</i> Proposals Part I + Part II – (G + N)

Check	Overall Recommendation from Reviewer
	I recommend this proposal for funding.
	I recommend this proposal for funding <i>pending revisions to budget and/or geographic reach of high need districts.</i>
	I do not recommend this proposal for funding (an Overall Total of 40 points or less).