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# Cover Sheet and Score Summary

Lead Agency:  **Maryland State Department of Education**

Program Title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Agency and Title of Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Review Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**SCORE SUMMARY**

Section Minimum Level Required Level

Extent of Need 2 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Goals, Outcomes, Milestones 2 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Plan of Operation 2 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Evidence of Impact 2 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Management Plan / Key Personnel 2 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Future Plans and Sustainability 2 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Budget Narrative 2 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

TOTAL AVERAGE SCORE \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

# Requirements

Proposals for funding must contain the following to be considered for funding:

* An application shall identify a signed partnership agreement among at least one county board, one teacher preparation program, and one exclusive employee representative to form a teacher collaborative to design and implement at least two of the following:
  + A 21st century practicum for teacher candidates that requires:
    - Prospective teachers to complete the equivalent of a full school year of practical teaching experience;
    - A county board and teacher preparation program jointly to identify placements for a teacher candidate;
    - Compensation for mentor teachers supervising and coaching teacher candidates; and
    - Public schools offering the practicum must be organized in a career ladder system as it is described in Education Articles [§6-1001](https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Laws/StatuteText?article=ged&section=6-1001&enactments=false) through [§6-1007](https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Laws/StatuteText?article=ged&section=6-1007&enactments=False&archived=False), and consist of diverse student bodies.
    - Preference will be given to programs that strengthen the teacher pipeline by recruiting from within communities to bring diversity into schools.
  + A professional development program for existing teachers in one or more of the following:
    - Culturally responsive pedagogy, content knowledge, and best practices in teaching diverse students and communicating with diverse student families, including individuals of all races, religions, sexual orientations, and gender identities;
    - Evaluation and effective use of research, data, and high–quality instructional materials, including digital resources and technology, to improve student performance;
    - Effective management of student behavior, including training in the use of restorative practices and trauma–informed approaches to meet student needs;
    - Conducting assessments of typical learning challenges for a student and methods to help the student overcome those challenges, including effective tools and strategies to meet the needs of students with disabilities and implement individualized education programs and 504 plans; and
    - Recognition of student mental health disorders
    - Preference will be given to programs that provide professional development in multiple areas.
* A peer assistance and review program that includes:
  + Implementation of a career ladder in schools as it is described in Education Articles [§6-1001](https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Laws/StatuteText?article=ged&section=6-1001&enactments=false) through [§6-1007](https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Laws/StatuteText?article=ged&section=6-1007&enactments=False&archived=False) where lead teachers or distinguished teachers on the ladder mentor new teachers and support existing teachers who are struggling or low performing;
  + An effective teacher evaluation system to provide rigorous, reliable, and relevant feedback for educators that is aligned with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Five Core Propositions as required in Education Article [§6-1010](https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Laws/StatuteText?article=ged&section=6-1010&enactments=true);
  + A teacher evaluation system developed under this paragraph shall define the knowledge and skills expected, utilize documented performance measures to provide personalized feedback, and is linked to student learning outcomes;
  + Requires stakeholders, teachers, and evaluators to be fully trained to understand the evaluation process, and requires the competency of the evaluator to be assessed; and
  + Includes post-observation conferences between the teacher and evaluator to encourage reflection of the teacher’s teaching practice.
* State-of-the-art professional education for prospective and current teachers that reflects international and national best practices, and that can be replicated in local school systems across the State.
* Evidence that collaboration among partners is a common thread among all decisions, planning, and implementation efforts.

The signed partnership agreement must be signed by all partners and meet the following provisions:

* A method for regularly communicating and collaborating including, if necessary, through memoranda of understanding on timeline, calendars, schedules, budget, payroll, billing procedures, etc.
* The Local Education Agency (LEA) and Educator Preparation Program (EPP) will align calendars to the greatest extent possible, to ensure that the 21st century practicum for teacher candidates is equivalent to a full school year (if applicable).
* The LEA and the EPP commit to working jointly to identify practicum placements as required in Education Article §6-120 and a mentor teacher for the candidate (if applicable).
* The LEA agrees to compensate mentor teachers.
* Prioritize time for the steering committee members to convene.
* Develop a means of sharing data as it pertains to the successful implementation and evaluation of the Teacher Collaborative Grant program.
* The LEA commits to school stability and agrees to alert the Teacher Collaborative Grant Program Monitor of any change in school leadership and will consider any change in leadership as a continuation of grant activities.
* The LEA and the exclusive employee representative will collaborate on matters that pertain to the career ladder as it is described in Education Articles §6-1001 through §6-1007, which was established by the Blueprint for Maryland’s Future.
* The exclusive employee representative commits to providing input on the design and implementation of the career ladder in the partner school.

Use this page to make comments about the proposal in general or to address concerns not addressed elsewhere in the rubric.

# Scoring Rubric

Proposals must demonstrate a **minimum level of 2** for each of the following areas to be considered for funding.

## Extent of Need

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Level 3 | Level 2 | Level 1 |
| The extent of need is well articulated and includes citations of research to support the need for the project, uses national, state, and local data to support the need for the solution, and documents current or past efforts to address the problem and where those efforts either failed or were inadequate. | The extent of need is articulated, and data is presented to support the narrative, but data is limited to one or two sources and does not discuss current or past efforts to address the problem. | The extent of need is not articulated clearly and/or the data cited does not support the narrative. |

Level: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Strengths and weaknesses:

## Goals, Outcomes, and Milestones

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Level 3 | Level 2 | Level 1 |
| Outcomes are aligned with the requirements of the Blueprint for Maryland’s Future and the stated need and establish a clear and coherent set of reasonable and ambitious milestones and goals, using local baseline data. Goals, milestones, and outcomes are likely to be replicable across the State. | Outcomes are aligned with the requirements of the Blueprint for Maryland’s Future and the stated need, but not all goals and milestones are aligned with the proposed outcomes or may not be ambitious or realistic. Goals, milestones, and outcomes are likely to be replicable across the State. | Outcomes do not align with the requirements established by the Blueprint for Maryland’s Future, do not align with the stated need, may lack milestones or links to goals, and/or are unlikely to be implemented within a designated timeframe. |

Level: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Strengths and weaknesses:

## Measuring Success

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Level 3 | Level 2 | Level 1 |
| The criteria for defining the success of the project is well-articulated using data-driven metrics, multiple outcomes, and realistic success targets aligned to the evidence of impact, and there is a well-defined process identified for ensuring collaborative partners stay on track with stated goals, outcomes, and success criteria. | The criteria for defining the success of the project is clearly identified using data-driven metrics, multiple outcomes, and realistic success targets aligned to the evidence of impact. | The criteria for defining success does not include data-driven metrics and/or multiple outcomes to evaluate the success or failure of the project. |

## Plan of Operation

|  |
| --- |
| Part I. Professional development for existing teachers in key focus areas. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Level 3 | Level 2 | Level 1 |
| Professional development activities align with multiple focus areas of the grant, reflects international and national best practices with citations to existing research, and are likely to be replicable across local education agencies. The program is clearly built on a well-articulated collaborative effort. | Professional development activities align with at least one of the focus areas of the grant, reflect international and national best practices but rely on partners outside of the collaborative to implement the program. Professional development activities are likely to be replicable across local education agencies and collaboration is evident between partners. | Proposed professional development activities do not align with the grant’s focus areas and/or do not reflect international and national best practices. |

Level: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Does the program provide professional development in multiple areas?

Strengths and weaknesses:

|  |
| --- |
| Part II. 21st century practicum for teacher candidates |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Level 3 | Level 2 | Level 1 |
| The practicum is equivalent to a full school year, there is a well-articulated plan to organize partner schools in a career ladder system as described in the Blueprint for Maryland’s Future, and collaboration between partners is evident. Practicum activities are focused on evidence-based interventions and research-driven practices and are likely to be replicable across local education agencies. | The practicum is equivalent to a full school year, mentors are compensated, and there is a plan to organize partner schools in a career ladder system as described in the Blueprint for Maryland’s Future. Collaboration between partners is evident and practicum activities are likely to be replicable across local education agencies. | The practicum is not equivalent to a full school year, mentors are not compensated, and/or there is no clear plan to organize partner schools in a career ladder system as described in the Blueprint for Maryland’s Future. |

Level: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Does the program strengthen the teacher pipeline by recruiting from within communities to bring diversity into schools?

Strengths and weaknesses:

|  |
| --- |
| Part III. A peer assistance and review program |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Level 3 | Level 2 | Level 1 |
| The teacher evaluation system is consistent with [§6-1010](https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Laws/StatuteText?article=ged&section=6-1010&enactments=true), utilizes documented performance measures to provide personalized feedback that is aligned with the teacher’s strengths, needs, and professional learning context, includes a plan to ensure that all stakeholders are trained to understand the evaluation process, and is likely to be replicable across local education agencies. There is a well-developed plan to organize participating schools in a career ladder system as described in the Blueprint for Maryland’s Future, and collaboration between partners is evident. | The teacher evaluation system is consistent with [§6-1010](https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Laws/StatuteText?article=ged&section=6-1010&enactments=true), includes a plan to ensure that all stakeholders are trained to understand the evaluation process, and is likely to be replicable across local education agencies. There is a clear plan to organize participating schools in a career ladder system as described in the Blueprint for Maryland’s Future and collaboration between partners is evident. | The teacher evaluation system is not consistent with Md. Code Education [§6-1010](https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Laws/StatuteText?article=ged&section=6-1010&enactments=true) and/or there is no clear plan to organize participating schools in a career ladder system as described in the Blueprint for Maryland’s Future. |

Level: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Strengths and weaknesses:

## Evidence of impact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Level 3 | Level 2 | Level I |
| The proposed plan and strategies are evidence-based with multiple citations to high-quality research and data is provided demonstrating prior success in achieving desired outcomes by a collaborative partner. | The proposed plan and strategies are evidence-based with clear citations to high-quality research. | The proposed plan and strategies are not based on evidence supported by high quality research and/or there are no citations included. |

Level: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Strengths and weaknesses:

## Management Plan / Key Personnel

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Level 3 | Level 2 | Level 1 |
| The signed partnership clearly articulates the roles, responsibilities, and contributions of key personnel, the time devoted to the project is shared similarly across partners and collaboration is evident. The steering committee represents all major stakeholders, the meeting schedule allows for adequate oversight and the plan clearly outlines the responsibility of the members. | The signed partnership outlines the roles, responsibilities, and contributions of key personnel, including qualifications and time devoted to the project. The steering committee represents all major stakeholders and meeting dates are identified in the proposal. | The signed partnership agreement does not adequately outline the roles, responsibilities, and contributions of key personnel and/or the steering committee governing the project does not represent the major stakeholders in the project. |

Level: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Strengths and weaknesses:

## Future Plans and Sustainability

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Level 3 | Level 2 | Level 1 |
| Describes a sustainability plan that furthers or expands the work amongst partners beyond the grant period to include a plan for future funding. | Addresses the need for a sustainability plan but does include specific information nor demonstrate commitment for funding beyond the grant period. | Future plans to sustain the project are not addressed. |

Level: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Strengths and weaknesses:

## Budget and Budget Narrative

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Level 3 | Level 2 | Level 1 |
| The budget clearly reflects the program activities described in the application and justifies all expenses, which are reasonable, cost-effective, and integrate other sources of funding. | The budget reflects the program activities described in the application and adequately justifies most expenses. | The budget does not reflect the activities described in the application, does not include an explanation of the costs, and/or has numerous errors. |

Level: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Strengths and weaknesses: