



MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NOTICE OF FUNDING AVAILABILITY
REVIEW CRITERIA AND SCORING RUBRIC
Teacher Collaborative Grant Program

LEAD AGENCY: _____

PROPOSAL TITLE: _____

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: _____

Name of Reviewer: _____

Review Signature _____ Date _____

SCORE SUMMARY

<u>Section</u>	<u>Maximum Score</u>	<u>Reviewer's Score</u>
Extent of Need	5	_____
Goals, Objectives, Milestones	10	_____
Plan of Operation	20	_____
Evaluation/Dissemination	20	_____
Management Plan/Key Personnel	20	_____
Integration with Education Reform	10	_____
Future Plans and Sustainability	5	_____
<u>Budget Narrative</u>	<u>10</u>	_____
TOTAL SCORE	100	_____

Review Criteria Requirements:

Teacher Collaborative Grant Program

All proposals must meet the following requirements to be considered for funding (check all requirements met by this proposal).

- The Collaboratives who receive funding will develop state-of-the-art professional education for prospective and current teachers that reflect 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.
- Partners shall develop a method for regularly communicating and collaborating with local school systems, including, if necessary, through financial memoranda of understanding, to strengthen teacher preparation, induction, and professional development programs.
- The Collaboratives who receive funding will implement a career ladder in schools in which the practicum or peer assistance and review program is offered, as it is described in Education Article §6-123.
- 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 design for teacher candidates;
 - A professional development program for new and existing teachers; or
 - A peer assistance and review program

Priorities:

Priority will be given to projects whose designs incorporate one or more of the following priorities (check all that apply).

- Evidence that the teacher collaborative is in furtherance of the purpose of the program.
- A teacher collaborative that addresses all three of the design items in their application: a professional development program for existing teachers, a 21st-century practicum, and a peer assistance and review program to support induction and mentoring programs that use an effective teacher evaluation system.
- A teacher collaborative that uses Lead Teachers, Distinguished Teachers, and Professor Distinguished teachers holding National Board Certification.
- A teacher collaborative that has at least two cohorts completing the 21st century practicum
- A teacher collaborative in which partners have co-equal Principal Investigator status and co-develop the program design features

Comments:

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

Comments:

Review Criteria
Extent of Need (5 points)

Teacher Collaborative Grant Program

Criteria

- Clearly states the problem.
- Uses national data relevant to the problem.
- Uses local data relevant to the problem.
- Uses multiple data sources (e.g. teachers, parents, students).
- Uses both quantitative (e.g. test scores, absentee rates) and qualitative (e.g. survey results, focus groups) data.
- Identifies target population.
- Supports the problem with properly cited research.
- Identifies the factors contributing to the problem.
- Demonstrates that other efforts to correct the problem are ineffective or inadequate.
- Discusses the applicant’s history and expertise in dealing with the problem
- Demonstrates an urgent need to deal with the problem.

SCORING RUBRIC:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT (5 total points)

<p>Exemplary (In addition to meeting all conditions listed in “Meets Standard”) Points: 4-5</p>	<p>Meets Standard (Meets all conditions listed for each criterion) Points: 2-3</p>	<p>Does not meet Standard (Does not meet one or more of the conditions listed for each criterion) Points: 0-1</p>
<p>Clearly states the main problem, cites research supporting the need for the project, and addresses the issues facing teacher education reform as noted in the 2019 Interim Report by the Kirwan Commission Policy Area 2 with a depth of understanding and prioritizes an action plan to address them.</p> <p>Notes multiple factors contributing to the needs/problems associated with the problem.</p> <p>Uses qualitative and quantitative data from multiple sources to support the need for solutions.</p> <p>Uses either only national, state, or local data (including MD Report Card) to accurately depict and document the problem.</p>	<p>States main problem and cites research to support the need for the project.</p> <p>Makes note of the need/problems of teacher education reform but only uses one source of data to support the narrative.</p> <p>Identifies a singular way to implement professional education plans.</p> <p>Uses either only national, state, or local data or multiple data sources (teachers, students, parents, etc.) but not all support the need for solutions.</p> <p>Acknowledges the urgency of the problem.</p>	<p>Does not articulate a clearly-defined problem</p> <p>Does not use data to support narrative.</p> <p>Does not address the targeted population and needs.</p> <p>Does not see the need/problem as urgent.</p>

Review Criteria**Teacher Collaborative Grant Program**

Fully documents current or past efforts to address the problem and where those efforts either failed or were inadequate to address total need and discuss applicant's record in dealing with this problem.	Mentions current or past efforts to address the problem but does not discuss where they failed or were inadequate to address total need in dealing with this problem.	
--	---	--

Points Assigned: _____

Strengths and weaknesses:

**Review Criteria
Goals, Objectives, and Milestones (10 points)**

Teacher Collaborative Grant Program

Criteria:

- Outcomes address the problem(s) identified in the needs assessment.
- Outcomes are established for each of the client groups identified in the needs assessment and the plan of operation.
- Goal(s), objective(s) and milestones are clearly stated.
- Goal(s), objective(s) and milestones are measurable.
- Goal(s), objective(s) and milestones provide a local baseline of comparison by which to judge progress.
- Goal(s), objective(s) and milestones are both ambitious and realistic.
- Goal(s) have long term deadlines.
- Objectives have annual deadlines.
- Objectives measure progress towards the goal(s).
- Milestone deadlines are set periodically during the year.
- Milestones measure progress towards the objectives(s).

SCORING RUBRIC:

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, and MILESTONES (10 total points)

<p>Exemplary (In addition to meeting all conditions listed in “Meets Standard”) Points: 8-10</p>	<p>Meets Standard (Meets all conditions listed for each criterion) Points: 5-7</p>	<p>Does not meet Standard (Does not meet one or more of the conditions listed for each criterion) Points: 0-4</p>
<p>Identifies multiple goals, objectives and milestones and includes a clear narrative to achieve these goals.</p> <p>Goals, objectives, and milestones are measurable and make a direct connection to the problem facing education reform and the recommendations made by the Kirwan Commission in the 2019 Interim Report in Policy Area 2.</p> <p>Outcome statements are clear and tell how the project’s target population would improve.</p> <p>Establishes a clear and coherent calendar of deadlines.</p> <p>Establishes a clear and coherent set of reasonable and ambitious</p>	<p>Lists only goals and objectives, but not deadlines or milestones.</p> <p>Goals, objectives, and milestones are measurable, relate to the problem, but connect loosely to the recommendations made by the Kirwan Commission in the 2019 Interim Report in Policy Area 2.</p> <p>Notes outcomes but is not specific to how they tie into the problem.</p> <p>Establishes a calendar of deadlines.</p> <p>Establishes milestones with reasonable and ambitious targets.</p>	<p>Does not identify a goal with objectives and milestones.</p> <p>Does not address the required deadlines or milestones.</p> <p>Any goals identified do not reflect the need/problem, and do not align to the Teacher Collaborative grant requirements established by the Blueprint for Maryland’s Future.</p>

Review Criteria

Teacher Collaborative Grant Program

milestones including local baseline data.		
---	--	--

Points Assigned: _____

Strengths and weaknesses:

**Review Criteria
Plan of Operation (20 points)**

Teacher Collaborative Grant Program

Criteria

- ❑ Strategies are directly linked to objectives.
- ❑ Strategies are supported by clearly stated rationales or properly cited research and are likely to result in the stated outcomes.
- ❑ Strategies work cohesively to address the problem(s) stated in the Extent of Need.
- ❑ All activities provide direct service to clients.
- ❑ All activities are linked to specific strategies.
- ❑ Dates are indicated for each activity.

SCORING RUBRIC:

PLAN OF OPERATION (20 total points)

While only two components are required for consideration, bonus points are awarded for proposals which implement all three components (possible 30 points total for this section).

Part I. (10 points) Professional development for existing teachers in one or more of the following areas:		
-Culturally responsive pedagogy and best practices in teaching diverse students and communication 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 assessment 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 -Recognition of student mental health disorders		
Exemplary (In addition to meeting all conditions listed in “Meets Standard”) Points: 8-10	Meets Standard (Meets all conditions listed for each criterion) Points: 5-7	Does not meet Standard (Does not meet one or more of the conditions listed for each criterion) Points: 0-4
A teacher collaborative develops state-of-the-art professional education for prospective and current teachers that reflects international and national best practices. A teacher collaborative develops extensive models of professional development programs that can be replicated in local school systems. The Professional Development model is built on a collaborative effort with teachers on the career ladder and faculty at the teacher	A teacher collaborative does not fully develop state-of-the-art professional education for prospective and current teachers that reflect international or national best practices. A teacher collaborative does not fully develop extensive models of professional development programs, and they cannot be fully replicated in all local school system(s). The professional development program utilizes existing teachers	A teacher collaborative develops professional education for prospective and current teachers but does not reflect international and national best practices. A teacher collaborative develops a model of professional development programs, but it cannot be replicated in local school systems. The professional development program relies on experts outside the partners to conduct the training.

Review Criteria**Teacher Collaborative Grant Program**

<p>preparation program to serve as experts in the field.</p> <p>The Professional Development Program provides training and education in all the areas above.</p>	<p>and faculty, but collaboration is not evident.</p> <p>The Professional Development Program provides training and education in at least two of the areas above.</p>	<p>The professional development program does not provide training and education in the areas above.</p>
--	---	---

Points Assigned: _____

Strengths and weaknesses:

Part II. (10 points) 21st century practicum for teacher candidates		
Exemplary (In addition to meeting all conditions listed in “Meets Standard”) Points: 8-10	Meets Standard (Meets all conditions listed for each criterion) Points: 5-7	Does not meet Standard (Does not meet one or more of the conditions listed for each criterion) Points: 0-4
<p>Partner schools are organized in a career ladder system described in HB1300 <i>Blueprint for Maryland’s Future</i> and consist of diverse student bodies.</p> <p>A practicum design for teacher candidates focuses on evidence-based interventions and research-driven practices.</p> <p>A practicum design requires a full school year (180 days) and is designed within the existing degree requirements.</p> <p>A practicum is explicit that a county board and teacher preparation program will jointly identify a placement for a teacher candidate and compensate a mentor teacher to supervise and coach the teacher candidate.</p> <p>Public school faculty who are Professor Distinguished Teachers will hold appointments to teach as clinical or adjunct faculty at the teacher preparation program.</p> <p>Members of the public school faculty who are Lead or Distinguished Teachers on the career ladder are responsible for designing the public school’s induction and mentoring new teachers and struggling teachers. It</p>	<p>Partner schools are not organized in a career ladder system as it is described in HB1300 <i>Blueprint for Maryland’s Future</i>, or do not consist of diverse student bodies.</p> <p>A practicum design for teacher candidates shows some attention to evidence-based interventions and research-driven practices.</p> <p>A practicum is designed within the existing degree requirements but does not require a full school year of experience (180 days).</p> <p>A practicum does not include a county board and teacher preparation program jointly to identify a placement for a teacher candidate or does not compensate a mentor teacher to supervise and coach the teacher candidate.</p> <p>Public school faculty who are Professor Distinguished Teachers are required to hold appointments to teach as clinical or adjunct faculty at the teacher preparation program, but there is no plan on how the Collaborative will achieve this.</p> <p>Members of the public school faculty who are Lead or Distinguished Teachers are either responsible for designing the public school’s induction or mentoring new and struggling</p>	<p>Partner schools are not organized in a career ladder system as described in HB1300 <i>Blueprint for Maryland’s Future</i> and do not consist of diverse student bodies.</p> <p>A practicum design for teacher candidates has minimal application of evidence-based interventions and research-driven practices.</p> <p>A practicum does not require a full school year (180 days).</p> <p>A practicum does not include a county board and teacher preparation program jointly to identify a placement for a teacher candidate, nor does it compensate a mentor teacher to supervise and coach the teacher candidate.</p> <p>Public school faculty does not include Professor Distinguished Teachers on the career ladder.</p> <p>Members of the public school faculty who are Lead or Distinguished Teachers on the career ladder are not responsible for designing the public school’s induction program, and mentoring new and struggling teachers.</p>

Review Criteria**Teacher Collaborative Grant Program**

is clear that these teachers must be Nationally Board Certified.	teachers. It is not explicitly stated that these teachers must be Nationally Board Certified.	
--	---	--

Points Assigned: _____

Strengths and weaknesses:

Part III. (10 points) A peer assistance and review program		
Exemplary (In addition to meeting all conditions listed in “Meets Standard”) Points: 8-10	Meets Standard (Meets all conditions listed for each criterion) Points: 5-7	Does not meet Standard (Does not meet one or more of the conditions listed for each criterion) Points: 0-4
<p>Public schools in which the program is implemented are organized in a career ladder system and consist of diverse student bodies.</p> <p>Lead or Distinguished Teachers on the career ladder are responsible for mentoring new and struggling teachers.</p> <p>An effective teacher evaluation system is consistent with Subsection 6-1010 of HB 1300 <i>Blueprint for Maryland’s Future</i> and COMAR 13A.07.04 <i>Evaluation of Professional Certificated Personnel</i> and provides actionable feedback grounded in data for educators to improve their professional practice.</p> <p>The teacher evaluation system clearly defines the skills expected of a teacher and utilizes documented performance measures to provide personalized feedback that is aligned with the teacher’s strengths, needs, and professional learning context.</p> <p>The program uses a peer observation-based process to evaluate a teacher that is linked to learning outcomes.</p> <p>The competency of the evaluator is assessed, and all stakeholders are</p>	<p>Public schools in which the program is implemented are not organized in a career ladder system, or do not consist of diverse student bodies.</p> <p>Lead or Distinguished Teachers on the career ladder are not responsible for mentoring new and struggling teachers.</p> <p>An effective teacher evaluation system is consistent with Subsection 6-1010 of HB 1300 <i>Blueprint for Maryland’s Future</i> and COMAR 13A.07.04 <i>Evaluation of Professional Certificated Personnel</i> but does not provide actionable feedback grounded in data for educators to improve their professional practice.</p> <p>The teacher evaluation system clearly defines the skills expected of a teacher but does not adequately utilize documented performance measures to provide personalized feedback that is aligned with the teacher’s strengths, needs, and professional learning context.</p> <p>The program uses a peer observation-based process to evaluate a teacher or is linked to learning outcomes.</p>	<p>Public schools in which the program is implemented are not organized in a career ladder system and do not consist of diverse student bodies.</p> <p>Lead or Distinguished Teachers on the career ladder are not responsible for mentoring new and struggling teachers</p> <p>A teacher evaluation system is not consistent with Subsection 6-1010 of HB 1300 <i>Blueprint for Maryland’s Future</i> and COMAR 13A.07.04 <i>Evaluation of Professional Certificated Personnel</i> and does not provide actionable feedback grounded in data for educators to improve their professional practice.</p> <p>The teacher evaluation system does not clearly define the skills expected of a teacher but does not utilize any documented performance measures to provide personalized feedback that is aligned with the teacher’s strengths, needs, and professional learning context.</p> <p>The program doesn’t use a peer observation-based process to evaluate a teacher and is not linked to learning outcomes.</p>

Review Criteria

Teacher Collaborative Grant Program

<p>fully trained to understand the evaluation process.</p> <p>The program design includes post-observation conferences between the teacher and evaluator to encourage reflection of the teacher’s teaching practice.</p> <p>Public school faculty who are Professor Distinguished Teachers will hold appointments to teach as clinical or adjunct faculty at the teacher preparation program.</p>	<p>The competency of the evaluator is assessed, or all stakeholders are fully trained to understand the evaluation process.</p> <p>The program design includes post-observation conferences between the teacher and evaluator but does not encourage reflection of the teacher’s teaching practice.</p> <p>Public school faculty who are Professor Distinguished Teachers are required to hold appointments to teach as clinical or adjunct faculty at the teacher preparation program, but there is no plan on how the Collaborative will achieve this.</p>	<p>The competency of the evaluator is not assessed, nor are all stakeholders fully trained to understand the evaluation process.</p> <p>The program design does not include post-observation conferences between the teacher and evaluator and does not encourage reflection of the teacher’s teaching practice.</p> <p>Public school faculty does not include Professor Distinguished Teachers on the career ladder.</p>
---	--	---

Points Assigned: _____

Strengths and weaknesses:

**Review Criteria
Evaluation and Dissemination Plan (20 Points)**

Teacher Collaborative Grant Program

Criteria:

- Clearly states what questions will be answered by the evaluation.
- Calls for final and ongoing evaluations.
- Uses appropriate methods that measure progress toward achieving objectives (formative) and measure relevant outcomes at the end of the project period (summative).
- Describes all evaluation activities and assigns responsibility for each.
- Evaluates the success towards completion of the outcomes.
- Evaluates how and why the project succeeded or failed.
- Establishes a baseline of data.
- Collects all necessary data, and states how they are to be collected, who will collect them and when they are to be collected.
- Collects both quantitative and qualitative data.
- Collects data from a variety of sources (parents, teachers, students, etc.)
- Employs multiple collection methods (surveys, student records, etc.).
- Identifies evaluators and states their qualifications.
- Identifies all major stakeholders and establishes appropriate methods for disseminating evaluation results to all of them.
- Calls for the completion and submission of quarterly reports, annual reports, and a comprehensive final report.
- Calls for the budgeting of resources for the evaluation and dissemination.

SCORING RUBRIC:

EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION (20 total points)

<p>Exemplary (In addition to meeting all conditions listed in “Meets Standard”) Points: 14-20</p>	<p>Meets Standard (Meets all conditions listed for each criterion) Points: 7-13</p>	<p>Does not meet Standard (Does not meet one or more of the conditions listed for each criterion) Points: 0-6</p>
<p>Clearly states well-developed evaluation questions and outlines the methods to measure formative and summative progress that will be answered.</p> <p>Evaluates data collected to reflect and refine the project.</p> <p>Collects and evaluates qualitative and quantitative data from multiple sources with multiple collection methods.</p> <p>Evaluates the success toward completion of the outcomes.</p>	<p>Clearly states evaluation questions that will be answered.</p> <p>Data collection is not demonstrated to inform future decisions.</p> <p>Partially evaluates the success toward completion of the outcomes.</p> <p>Identifies a few outcomes to evaluate success or failure of the project.</p> <p>Demonstrates completion and submission of all reporting deadlines.</p>	<p>Limited statement and development of evaluation questions.</p> <p>Data collection is limited.</p> <p>Limited to no evaluation of the success toward completion of the outcomes.</p> <p>Limited identified measures of success or failure.</p> <p>Limited demonstration of meeting reporting requirements.</p> <p>Limited budgetary resources for evaluation and/or qualified personnel.</p>

Review Criteria**Teacher Collaborative Grant Program**

Identifies multiple outcomes to evaluate success or failure of the project. Identifies evaluators and all major stakeholders and demonstrates dissemination plan.	Budgets resources for evaluation and dissemination.	
--	---	--

Points Assigned: _____

Strengths and weaknesses:

**Review Criteria
Management Plan/Key Personnel (20 points)**

Teacher Collaborative Grant Program

Criteria:

- Identifies all partners and establishes roles, responsibilities and donations of each to the project.
- Partners’ responsibilities and contributions are reiterated in a letter of commitment.
- Establishes a steering committee, discusses duties, and sets meeting dates.
- Lists steering committee members and states the expertise of each.
- All major stakeholder groups have representation on the steering committee.
- Lists of all key personnel with descriptions of duties, qualifications, and percentages of time dedicated to the project.
- Identifies a project director dedicating appropriate time to the project (e.g. 25%).
- Résumés are provided for each key personnel that reiterate the qualifications presented in this section.
- Job qualifications are provided for all to-be-hired key personnel.
- Presents a clear organizational structure with a steering committee providing active oversight.
- Includes a detailed management plan worksheet, listing all major management actions, assigning responsibility for each action, and assigning dates for each.
- Timeline contains all key elements from the implementation, management and evaluation plans.
- Timeline is presented in the form of a Gantt chart.
- Timeline demonstrates adequate scheduling for the completion of all tasks.

SCORING RUBRIC:

MANAGEMENT PLAN / KEY PERSONNEL (20 total points)

<p>Exemplary (In addition to meeting all conditions listed in “Meets Standard”) Points: 14-20</p>	<p>Meets Standard (Meets all conditions listed for each criterion) Points: 7-13</p>	<p>Does not meet Standard (Does not meet one or more of the conditions listed for each criterion) Points: 0-6</p>
<p>Identifies multiple management systems to track progress of the project.</p> <p>Monitors the timeline to meet the deadlines to complete the project.</p> <p>Defined Steering Committee that states the expertise of each member and clear organizational structure with active oversight.</p> <p>Roles, responsibilities, and donations of time are shared similarly across all partners.</p> <p>All partners are represented in the management plan, and collaboration is evident.</p> <p>Letters of commitment are provided and describe level of partners’</p>	<p>Limited monitored timeline to complete the project.</p> <p>Defined steering committee with all major stakeholders represented and meeting dates established.</p> <p>Key personnel and project director are identified with duties, qualifications, and percentages of time dedicated to the project.</p> <p>Some partners are represented in key personnel, but collaboration is not evident.</p> <p>Letters of commitment are provided for each partner.</p>	<p>Does not identify measures of tracking the progress of the project.</p> <p>Does not follow a plan to fulfill the deadlines and timeline.</p> <p>Steering committee does not include all major stakeholders or have a reasonable set of meeting dates.</p> <p>All partners are not represented in key personnel. Collaboration is not evident.</p>

Review Criteria

Teacher Collaborative Grant Program

responsibilities and contributions to the project.		
--	--	--

Points Assigned: _____

Strengths and weaknesses:

Review Criteria
Integration with Educational Reform (10 points)

Teacher Collaborative Grant Program

Criteria:

- Describes how this project is part of overall education reform.
- Describes how the project supports local school systems’ standards and initiatives.
- Describes how the project helps meet the goals of the *Blueprint for Maryland’s Future* and supports state standards and initiatives.
- Describes how the project supports national standards and initiatives.
- Describes how this project enhances and shares resources with current efforts or projects.
- Describes how the project could coordinate with future projects and increase efficiency and cost effectiveness.

SCORING RUBRIC:

INTEGRATION WITH EDUCATIONAL REFORM (10 total points)

Exemplary (In addition to meeting all conditions listed in “Meets Standard”) Points: 8-10	Meets Standard (Meets all conditions listed for each criterion) Points: 5-7	Does not meet Standard (Does not meet one or more of the conditions listed for each criterion) Points: 0-4
Identifies specific standards and initiatives. Describes resources and shares resources with current efforts or projects to increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness. Effectively links specific state, national, and local goals and objectives to extend and support HB1300 <i>Blueprint for Maryland’s Future</i> .	Identifies specific goals and objectives aligned to federal, state, and local standards and initiatives. Mentions standards and initiatives without being specific. Describes resources, but does not fully share resources with current efforts or projects. Loosely addresses specific state, national, and local standards, and initiatives to extend and support HB1300 <i>Blueprint for Maryland’s Future</i> .	Does not address standards or initiatives at any level. Does not describe resources or share resources with current efforts or projects. Does not link specific state, national, and local standards and initiatives to extend and support HB1300 <i>Blueprint for Maryland’s Future</i> .

Points Assigned: _____

Strengths and weaknesses:

Review Criteria
Future Plans and Sustainability (5 points)

Teacher Collaborative Grant Program

Criteria:

- Presents a plan for the project in event of reduced funding.
- Demonstrates commitment for funding successful elements of the project.
- Does not overly rely on acquisition of future grant awards.
- Demonstrates partners’ dedication to maintaining an active partnership beyond the grant period.
- Demonstrates that successful elements of the project will continue past the grant period.

SCORING RUBRIC:

FUTURE PLANS (5 total points)

Exemplary (In addition to meeting all conditions listed in “Meets Standard”) Points: 4-5	Meets Standard (Meets all conditions listed for each criterion) Points: 2-3	Does not meet Standard (Does not meet one or more of the conditions listed for each criterion) Points: 0-1
<p>Has a stated commitment to a sustainability plan that furthers the work amongst active partners in all of the following:</p> <p>Presents a plan in case of reduced funding.</p> <p>Demonstrates commitment for funding.</p> <p>Does not rely on acquisition of future grant awards.</p> <p>Demonstrates partners’ dedication beyond the grant period.</p>	<p>Addresses the need for a sustainability plan, but without specifics in at least two of the following:</p> <p>Presents a plan in case to reduce funding.</p> <p>Demonstrates commitment for funding.</p> <p>Does not rely on acquisition of future grant awards.</p> <p>Demonstrates partners’ dedication beyond the grant period.</p>	<p>Does not address the need for sustainability in the following:</p> <p>Presents a plan in case to reduce funding.</p> <p>Demonstrates commitment for funding.</p> <p>Does not rely on acquisition of future grant awards.</p> <p>Demonstrates limited partners’ dedication beyond the grant period.</p> <p>Demonstrates the continuity within the grant period.</p>

Points Assigned: _____

Strengths and weaknesses:

**Review Criteria
Budget Narrative (10 points)**

Teacher Collaborative Grant Program

Criteria:

- Provides a budget narrative justifying all expenses not clearly justified in the project narrative.
- Presents an explanation as to how all costs are reasonable and within current market value.
- Presents an adequate explanation as to the cost-effectiveness of the budget.
- Organizes line items by appropriate budget categories (i.e. “objects”), and provides totals for each category.
- Contains no vague line items. All line items are for specific expenses.
- All line items contain the calculations used to derive the expected cost.
- Covers all expenses implied or stated in the project narrative and budget narrative.
- Includes only those expenses clearly stated in the project narrative or budget narrative.
- Presents all requested funds and in-kind contributions for the total cost of the project.
- Follows the prescribed format (see NOFA).
- Indirect costs are calculated at a reasonable rate.
- Budget contains no mathematical errors.

SCORING RUBRIC:

BUDGET NARRATIVE (10 total points)

<p>Exemplary (In addition to meeting all conditions listed in “Meets Standard”) Points: 8-10</p>	<p>Meets Standard (Meets all conditions listed for each criterion) Points: 5-7</p>	<p>Does not meet Standard (Does not meet one or more of the conditions listed for each criterion) Points: 0-4</p>
<p>Projects budget through completion of grant in the following requirements:</p> <p>Provides a budget narrative justifying all expenses as they relate to the purpose of the grant.</p> <p>Presents a clear explanation of costs and demonstrates cost-effectiveness.</p> <p>Organizes line items by the budget categories and provides totals for each category.</p> <p>All line items contain the calculations used to derive the expected cost.</p> <p>Presents all requested funds and in-kind contributions for the total cost of the project.</p>	<p>Limited projection of budget through completion of grant in at least two of the following:</p> <p>Provides a budget narrative justifying most expenses, some items don’t align to the purpose of the grant.</p> <p>Presents a vague explanation of costs and cost-effectiveness.</p> <p>Organizes line items by the budget categories and provides totals for each category.</p> <p>Most line items contain the calculations used to derive the expected cost.</p> <p>Presents all requested funds and in-kind contributions for the total cost of the project.</p>	<p>Does not project budget through completion of grant in the following requirements:</p> <p>Provides a budget narrative, but many expenses are not justified.</p> <p>There are gaps in explanation of costs and lacks demonstration of cost-effectiveness.</p> <p>Organizes line items by the budget categories and provides totals for each category.</p> <p>Calculations are not shown to derive the expected cost.</p>

Points Assigned: _____

Strengths and weaknesses:

