

**Texas Regional Collaboratives
Mathematics and Science RFA 2012-2013 Grants**

SCORING RUBRIC

The purpose of the rubric is to identify each applicant's ability to provide services to their teaching and learning communities consistent with the goals of Texas Regional Collaboratives. A total score of 235 points is possible.

This rubric outlines the priorities of the TRC in funding both new and existing Regional Collaboratives. Applicants are encouraged to use this tool as a guide in developing a program that will enable them to focus their resources on addressing these priorities.

Each successive section of the rubric scoring scale includes all the criteria of the previous lower score in addition to those cited in higher scoring categories.

The term "secondary teachers" refers to middle and high school teachers in grades 6-12.

**Texas Regional Collaboratives
Mathematics and Science RFA 2012-2013 Grants**

SCORING RUBRIC (continued)

Points ✓	Item Description	Minimal (0-5)	Fair (6 -10)	Good (11 -15)	Excellent (16 - 20)
NARRATIVE					
20	Project Overview, Summer Institute, Online Professional Development	Summary is present but lacking detail.	The narrative is limited and goals, targeted levels, and major activities and content focus do not appear to be well matched.	Goals are clearly stated and description is thorough. Content focus is paramount. If online PD is included, it clearly advances goals of project.	Comprehensive, coherent Professional Development Program is clearly and thoroughly presented. Goals of the program are clearly stated, targeted levels and major activities are well thought out and match the stated goals. Value-add for TEA modules is explicitly addressed if applicable.
20	Mentoring Activities, Plan for Cadre Members	Summary is incomplete, poorly written.	The narrative is lacking detail regarding priorities for CMs and how mentoring will be carried out.	Goals are clearly stated and description is thorough both for Immersion and Non-Immersion campuses.	Comprehensive, coherent Professional Development Program is clearly presented. Addressed areas are thorough, clear, and descriptive. Goals of the program are clearly stated, targeted levels and major activities are well thought out and match the stated goals.
20	Project Evaluation	Objectives listed, measure of teacher content knowledge clearly described.	Objectives listed, teacher content, teacher practice and student achievement addressed in the assessment, and instruments or metrics used are clearly explained.	Clearly describes plan for collection of student data at the teacher level and at immersion campuses with detail regarding agreement with districts/teachers and data collection protocols.	The plan includes a quasi-experimental design with analysis of comparison group student data at the teacher level for all teacher mentors and campus level for immersion campuses

**Texas Regional Collaboratives
Mathematics and Science RFA 2012-2013 Grants**

ADDITIONAL PROGRAM DESCRIPTION					
20	Instructional Timeline Support Docs: <i>Partner letters</i> <i>Teacher Application</i>	Appears to be a laundry list of options rather than a coherent plan.	All required PD is planned, but may be lacking focus. Instructional timeline allows for 100 hours to be earned by STMs and MTMs. Includes at least 40 hours in summer 2012. 40 hours of required content for mentors is addressed.	Opportunities for additional hours are offered but not excessive to allow for flexibility. Timeline clearly specifies both training that is required of all MTMs or STMs and training that is optional. Training opportunities are focused.	Instructional plan reflects goals stated in the narrative and recruitment letters. Plan is clear in focus and completion by mentors and Cadre Members is feasible. Cohesive plan to build a professional learning community evident in design. More than 40 hours of training are provided in the summer of 2012. Teacher application clearly requires Summer Institute attendance, with dates.
20	Budget and Budget Justification	Section complete.	Administrative costs represent less than 50% of the total budget, are reasonable and based on the description of services. Participant costs are reasonable and related to delivery of services. Majority of budget reflects a priority on teacher support.	Descriptors are thorough. The cost represents a careful consideration of budget for the descriptions. Substantive involvement of STEM faculty reflected.	Costs clearly aligned with services and recommended multiplier. Leveraging of resources is evident and extensive. Justification is detailed and thorough including both teacher materials and administrative/instructional time.
15	Instructional Team Members Support Docs: <i>ITM vitae</i>	Section complete. At least one member must be affiliated with a math, science, or engineering college or department of the partnering IHE.	Section complete and all vitae are accounted for. Each vita is two pages or less.	Responsibilities clearly outlined with substantial involvement of required STEM faculty that will address the topic of focus for the grant year.	N/A

**Texas Regional Collaboratives
Mathematics and Science RFA 2012-2013 Grants**

PARTNERS					
20	Collaborative Partners Support Docs: <i>Partner letters</i>	All required partners listed but supporting letters missing or incomplete.	All required partners listed and supporting letters provided.	Required partners listed with supporting letters that outline specific responsibilities. Summer institute dates specified for IHE and LEA letters.	Supporting letters provide detail regarding commitment of time and resources, data collection requirements. Letters demonstrate a clear understanding of specific commitments on the part of the partner organization and clear administrative support at LEAs.
20	Immersion Partners Support Docs: <i>Partner letters</i>	At least five campuses are listed but supporting letters missing or inadequate.	At least five campuses are listed and supporting letters provided that specify immersion.	Documentation mentions specific required training dates and specific data required to be provided by districts.	Details regarding commitment of all teachers at the tested grade level are addressed. Plan for 24 hours of CM training is addressed. Number of teachers to be trained specified.
PLANNING					
20	Prior Professional Development <i>To be supplied as a Supporting Document</i>	Prior professional development described, but limited in detail or lacking substantive evaluation data. Prior TRC grant requirements not adequately met if applicable.	Analysis of impact of prior PD on teachers described. Prior TRC grant performance acceptable. (i.e., meeting targeted goals, maintaining DataCenter, timely submission of reports, invoicing, and attendance at required events).	Analysis of impact of prior PD on both teachers and students addressed. Prior TRC grant performance excellent.	Extensive and detailed evaluation data and thorough analysis documenting impact on students and teachers (e.g. statistical and graphical representations).
15	Needs Assessment	Assessment is present but the analysis lacks specificity.	Instrument is present in the materials submitted. Analysis is detailed and supports goals and instructional timeline.	Included are assessments for teachers <i>and</i> for student impact. There is a thorough analysis of the assessment.	N/A

**Texas Regional Collaboratives
Mathematics and Science RFA 2012-2013 Grants**

15	Planning Meeting Supporting Docs: <i>Planning mtg docs</i>	Section is complete.	Checked items show that the planning meeting has been well thought out and held before application submitted.	Additional supporting documents show thorough and detailed planning and communication.	N/A
20	Recruitment and Selection of Underrepresented/ Underserved Supporting Docs: <i>Teacher Application, recruitment flyers</i>	Recruitment/selection strategies are minimal with limited supporting documentation.	Recruitment/selection strategies are addressed and the items checked are supported in other documents. Teachers of ELL are addressed.	Sample application for teachers thoroughly describes teacher commitment for project year.	Detailed teacher application and other communication provided in supporting documents that clearly substantiate targeted recruitment. Secondary teachers are targeted. Data requirements as outlined in the Recruitment portion of the Guidelines are specified.
10	Private Nonprofit	Section is complete but no supporting documentation.	Section is complete with supporting documentation.	N/A	N/A