

RFP GT-06: XVII. PROPOSAL EVALUATION RUBRIC

Score Sheet
New York State Education Department
Model Induction Program RFP
SED Use Only

Raters are asked to evaluate each element of the proposal narrative as listed in the application. Two raters will independently read and evaluate each proposal. If there is a difference of 10 points or more between the two reviewers' scores, a third reviewer will review the application and the lowest score will be dropped and the score on this portion will be based on the average of the remaining two evaluations. Only applicants that first meet all of the mandatory requirements will advance to scoring. The Program Narrative and attachments will be reviewed to confirm that the mandatory requirements have been met. The General, Early Career Educator, and Mentor requirement components of each application will be scored for all applications that meet the mandatory requirements. Application may receive up to 70 points for this portion of the proposal and must receive an average score of 53 to move to the budget review and Additional Extra Credit Program Component review. Applications must receive a final average score of 67 or above to be eligible to receive an award.

Rater:	Applicant: New York City or Rest of State:
Meets Mandatory Requirements (Yes/No):	Required Component Review Score: Budget and Budget Narrative Score: Additional Extra Credit Component Score: Final TOTAL Score:

Rating Guidelines:

Quality Indicator	Description
Very Good	The response is specific and comprehensive. There is complete, detailed, and clearly articulated information as to how the criteria are met. The ideas presented are innovative, well-conceived and thoroughly developed.
Good	The response is reasonably comprehensive and includes sufficient detail. It contains many of the characteristics of a response that is very good even though it may require additional specificity, support or elaboration in places.
Fair	The response is non-specific and lacks focus and detail. The response addresses some of the selection criteria, but not all. Some ideas presented are sound, but others are not responsive to the purpose of the RFP. Additional information is needed in order to be reasonably comprehensive and meet the criteria of a response that is good.
Poor	The response does not meet many criteria; provides inaccurate information or provides information that requires substantial clarification as to how the criteria are met; lacks meaningful detail; demonstrates lack of preparation; or otherwise raises substantial concerns about the applicant's understanding of the issue in concept and/or ability to meet the requirement in practice.
No Evidence	The response does not address the criteria or simply re-states the criteria.

RFP GT-06: XVII. PROPOSAL EVALUATION RUBRIC

OVERALL EVALUATION		
	SCORE	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
Summary (General Requirements)		
Applicant Capacity and Sustainability (General Requirements)		
Program Requirements for Early Career Educators		
Program Requirements for Mentors		
Use of technology		
SUBTOTAL SCORE (Summary, Applicant Capacity and Sustainability, Program Requirements Educators, Program Requirements Mentors, Technology)		<i>Subtotal must average 53 across reviewers to be further reviewed and considered</i>
<i>Additional Extra Credit Program Criteria (New/Additional Certification)</i>		
<i>Additional Extra Credit Program Criteria (Impact Awards)</i>		
Budget and Budget Narrative		
TOTAL SCORE (SUBTOTAL SCORE, Budget and Budget Narrative Score, and Additional Extra Credit Program Criteria Score(s), as applicable)		<i>Total score must average 67 across reviewers to be eligible for an award</i>
Overall Recommendation:		

RFP GT-06: XVII. PROPOSAL EVALUATION RUBRIC

Elements of the Proposal Narrative:

	Do applicants meet the following mandatory requirements:	Yes/No	Type of Evidence Provided
Mandatory Requirements	1) The applicant has confirmed that the participating school(s) where the proposed program will take place has already implemented teacher evaluation in compliance with Education Law §3012-c; or , the applicant has provided MOU that confirms an agreement to implement teacher evaluation in compliance with Education Law §3012-c signed with their collective bargaining unit(s) for the 2012-13 school year.		
	2) The applicants describes in Attachment C how they meet the applicant eligibility requirements under this grant by proposing an induction program that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Will serve schools that meet the definition of high-poverty as described within this RFP; and b. Meets at least two of the additional characteristics within their schools served as described in Section IV. 		
	3) The applicant has agreed (see Attachment B) to participate in a research study conducted by NYSED that will evaluate the efficacy of the proposed model induction program compared with non-participating programs within the district both during and following the grant period.		
	4) The applicant has ensured, where applicable and in accordance with law and regulation that new initiatives described in their application are allowable under collective bargaining agreements (see Attachment B and any additional related attachments).		
	5) If the application is for a partnership or consortium then the required MOU delineating the roles and responsibilities of each entity is included as an attachment with Section A and signed by all parties.		

Do not advance to scoring if there are any NO responses within this section.

RFP GT-06: XVII. PROPOSAL EVALUATION RUBRIC

SUMMARY (GENERAL REQUIREMENTS) (Up to 10 points)				
0	1 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 8	9-10
<input type="checkbox"/> No Evidence	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good
Score:	Score:	Score:	Score:	Score:
<p>The proposal describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The current, existing induction and mentoring approach(es) used within the district, and explains how any initiative funded by this award will enhance or complement the existing induction and mentoring already provided for all early career educators; b. The theoretical foundation and relevance in peer reviewed scholarly literature, NYS mentoring standards and/or other best practices; c. The method(s) used for implementation at the district or school level; and d. The methods that will be used for assessing and evaluating the program activities and outcomes and how and when the results of formative and summative evaluations of the program activities and outcomes conducted by the applicant and/or any partners will be reported to NYSED (results must be reported, at a minimum, on an annual basis). 			Score:	Explanation of Score:

RFP GT-06: XVII. PROPOSAL EVALUATION RUBRIC

APPLICANT CAPACITY AND SUSTAINABILITY (GENERAL REQUIREMENTS) (Up to 10 points)				
0	1 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 8	9-10
<input type="checkbox"/> No Evidence	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good
Score:	Score:	Score:	Score:	Score:
<p>1) The proposal provides an overall project plan, including a timeline for the planning period, that describes the applicant’s capacity to oversee and manage the proposed program including evidence of adequate human, organizational, and professional resources and associated abilities to meet the needs of their proposed program, as well as their propensity to deliver results (any track record of successful induction and mentoring program results by the applicant and/or partners should be included and discussed here).</p> <p>2) The proposal describes how any initiative funded by this award will aim to involve key stakeholders (e.g., unions, key teachers, school leaders) to ensure there is support, particularly for specific programmatic components (e.g., common planning time, collaborative efforts and opportunities) and to build internal school capacity, and describes how school leaders will lead the program as part of a coherent school-wide development initiative.</p> <p>3) The proposal describes a sustainability plan for how the applicant will continue this induction program, including many if not all of the additional proposed services and components, after the expiration of this grant, and demonstrate how the program will be maintained fiscally by identifying sources of potential funds.</p>			<p>Score:</p>	<p>Explanation of Score:</p>

RFP GT-06: XVII. PROPOSAL EVALUATION RUBRIC

PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS FOR EARLY CAREER EDUCATORS (Up to 20 points)				
0	1 - 6	7 - 12	13 - 18	19 - 20
<input type="checkbox"/> No Evidence	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good
Score:	Score:	Score:	Score:	Score:
<p><i>Formative Assessment and Differentiated Programs and Supports (Up to 10 points):</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The proposal must describe how the program will provide differentiated programmatic offerings based on initial and ongoing formative assessment results of each educator and their student learning data, and how the applicant will know whether and how the effectiveness of each early career educator improves. 2) The proposal describes in what other ways supports provided to early career educators utilize NYS Mentoring Standards (see Attachment E), other research-based innovations, or best practices. 			Score:	Explanation of Score:
<p><i>Assessment and Development of Shortage Area Skills (Up to 10 points):</i></p> <p>For teachers of English language learners, students with disabilities, and/or any STEM discipline, including enhancing math and science content pedagogy of Common Branch teachers, the proposal describes how specific skills and knowledge needed to advance student learning and ensure student growth for these students (English language learners, students with disabilities, and students in STEM disciplines) will be assessed and developed in early career educators.</p> <p>Note: Best practices for induction programs specifically focused on teachers of these areas have important differences from more generalized approaches to teacher induction, and applicants must explain how their proposed approach is rooted in what is known to have good results for students in these specific areas.</p>			Score:	Explanation of Score:

RFP GT-06: XVII. PROPOSAL EVALUATION RUBRIC

PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS FOR MENTORS (Up to 20 points)				
0	1 - 6	7 - 12	13 - 18	19 - 20
<input type="checkbox"/> No Evidence	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good
Score:	Score:	Score:	Score:	Score:
<p><i>Mentor Selection (Up to 15 points):</i></p> <p>The proposal establishes rigorous and challenging mentor selection criteria that ensures high quality mentors, and explains how selected mentors and early career educators will be matched for the proposed program. For the mentor selection criteria, the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Describes the mentor candidate eligibility requirements and mentor selection process in the planning period and beyond: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Explains the selection process and how the applicant will ensure that only mentors who are specialists (i.e., English language learners, students with disabilities, STEM disciplines) and able to achieve significant student achievement gains in their particular grade/content areas are allowed to mentor early career educators, including the type of evidence relied upon to make this selection; ii. Explains what level of performance under the teacher evaluation system is required to become a mentor and to remain a mentor once the full evaluation system is established in the school; iii. Describes how the selection criteria incorporates recommendations from the recently adopted New York State mentoring standards and/or other best practices in mentoring selection. 			Score:	Explanation of Score:
<p><i>Mentor Training, Supports, and Development (Up to</i></p>			Score:	Explanation of Score:

RFP GT-06: XVII. PROPOSAL EVALUATION RUBRIC

5 points):

The proposal provides mentors selected for the program any additional professional development supports that they need to be proficient, and able to support early career educators, with:

- Common Core Standards;
- Data-driven inquiry;
- Evidence-based observation aligned with district evaluation models, including the district's selected teacher practice rubric;
- Student growth goal-setting process, as required by the district's evaluation process;
- Current best practices and specific strategies for English language learners and students with disabilities, with specific focus on instruction in literacy, research based practices in the provision of specialized instruction for students with disabilities, Response to Intervention, and Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports, as well as native language development.
 - a. The proposal includes a detailed description of the types of individualized supports, differentiated professional development, and training that will be provided during the planning period of this grant (and ongoing) to selected mentors on the above components, as well as the New York State mentoring standards.
 - b. The proposal explains the tools (e.g., mentor skill rubrics, performance assessments, surveys of mentored teachers, etc) that will be used to continuously evaluate mentors and inform the individualized supports and ongoing professional development, as well as describe their plans for removing ineffective mentors.

RFP GT-06: XVII. PROPOSAL EVALUATION RUBRIC

USE OF TECHNOLOGY (Up to 10 points)				
0	1 - 3	4 – 5	6 - 8	9-10
<input type="checkbox"/> No Evidence	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good
Score:	Score:	Score:	Score:	Score:
<p><i>Proposals whose program incorporates technology (Up to 10 points):</i></p> <p>The proposal describes in detail how the program incorporates technology, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Exemplar videos of outstanding teachers for professional development; o Video as a tool for teacher reflection; o Coaching by mentors through collaborative inquiry such as review of videos of teachers, online interactions; o Remote mentoring via technology such as Skype, or satellite; o Blended mentoring (remote mentoring from content experts and on-site mentoring from school-based experts); o On-line classroom modules, On-line professional learning communities, virtual simulation exercises, etc for collaboration amongst content specific teachers across the state. <p>The proposal describes how the program will incorporate the use of technology, any research to support their approach, and how they will evaluate the effectiveness of the technology usage (e.g., types of data and metrics that will be collected).</p> <p>The proposal explains why there is a demonstrated need for an investment in this approach to technology for this induction model (e.g., without remote mentoring, the district could not provide content expert mentors to their new science teachers).</p>			<p>Score:</p>	<p>Explanation of Score:</p>

RFP GT-06: XVII. PROPOSAL EVALUATION RUBRIC

PLEASE STOP YOUR REVIEW

**CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION UNIT (CAU) WILL
CALCULATE A SUBTOTAL SCORE UP TO THIS POINT
PLEASE ELECTRONICALLY PROVIDE CAU THE SUBTOTAL
SCORE TO THIS POINT**

DOES THIS APPLICATION MEET AN AVERAGE MINIMUM SCORE of 53?

Yes or No

IF YES, PROCEED WITH SCORING.

IF NO, STOP SCORING.

RFP GT-06: XVII. PROPOSAL EVALUATION RUBRIC

ADDITIONAL EXTRA CREDIT SECTIONS (Up to 10 points)		
0	5	
Unclear or insufficient explanation to justify granting credit. Not likely to attract more teachers into shortage areas.	Clear, coherent explanation of proposal. Likely to increase supply of teachers in the relevant shortage area.	
<input type="checkbox"/> No Evidence	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence	
Score:	Score:	
<p><i>Proposals whose program provides incentives and structures to enable additional or new full-certification in shortage areas (0 or 5 points):</i></p> <p>The proposal describes how the program will provide incentives and structures to enable early career educators who are not yet certified in shortage areas to obtain the requisite credentials that will allow them to become eligible and prepared to teach as a fully certified New York State teacher in that shortage area.</p> <p>The proposal describes the specific incentives and structures the program will provide to early career educators to provide incentives to them to seek additional, or new, full-certification in specific shortage areas.</p> <p>The proposal describes how the applicant will ensure educators complete their certification, and what, if any, commitments will be required of applicants after they complete their certification, such as remaining within low performing schools in the district.</p>	Score:	Explanation of Score:
<p><i>Proposals whose program pilots the usage of "Impact Award" funding (0 or 5 points)</i></p> <p>The proposal describes how the program will pilot the usage of "Impact Award" funding, meaning financial or other incentives, to reward individuals, schools, and/or third party partners who achieve key benchmarks such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reward success based on achievement of key 	Score:	Explanation of Score:

RFP GT-06: XVII. PROPOSAL EVALUATION RUBRIC

<p>interim benchmarks at various stages over the course of the grant, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Percentage of mentored teachers, receiving ratings of Developing or better, retained in their school/the district.▪ Percentage of mentored teachers who receive evaluation ratings above Developing.▪ Number of new teachers, receiving ratings of Developing or better, who seek new certification in a shortage area. <p>The proposal describes how the program will incorporate the use of Impact Awards, and which key interim benchmarks will be used by the district at which points in time.</p> <p>The proposal explains how the applicant will ensure that the benchmarks selected are ambitious and challenging, how rewards will be made before the end of the grant period, and a sustainability plan for how remaining awards will be funded after the conclusion of the grant period in July 2014.</p>		
---	--	--

RFP GT-06: XVII. PROPOSAL EVALUATION RUBRIC

BUDGET AND BUDGET NARRATIVE SCORING (Up to 20 points)

NOTE: Applicants who submit a budget and budget narrative that requests awards over \$500,000 total per application and/or \$50,000 per school will automatically receive a score of zero for this section.

The budget and budget narrative must comply with the following:

1. Complete an [FS-10](#) that shows in detail all expenses requested from the Model Induction Program funds during the six-month planning period. A complete Budget Summary form (Attachment D) is also included summarizing expenses of requested funds from the grant for the entire grant period. A summary of any district and other source contributions, if any, is listed on the chart where requested.
2. Provide a budget narrative that justifies all proposed expenditures and indicates the basis of calculation for each cost. For each item, provide the information in a manner that will allow reviewers to clearly understand the basis of calculation for each proposed expenditure. The budget narrative expenditure descriptions should also include a description of any district and other source contributions..
3. Describe how proposed expenditures are appropriate, reasonable and necessary to support the project activities and goals.
4. Describe how the expenditures and activities are supplemental to and do not supplant or duplicate services currently provided.

0	1 – 6	7 – 12	13 - 18	19 - 20
<input type="checkbox"/> No Evidence	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Good
Score:	Score:	Score:	Score:	Score:
Are the requested awards amounts over the \$500,000 total per application or the \$50,000 total per school participant? NOTE: If YES, STOP scoring and give an automatic score of zero (0) for this section.			Yes/No	Explanation of Score:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The budget is thorough, specific, and supports the proposed project. The proposed project budget presents expenses that are allowable, realistic, accurate, cost-efficient, and clearly relate to and reflect project activities, objectives, and outcomes. The costs are reasonable in relation to the 			Score:	Explanation of Score:

RFP GT-06: XVII. PROPOSAL EVALUATION RUBRIC

<p>objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The estimated number of mentors and early career educators to be served in each school is stated, and the costs per school are reasonable and cost-efficient in relation to the number of estimated mentors and early career educators to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.• The required personnel, professional and technical services, and/or travel for the proposed project are clearly and adequately explained.• The justifications for expenditures are reasonable and clearly explained.• The costs for equipment, supplies, and materials are reasonable and adequately justified.• The costs related to any additional extra credit program components selected, such as technology, incentives, and/or impact awards are reasonable and clearly explained.		
--	--	--