

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FINAL REPORT - SPECIAL RULE (50% RULE)** | | | | |
| **Improving Teacher Quality State Grant Program** | | | | |
| **Project Title/Grant #** |  |  |  |  |
| **Lead Institution** |  |  |  |  |
| **Grant Period** |  |  |  |  |
| **Project Director** |  |  |  |  |
| **Grant Budget Amount** |  |  |  |  |
| *Every application and final report must demonstrate that no one partner receives more than 50% of the total benefit of the grant funds. (Each participating division of a four-year institution is a separate partner.) Although this chart does not have to be the means of demonstrating that the 50% rule has been followed, the application must be explicit in its demonstration that no partner receives more than 50% benefit. It is recommended that applications have no one partner very close to 50 percent.* | | | | |
| **Partner** | **Budget Item Benefiting Partner** | **Dollar Value** | **% Benefit** | **How the Item Benefits the Partner** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Arts & Sciences** |
| --list budget items, add as many rows as needed |  |  |  |  |
|
| **High Need LEA** |  |  |  |  |
|
| --list budget items, add as many rows as needed |  |  |  |  |
|
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Teacher Preparation** |
| --list budget items, add as many rows as needed |  |  |  |  |
|
| **TOTAL (= total requested funds)** |  |  |  |  |
| \* If there are additional partners (e.g. other LEAS), please add rows to table as needed. | | | | |



**Final Report Table 2: Participant Contact Hours by School Level (Required)**

**Grant Number and Project Title**

**Reporting Period 11/24/14 – 06/30/16**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type of Participants | Elementary | | | Middle | | | High | | | Total Participants |
| # | Contact  Hrs. Per Participant | Credits Earned by # & Type) | # | Contact  Hrs. *Per Participant* | Credits  Earned: # and Type | # | Contact  Hrs. *Per Participant* | Credits  Earned by # & Type |  |
| **Principals** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **In-service teachers:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Out-of-field |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Provisional/  Conditional  Certification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Highly qualified**  **Paraprofessionals** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total Participants by School Level** (Elem, MS, HS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**TABLE KEY:**

U = Undergraduate credit hours

C = MSDE continuing professional development credit

G = Graduate credit hours

O = Other (explain)

**Title II-A**

**Improving Teacher Quality Grant Programs**

**Measuring Effective Professional Development**

**Evaluation Rubric**

The evaluation is organized into three categorical areas:

**Area 1: Changes in Teacher Content Knowledge**

**Area 2: Changes in Teacher Pedagogical Knowledge and/or Teacher Practice**

**Area 3: Changes in Student Learning Outcomes**

In each area, we ask for three types of information: the type of study conducted, the measurement instrument used, and the general trend of the evaluation results.

**To complete this survey, please determine which of the listed choices best fits how you measured your project goals and objectives for each of the categories.** If how you measured the goals and objectives fits into more than one category within a single question, please count it within *each* appropriate category. Since this likely will result in some evaluation measurements being counted multiple times, the sum of the responses will likely be greater than the total number evaluation measures.

As much as possible, please try to use the categories outlined in the survey to classify each of your evaluation goals and objectives.

Thank you for your time and effort!

**Directions:** Select your choice by putting an “X” next to the phrase which best describes your project evaluation method.

**Area 1: Changes in Teacher Content Knowledge**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of Study Conducted** | |
| ***Type of Study*** | |
| Descriptive |  |
| Correlational |  |
| Post-intervention comparisons only |  |
| Pre-post comparison, within participant group |  |
| Pre-post comparison to another group (normative, quasi-experimental, randomized control trials (RCT), etc.) |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Measurement Instrument Used** | |
| ***Measurement Instrument*** | |
| Did not measure changes in teacher content knowledge |  |
| INDIRECT measures: Anecdotal or narrative evidence of changes in PD content area knowledge (survey, interview, structured observation, document analysis, etc.) | |
| * Participant-reported |  |
| * Based on external observations or analysis |  |
| DIRECT measures: | |
| * Project-developed/adapted instrument measuring changes in SPECIFIC PD content area knowledge |  |
| * Project-developed/adapted instrument measuring changes in BROAD PD content area knowledge |  |
| * Published instrument (established reliability and validity) measuring changes in PD content area knowledge |  |
| * Commercial or state-developed standardized instrument (or archived data from such instruments) measuring changes in PD content area knowledge |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **General Trend of Evaluation Results** | |
| ***Trend of Results: Changes in Teacher Content Knowledge*** | |
| Substantial INCREASE (>3 S.D.) |  |
| Moderate INCREASE (2-2.9 S.D.) |  |
| Slight INCREASE (1-1.9 S.D.) |  |
| NO reliable change in teacher content knowledge (0-0.9 S.D.) |  |
| Slight DECREASE (1-1.9 S.D.) |  |
| Moderate DECREASE (2-2.9 S.D.) |  |
| Substantial DECREASE (>3 S.D.) |  |

**Additional comments on Area 1: Changes in Teacher Content Knowledge:**

**Area 2: Changes in Teacher Pedagogical Knowledge and/or Teacher Practice**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of Study Conducted** | |
| ***Evaluation Strategy*** | |
| Descriptive |  |
| Correlational |  |
| Post-intervention comparisons only |  |
| Pre-post comparison, within participant group |  |
| Pre-post comparison to another group (normative, quasi-experimental, randomized control trials (RCT), etc.) |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Measurement Instrument Used** | |
| ***Measurement Instrument*** | |
| Did not measure changes in teacher pedagogical knowledge and teacher practice |  |
| INDIRECT measures: Anecdotal or narrative evidence of changes in pedagogical knowledge and/or Teacher Practice (survey, interview, structured observation, document analysis, etc.) | |
| * Participant-reported |  |
| * Based on external observations or analysis |  |
| DIRECT measures: | |
| * Project-developed/adapted instrument measuring changes in PD-SPECIFIC pedagogical knowledge |  |
| * Project-developed/adapted instrument measuring changes in BROAD pedagogical knowledge |  |
| * Published instrument (established reliability and validity) measuring changes in pedagogical knowledge |  |
| * Commercial or state-developed standardized instrument (or archived data from such instruments) measuring changes in pedagogical knowledge |  |
| * One-time direct observation in teacher’s classroom documenting changes in teacher practice |  |
| * Multiple, systematic direct observations in teacher’s classroom documenting changes in teacher practice |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **General Trend of Evaluation Results** | |
| ***Trend of Results: Changes in Teacher Pedagogical Knowledge and/or Teacher Practice*** | |
| Substantial INCREASE (>3 S.D.) |  |
| Moderate INCREASE (2-3 S.D.) |  |
| Slight INCREASE (1-2 S.D.) |  |
| NO reliable change in teacher content knowledge (0-1 S.D.) |  |
| Slight DECREASE (1-2 S.D.) |  |
| Moderate DECREASE (2-3 S.D.) |  |
| Substantial DECREASE (3+ S.D.) |  |

**Additional comments on Area 2: Changes in Teacher Pedagogical Knowledge and/or Teacher Practice:**

**Area 3: Changes in Student Learning Outcomes**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of Study Conducted** | |
| ***Evaluation Strategy*** | |
| Descriptive |  |
| Correlational |  |
| Post-intervention comparisons only |  |
| Pre-post comparison, within participant group |  |
| Pre-post comparison to another group (normative, quasi-experimental, randomized control trials (RCT), etc.) |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Measurement Instrument Used** | |
| ***Measurement Instrument*** | |
| Did not measure changes in student learning outcomes |  |
| INDIRECT measures: Anecdotal or narrative evidence of changes in student learning outcomes (survey, interview, structured observation, etc. – all EXCEPT student work samples) | |
| * Participant-reported |  |
| * Based on external observations or analysis |  |
| DIRECT measures: | |
| * Embedded assessment measuring changes in student learning outcomes (student work samples) |  |
| * Participant-created/adapted student assessment instrument measuring changes in student learning outcomes |  |
| * Project-provided/adapted student assessment instrument measuring changes in student learning outcomes |  |
| * Published instrument (established reliability and validity) measuring changes in student learning outcomes |  |
| * Commercial or state-developed standardized instrument (or archived data from such instruments) measuring changes in student learning outcomes |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **General Trend of Evaluation Results** | |
| ***Trend of Results: Changes in Student Learning Outcomes*** | |
| Substantial INCREASE (>3 S.D.) |  |
| Moderate INCREASE (2-3 S.D.) |  |
| Slight INCREASE (1-2 S.D.) |  |
| NO reliable change in teacher content knowledge (0-1 S.D.) |  |
| Slight DECREASE (1-2 S.D.) |  |
| Moderate DECREASE (2-3 S.D.) |  |
| Substantial DECREASE (3+ S.D.) |  |

**Additional comments on Area 3: Changes in Student Learning Outcomes:**