# Appendix A: Specialized Secondary Programs Scoring Rubric

Each question in the Program Narrative sections of the application, as well as the requirements identified in the *Application Format Requirements* and the *Program Application: Sections for Submission* sections, will be assigned a rating using the scoring rubric.

To convert ratings to points, a multiplier will be applied based on the significance of each component as it relates to the goals, desired outcomes, and requirements of the Specialized Secondary Programs grant. The scored components of this application have a total value of **100 points**.

## Scored Components:

| **Scored Components** | **Maximum Points** |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 1:** **Curriculum Development:**Question #1 | 5 |
| **Section 1:** **Curriculum Development:**Question #2 | 35 |
| **Section 1: Curriculum Development:**Question #3 | 5 |
| **Section 2: Local Work-based Learning Opportunities Provided for SSP Students:**Question #1 | 15 |
| **Section 3: Professional Development:**Question #1 | 5 |
| **Section 3: Professional Development:**Question #2 | 5 |
| **Section 3: Professional Development:**Question #3 | 5 |
| **Section 4:** Sustainability***:*** | 5 |
| **Section 5: Grant Budget:** | 5 |
| **Section 5: Budget Narrative:** | 15 |
| **Total:** | 100 |

## Section 1: Curriculum Development1. — 5 points possible

| **OUTSTANDING (5 rating)** | **STRONG (4–3 rating)** | **ADEQUATE (2 rating)** | **INADEQUATE (1–0 rating)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The two proposed **new**, year-long courses are unique and are not available to other students throughout the state. It is clear that both of the proposed courses do not supplement any existing academies, pathways, programs, competitions, or clubs at the school. The two proposed courses appear to be highly innovative when compared to courses currently available throughout the state. The two proposed courses provide a definite sequence of study in two consecutivegrade levels.  | The two proposed **new**, year-long courses are unique and are not typically available to other students throughout the state. One or both of the proposed courses may be offered in a few schools throughout the state. It is clear that both of the proposed courses do not supplement any existing academies, pathways, programs, competitions, or clubs at the school. The two proposed courses appear to be innovative when compared to courses currently available throughout the state. The two proposed courses provide a definite sequence of study in two consecutivegrade levels.  | The two proposed yearlong courses are **new** to the school; however, they are not unique and are typically available to other students throughout the state. It is clear that both of the proposed courses do not supplement any existing academies, pathways, programs, competitions, or clubs at the school. Courses may be considered to be in this category if a portion of the content is new, but is integrated with content that is typically available to other students throughout the state (e.g., proposed courses may appear to be primarily focused on various academic content standards rather than emphasizing CTE standards). The proposed courses appear to display an identifiable level of innovation when compared to courses currently available throughout the state. The two proposed courses provide a definite sequence of study in two consecutivegrade levels. | It is not absolutely clear to the reader that the two proposed courses are **new** to the school or yearlong courses. An amount other than the required two courses may have been proposed or discussed. Similar courses are typically available to students throughout the state. It is not absolutely clear to the reader that these courses do not supplement an existing academy, pathway, program, competition, or club at the school. Courses may appear to be elective options within a department or an existing academy/pathway. Minimal innovation is evident in the proposed courses. The two proposed courses provide a definite sequence of study in two consecutivegrade levels. |

## ***Section 1: Curriculum Development***2. — 35 points possible

| **OUTSTANDING (35–26 rating)** | **STRONG (25–16 rating)** | **ADEQUATE (15–10 rating)** | **INADEQUATE (9–0 rating)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The instructional/academic content for the two new, year-long, innovative courses was clearly and thoroughly described. The proposed course names and specific (not multiple/range) grade levels the courses will be offered are identified. The proposed courses provide a definite sequence of study to a cohort of students in two consecutivegrade levels. The plan to establish and maintain a cohort of students is clearly explained. A “survey” class is not included as part of the proposed sequence of courses funded by this grant. The course content described corresponds to the standards in the identified CTE Career Pathway(s).  | The instructional/academic content for the two new, year-long, innovative courses was clearly described. The proposed course names and specific (not multiple/range) grade levels the courses will be offered are identified. The proposed courses provide a definite sequence of study to a cohort of students in two consecutivegrade levels. The plan to establish and maintain a cohort of students is explained. A “survey” class is not included as part of the proposed sequence of courses funded by this grant. The course content described corresponds to the standards in the identified CTE Career Pathway(s). | The instructional/academic content for the two new, year-long, innovative courses was generally described. Additional details may be required in order to present a clear and complete understanding of the targeted content of one or more proposed courses. The proposed course names and specific (not multiple/range) grade levels the courses will be offered are identified. The proposed courses provide a definite sequence of study to a cohort of students in two consecutivegrade levels. The concept of a cohort of students may have been mentioned, but the establishment and maintaining of a cohort was not clearly explained. A “survey” class is not included as part of the proposed sequence of courses funded by this grant. The course content described corresponds to the standards in the identified CTE Career Pathway(s). | The instructional/academic content for the two new, year-long, innovative courses was vaguely described. An amount other than the required two courses may have been proposed or discussed. The academic content may have been provided as a **list of topics**. The proposed course names or specific grade levels the courses will be offered may not have been identified. A range of grade levels may have been identified for one or more courses. The establishment of a cohort of students may not have been identified and/or discussed. It is not clear to the reader that the proposed courses provide a definite sequence of study in two consecutivegrade levels. A “survey” class may have been included as part of the proposed sequence of courses. The course content may not correspond to the standards in the identified CTE Career Pathway(s). |

## Section 1: Curriculum Development3. — 5 points possible

| **OUTSTANDING (5 rating)** | **STRONG (4–3 rating)** | **ADEQUATE (2 rating)** | **INADEQUATE (1–0 rating)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The curriculum development team includes at least two teachers from the school. The name, company/organization, and job title for each person was provided. At least one outside expert (outside experts have recent professional experience in the specific targeted/specialized area of instruction) was identified. The outside expert’s knowledge and skills specific to the identified area of instruction were clearly and thoroughly discussed. The outside expert’s area of expertise, knowledge, and skills specifically relate~~s~~ to the targeted/specialized area of instruction (directly pertains to the identified CTE pathway). The specific qualifications/professional experience of the outside expert(s) were thoroughly and clearly explained. The sequence of courses will be conducted at the same site and taught by district paid personnel during the regular school day. | The curriculum development team includes at least two teachers from the school. The name, company/organization, and job title for each person was provided. At least one outside expert (outside experts have recent professional experience in the specific targeted/specialized area of instruction) was identified. The outside expert’s knowledge and skills specific to the identified area of instruction were clearly and thoroughly discussed. The outside expert’s area of expertise pertains to a closely related CTE pathway within the same identified industry sector. The specific qualifications/professional experience of the outside expert(s) were thoroughly and clearly explained. The sequence of courses will be conducted at the same site and taught by district paid personnel during the regular school day. | The curriculum development team includes at least two teachers from the school. The name, company/organization, and job title for each person was provided. At least one outside expert (outside experts have recent professional experience in the specific targeted/specialized area of instruction) was identified. The outside expert’s knowledge and skills specific to the identified area of instruction may only have been adequately discussed. The outside expert’s area of expertise pertains to an unrelated CTE pathway within the same identified industry sector. The specific qualifications/professional experience of the outside expert(s) may only have been adequately explained. The sequence of courses will be conducted at the same site and taught by district paid personnel during the regular school day. | The members of the curriculum development team may not be clearly identified. May have an incomplete team (e.g., missing teacher or outside expert). The name, company/organization, and job title for each person may not have been provided. The outside expert’s knowledge and skills specific to the identified area of instruction may not have been discussed adequately or at all. The specific qualifications/professional experience of the outside expert(s) were not clearly identified or did not relate to the targeted/specialized area of instruction (expertise pertains to a different industry sector than the one identified in the application). It is not clear to the reader that the sequence of courses will be conducted at the same site and/or taught by district paid personnel during the regular school day.  |

## ***Section 2: Local Work-based Learning Opportunities Provided for Specialized Secondary Programs’ Students***1. — 15 points possible

| **OUTSTANDING (15–10 rating)** | **STRONG (9–5 rating)** | **ADEQUATE (4–2 rating)** | **INADEQUATE (1–0 rating)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Thoroughly and completely describes the local work-based learning (WBL) opportunities. The WBL opportunities are specific to the CTE Career Pathway (not the industry sector) identified for the proposed SSP. **At least four** types of WBL opportunities are identified and described. It is clear to the reader that all SSP students will be provided WBL opportunities. Each letter of commitment includes specific services to be provided **and** the **number** of SSP students that can be accommodated. The cumulative number of students served by local partners meets or exceeds the total number of SSP students identified on Form B. All letters of commitment are written on official letterhead and contain original (not typed) signatures. No letter(s) are form letters, in part or in whole. | Contains a strong description of the local WBL opportunities. The WBL opportunities are specific to the CTE Career Pathway (not the industry sector) identified for the proposed SSP. **At least three** types of WBL opportunities are identified and described. It is clear to the reader that all SSP students will be provided WBL opportunities. Each letter of commitment includes specific services to be provided **and** the **number** of SSP students that can be accommodated. The cumulative number of students served by local partners meets or exceeds the total number of SSP students identified on Form B. All letters of commitment are written on official letterhead and contain original (not typed) signatures. No letter(s) are form letters, in part or in whole. | Adequate description of the local WBL opportunities. The WBL opportunities are specific to the CTE Career Pathway (not the industry sector) identified for the proposed SSP. **At least two** types of WBL opportunities are identified and described. It is clear to the reader that all SSP students will be provided WBL opportunities. **Each letter of commitment includes specific services to be provided**. The cumulative number of students served by local partners meets or exceeds the total number of SSP students identified on Form B. All letters of commitment are written on official letterhead and contain original (not typed) signatures. No letter(s) are form letters, in part or in whole. | Minimal description of the local WBL opportunities. The WBL opportunities may be related to an **industry sector** as opposed to the specific CTE Career Pathway identified for the proposed SSP. **At least two** types of WBL opportunities are identified and described. It may **not** be clear to the reader that all SSP students will be provided WBL opportunities. May include virtual experiences as part of the WBL description. Each letter of commitment may not include specific services to be provided and/or the **(cumulative)** **number** of SSP students that can be accommodated (letters may identify **“all”** **students**). One or more letters may not be on original letterhead, may be missing, may not have original signatures, or may be a form letter, in part or in whole. |

##  ***Section 3: Professional Development******1. — 5 points possible***

| **OUTSTANDING (5 rating)** | **INADEQUATE (0 rating)** |
| --- | --- |
| The list of identified SSP teachers appears to be appropriate for the proposed SSP as described in the application. At least two teachers from the school were identified. The two required teachers have teaching duties assigned at the SSP school site during this grant period. The SSP teacher duties were clearly identified. All identified duties are appropriate for the described SSP. | The list of identified SSP teachers appears to be inappropriate for the proposed SSP as described. An excessive number of teachers may have been listed. May have included teachers for future growth of the SSP. Two teachers from the school may not have been identified. One or both of the two required teachers may not have teaching duties assigned at the SSP school site during this grant period. The SSP teacher duties may not be clearly identified. One or more identified duties may not be appropriate for the described SSP. The degree of guidance compliance impacts the rating. |

## ***Section 3: Professional Development******2. — 5 points possible***

| **OUTSTANDING (5 rating)** | **STRONG (4–3 rating)** | **ADEQUATE (2 rating)** | **INADEQUATE (1–0 rating)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Thoroughly and clearly describes the major professional development needs of the SSP teachers that will ensure they are effectively prepared to plan, develop, and eventually implement the SSP. All of the identified needs are clearly and specifically related to the targeted area of instruction and technical skills of the SSP. It appears to the reader that all of the major professional development needs were identified. The technical skills and knowledge necessary to fulfill the requirements of the grant are clearly and thoroughly described. Planning time is identified. | Clearly describes major professional development needs of the SSP teachers that will ensure they are effectively prepared to plan, develop, and eventually implement the SSP. Most of the identified needs are clearly and specifically related to the targeted area of instruction and technical skills of the SSP. It appears to the reader that one or more major professional development needs may not have been identified. The technical skills and knowledge necessary to fulfill the requirements of the grant are clearly described. Planning time is identified. | Fundamental professional development needs are identified. Some needs may not have been thoroughly described. One or more identified needs may appear to be general in nature, applying to the common needs of a variety of SSPs or include the needs of the school/district that are not exclusive to the SSP teachers. It appears to the reader that one or more professional development needs may not have been identified. The technical skills and knowledge necessary to fulfill the fundamental requirements of the grant are identified. Planning time is identified. | Some general professional development needs are identified. The needs may not be thoroughly described. Many needs may appear to be general in nature applying to the common needs of a variety of SSP or include the needs of the school/district that are not exclusive to the SSP teachers. The needs may not adequately reflect the needs of the SSP teachers. It appears to the reader that one or more professional development needs may not have been identified. Some of the technical skills and knowledge necessary to fulfill the requirements of the grant are identified. Planning time is identified. |

## ***Section 3: Professional Development******3. — 5 points possible***

| **OUTSTANDING (5 rating)** | **STRONG (4–3 rating)** | **ADEQUATE (2 rating)** | **INADEQUATE (1–0 rating)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The planned professional development activities are extensive and detailed. The planned activities clearly prepare the SSPteachers to most effectively plan, develop, and eventually implement the SSP. Every identified professional development need coincides with extensive professional development activities. All of the identified activities are clearly and specifically related to the targeted area of instruction and technical skills required of the SSP teachers. The amount of planning time identified should clearly and thoroughly meet the needs of the SSP teachers. It appears to the reader that all necessary professional development needs and activities were identified and discussed.  | The planned professional development activities are clearly and thoroughly discussed.The planned activities should enable the SSPteachers to effectively plan, develop, and eventually implement the SSP. Every identified professional development need coincides with comprehensive professional development activities. All of the identified activities are clearly and specifically related to the targeted area of instruction and technical skills required of the SSP teachers. The amount of planning time identified should more than adequately meet the needs of the SSP teachers. It appears to the reader that one or more necessary professional development needs and/or activities were not identified and/or discussed. | The planned professional development activities are identified. All activities correspond to an identified need. Some details may be incomplete. The planned activities should enable the SSP teachers to effectively plan, develop, and eventually implement the SSP. Every identified professional development need coincides with professional development activities. All of the identified activities are clearly and specifically related to the targeted area of instruction and technical skills required of the SSP teachers. The amount of planning time identified should adequately meet the needs of the SSP teachers. It appears to the reader that one or more necessary professional development needs and/or activities were not identified and/or discussed. | The planned professional development activities are identified.Some details may be incomplete. It is not clear if the planned activities will enable the SSP teachers to plan, develop, and eventually implement the SSP. Some identified professional development needs may not be adequately met through the planned activities. One or more of the identified activities may not be specifically related to the targeted area of instruction and technical skills required of the SSP teachers. The amount of planning time identified may not adequately meet the needs of the SSP teachers. It appears to the reader that one or more necessary professional development needs and/or activities were not identified and/or discussed. |

## ***Section 4: Sustainability***

## 1. — (5 points)

|  **OUTSTANDING (5 points)** | **STRONG (4-3 points)** | **ADEQUATE (2 points)** | **MINIMAL (1–0points)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Significant** cash and in-kind support is identified and discussed which clearly and convincingly demonstrates how the proposed SSP will be sustained beyond the funding period. All identified components of the proposed SSP will be sustained. Letters of Commitment from partners are provided that **clearly identify and discuss** the type, level, and duration of support to be provided. A letter of commitment from the **superintendent and/or the school board** stating the intention to include the proposed SSP in the LEAs **LCAP** is provided. The letters of commitment are referenced in this narrative section. | **Significant** cash and in-kind support is identified and discussed which clearly and convincingly demonstrates how the proposed SSP will be sustained beyond the funding period. All identified components of the proposed SSP will be sustained. Letters of Commitment from partners are provided that **clearly identify and discuss** the type, level, and duration of support to be provided. A letter of commitment is provided from the site **principal** that **clearly and thoroughly describes** the types and levels of support to be provided. The letters of commitment are referenced in this narrative section. | Cash and in-kind support is identified and discussed which adequately demonstrates how the proposed SSP will be sustained beyond the funding period. All identified components of the proposed SSP will be sustained. Letters of Commitment from partners are provided that **identify and discuss** the type, level, and duration of support to be provided. A letter of commitment is provided from the site **principal** that **describes** the types and levels of support to be provided. The letters of commitment are referenced in this narrative section. | A clear and thorough **plan** to pursue and gain cash and in-kind support is provided. Potential partners and the type of services to be provided are clearly identified. Letters/e-mails documenting the efforts to secure the necessary partners are provided. |

## ***Section 5: Grant Budget*** ***1. — 5 points possible***

| **OUTSTANDING (5 rating)** | **INADEQUATE (0 rating)** |
| --- | --- |
| The Grant Budget (Form C) is **complete**. Grant funds are clearly focused primarily on costs related to curriculum development and professional development. | The Grant Budget (Form C) may be **incomplete**. Grant funds are **not entirely focused** on costs related to curriculum development and professional development. |

## ***Section 5: Budget Narrative******1. — 15 points possible***

| **OUTSTANDING (15–10 ratings)** | **STRONG (9–5 ratings)** | **ADEQUATE (4–2 ratings)** | **MINIMAL (1–0 ratings)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The Budget Narrative (Form D) has a **complete correlation** between the activities identified in the narrative sections of the application and the budget items discussed in the Budget Narrative is evident. **All** activities discussed in the narrative sections of the application are represented in the Budget Narrative. **All** items in discussed in the Budget Narrative are mentioned in the narrative sections of the application. | The Budget Narrative (Form D) has a **strong correlation** between the activities identified in the narrative sections of the application and the budget items discussed in the Budget Narrative is evident. **All** activities discussed in the narrative sections of the application are represented in the Budget Narrative. **All** items in discussed in the Budget Narrative are mentioned in the narrative sections of the application. | The Budget Narrative (Form D) has a **correlation** **exists** between the activities identified in the narrative sections of the application and the budget items discussed in the Budget Narrative. **Some** activities may be mentioned in either the Budget Narrative **or** the narrative sections of the application, but **not both**. | The Budget Narrative (Form D) include **minimal** to **no** correlation between the activities identified in the narrative sections of the application and the budget items discussed in the Budget Narrative is not clear for many of the activities listed. **Multiple** activities are listed in either the Budget Narrative **or** the narrative sections of the application, but **not both**. |
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