

The currency for all Professional Development Opportunities is PDPs.

15 PDPs will not automatically entitle participants to institute or salary increment credit.

If the facilitator or developer wants participants to earn credit for salary increments, this needs to be stated explicitly in the proposal (see budget section.)

<i>Rubric for Component Review</i>	Needs Improvement (1 point)	Worthy (2 points)	Exemplary (3 points)
<p>SIP/DIP Alignment</p> <p><i>DOE mandates PD that connects to District or School Improvement Initiatives. (School committee initiatives and DOE mandates are included in this category.)</i></p>	<p>No explicit connection to the District Improvement Plan, a School Improvement Plan, school committee goal or DOE mandate.</p>	<p>Explicit connection to a goal or objective from the DIP, SIP, school committee or DOE mandate.</p>	<p>Explicit connection to more than one goal or objective from the DIP or SIP or DOE mandate.</p>
<p>Budget</p> <p><i>N.B. If a PD opportunity is developed for participants in one school only, it is preferred that any requested resources come from that school's budget. Exemptions may be made by the Faculty Senate.</i></p>	<p>No budget information provided</p> <p>Requested resources not currently available through either building or FS budget(s)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of clarity regarding budget implications (stipend, increment, materials) Budget implications don't match depth and breadth of proposed activity 	<p>Clearly defined budget implications (stipend, increment, materials) which match the standard and expectations of PD</p> <p>Resources (if any are required) available through building or FS budget(s)</p>
<p>Elements of the Plan</p> <p><i>Proposals need to outline Targeted group for PD Anticipated Outcomes of PD Outcomes should be measurable Product that will be developed Evaluation of participation</i></p>	<p>Lack of clarity in more than one of the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measurable outcomes Key terms/explicit language How participants will be evaluated Product related to educational program 	<p>Lack of clarity in one of the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measurable outcomes Key terms/explicit language How participants will be evaluated Product related to educational program 	<p>Clear, explicit definition of the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measurable outcomes Key terms/explicit language How participants will be evaluated Product related to educational program
<p>Methods of Application</p> <p><i>How will this PD opportunity be applied to the classroom thus improving the Tantasqua/Union 61instruction program?</i></p>	<p>Lack of clear evidence of how proposed PD will improve teacher skill set, the instructional program and/or curriculum.</p>	<p>No specific information of how proposed PD will improve teacher skill set, the instructional program and/or curriculum.</p>	<p>Clear evidence of how PD will improve teacher skill set and the instructional program or curriculum.</p>

Consensus of the review committee or Faculty Senate will determine approval. Proposals can be revised at the time of presentation or presented again after revision.

4-6 points: proposal will be returned to developer with Faculty Senate input

7-9 points: worthy proposal, tentative approval pending recommended revision

10-12 points: approval granted

Faculty Senate will prorate discretionary budget so that there can be on ongoing approval process during the course of the school year.