Illinois State Board of Education

100 North First Street • Springfield, Illinois 62777-0001
www.isbe.net

James T. Meeks
Chairman

Tony Smith, Ph.D.
State Superintendent of Education

Administrator's Academy Course Proposal Rubric

	Not Approved	**Modifications Necessitated**	**Approved**
Course Title	The Course Title does not reflect the content of the course.	The Course Title is ambiguous. The content of the course is unclear.	The Course Title is descriptive, clearly indicating the content or topic, including key words.
Course Description	The Course Description does not indicate the course topic, nor reflect course outcomes.	The Course Description attempts to develop the course topic with limited and/or unclear details, and vaguely reflects the outcomes of the course. Pre-assignments and/or required course materials are not indicated.	The Course Description clearly indicates the course topic and content. It reflects the outcomes of the course and is aligned to the Course Syllabus. Any pre-session assignments and/or materials that participants must bring to the session (such as School Improvement Plan) are clearly listed.
CPD Hours	The course does not meet the 6 hour total minimum time requirement of which at least 3 hours are in direct contact with the presenter.	The course meets the minimum time requirement; however, insufficient time is allotted for the Application/Dissemination component.	The course meets the minimum time requirement. Appropriate time is included for pre-session activities, indirect contact activities such as research, reading, preparing documents, and completing the Application/Dissemination component.
Participant Outcomes	All outcomes are worded incorrectly (as actions), are knowledge-based (lack depth), and/or do not align to standards.	The majority of outcomes are written incorrectly. They are vague; it is unclear as to what participants will know or be able to do; and they only ask participants to recall, remember, identify, recognize, or reproduce the intended outcomes. The alignment to standards is unclear.	Each outcome indicates what the participant will know or be able to do as a result of the instruction. Outcomes are not worded as "actions" and are indicative of higher order thinking (application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation, etc. are embedded in the course). School leader standards (or Learning Forward standards) and performance/knowledge indicators are aligned directly to each outcome.
Course Materials	No substantive materials are listed. It appears that only one perspective often by one author is provided. Materials are not current (older than 5 years).	Not all materials are listed, although they are referenced in other areas of the proposal. A primary material is listed, but is not current (5 years or less).	All materials included in the course are listed, including Power Points, audio/video materials, worksheets, templates and handouts. AA courses are expected to have a greater depth of knowledge than other workshops; therefore, required materials include a primary resource such as a book. All required information is provided. Numerous individuals/authors are identified. At least 2 of the materials are within the last 5 years.

	Not Approved	**Modifications Necessitated**	**Approved**
Research References	No research references are listed, or there are no substantive materials. Research papers alone are not sufficient.	Research references are limited and are not reputable. It is not clear how the proposal is research-based, or has vague, imprecise research from unreliable sources	At least 2 valid evidence based research references were used to create the course. Multiple authors/researchers, peer reviewed materials, and notable experts in the field are identified. Sufficient references for those who wish to pursue further research into the topic.
Course Syllabus	The course syllabus includes subtopics that are not aligned or applicable to the course content. Time allotted for some sections does not appear appropriate for the activities identified. The Application/Dissemination component is not reflective of higher order thinking. Activities are knowledge based (recall, reproduce, identify, recognize).	The course syllabus includes subtopics that do not adequately establish a purpose and are knowledge based. Subtopics are unclear, and are vague as to the instructional topic for that time period. Time allotted for some sections appears too short to adequately complete the activities identified. The Application/Dissemination component connection to higher order thinking is indistinct.	The course syllabus clearly identifies the subtopics addressed and the recommended activities for delivery appear appropriate. Subtopic titles are concise and clearly indicate the instructional topic for that time period. Activities are varied and address multiple learning styles while engaging participants in higher order thinking skills such as analysis and synthesis of the content. Only one subtopic is identified as the Application/Dissemination component, though application activities may be used throughout the instruction. Duration time appears appropriate as is Direct Contact and Indirect Contact for all activities. Activities such as "Small Group Discussion" and Group Activity" are not indicated for Indirect Contact where the participant is not in touch with the rest of the group.
Application Dissemination Component	The A/D component does not require participants to produce a product.	The A/D component allows participants to produce a product, but it is unclear what it is and how it aligns to the outcomes of the course. Assignments lack clarity.	The A/D component allows each participant (or collaboratively as a team) to produce a written product that reflects application of the outcomes of the course. Assignments are specific and include analysis, synthesis or application of the new material. Clearly identified criteria or templates are provided. The activity is aligned to the time allotted for completion.

AA Coordinators are encouraged to use this rubric to:

- ✓ Use as a foundation to determine desired expectations for an Administrators' Academy course proposal.
- ✓ Self-assess. Coordinators will have a better idea if expectations are being met before submitting their proposal(s).
- ✓ Gain inter-rater reliability. Utilize as a valid and reliable tool when using multiple assessors.
- ✓ Engage in the learning process of creating proposals. Now that coordinators can describe exactly what is expected in a proposal it will be easier to meet these expectations.
- ✓ Identify where the proposal fails and analyze what needs to be done in order to improve the quality of the proposal.
- ✓ Share. When third-party providers ask to create a proposal, provide them with a copy and have them assure you that their proposals will meet the criteria before you go through the work of submitting it.

SCORING

If any area is "not approved", then the proposal will be rejected.

If three or more "needs improvement" areas are identified, significant modifications are necessary and the proposal will be returned to the submitter as requiring modification.