

St. Ignatius College Preparatory
2010 SUMMER CURRICULUM GRANT
APPLICATION INFORMATION

Background

The Summer Curriculum Grant for Professional Development is available to professional staff at St. Ignatius for the summer of 2010. The Professional Development Committee will accept applications through February 22, 2010, which will be acted upon no later than April 16, 2009. All applicants are highly encouraged to meet with Paul Molinelli, the Professional Development Director, well before the application deadline to discuss the merits and feasibility of the proposed curriculum project.

Grant Criteria

The Summer Curriculum Grant will support curriculum projects that fulfill the major criteria below:

1. *Proposal Completeness and Project Timeline:* The proposal follows application guidelines, and the timeline reflects a reasonable estimate of the project's scope and pacing.
2. *Purpose, Need, & Department Support:* The proposed curriculum project addresses a significant need, and the proposal has the support of the department(s).
3. *Project Scope:* The proposed curriculum project will benefit many students while contributing to the achievement of department and/or schoolwide outcomes.
4. *Curriculum Design:* Outcomes, assessments, and instructional methods are well-designed, properly aligned, and consistent with the principles of backward design. While not essential criteria, interdisciplinary projects that promote collaboration across departments and projects that support development of 21st Century skills are highly encouraged.
5. *Collaboration:* collaboration is an essential aspect of the work, and roles (including project manager) are clearly defined and tasks appropriately assigned.
6. *Scope of Professional Duties:* The project exceeds normal professional expectations for curriculum development.
7. *Evaluation:* Methods for evaluating the project are valid and sufficiently rigorous.

Grant Award Levels

Grants will be awarded at particular levels, representing the projected amount of time, energy, and resources required to complete the grant project. This includes both labor and incidental expenses. Grants will be awarded according at the following levels:

Level 3	less than \$4,000
Level 4	\$4,000
Level 5	\$5,000
Level 6	\$6,000
Level 7	\$7,000
Level 8	\$8,000
Level 9	more than \$8,000

When applying for a particular level of funding, consider the following examples as a guideline:

- Designing a completely new course would likely qualify grant applicants for a Level 8 grant, or Level 9 if three or more colleagues are planning to contribute substantially to the project.
- Creating new level-wide units and assessments for an existing course, incorporating a backwards design template, might qualify grant applicants for Level 5 or Level 6 funding.
- Revising a first-year course, funded the previous summer at Level 8 or 9, might qualify grant applicants for Level 3 or Level 4 funding.

In all cases, applicants should consider the overall scope of their grant project when determining an appropriate funding level, using as a guide a reasonable estimate of the time and resources required to complete the project.

Follow-up Grants

Summer Grant recipients can apply for follow-up grants for the purposes of revising and or expanding the original curriculum grant project. In most cases, follow-up grants are funded at a substantially lower level.

Presentation and Approval

1. At an appointed time, the proposal's author(s) will prepare and deliver a short presentation to the Professional Development Committee, highlighting the proposed grant project's essential features and addressing Committee member's key questions.
2. The Professional Development Committee, in full partnership with the Assistant Principal for Academics, who is a member of this committee, will make recommendations to the Principal who, in turn, must approve all projects and grants. Recipients will receive notification by no later than April 16, 2010.

St. Ignatius College Preparatory
2010 SUMMER CURRICULUM GRANT
APPLICATION GUIDELINES

Please use the guidelines below to complete the application, and submit your proposal to the Director of Professional Development by February 22, 2010.

The proposal should include the following:

1. Title Page

The title page should include:

- A descriptive title of the grant project.
- The name of the project director and the name(s) of each project member.
- The date submitted.
- The proposed level at which the grant should be funded.
- Department chair(s) signature(s).

2. Project Description

A detailed description of the proposed project or program should include:

- An executive summary or overview.
- A statement of the purpose and need for the curriculum project. How will this project improve student learning, impact department outcomes, and/or contribute to the achievement of schoolwide ESLRs?
- A description of the overall design of the curriculum project – including discipline-relevant standards, course outcomes, assessments, instructional methods, and/or curriculum resources.
- A delineation of tasks and responsibilities for each member of the project team. Include a percentage estimate of each member's anticipated contribution to the project.
- A detailed timeline that includes starting date, planned work days, and a date on which written report or written curriculum will be completed.
- Procedures *and evaluation instruments* (i.e., *student surveys, classroom observations, etc.*) to determine whether the program has met its goals.

3. Projected Expenses

Include a detailed outline of expenses beyond labor. Include any additional funding sources.

PROJECT DELIVERABLES

1. The delivered project must include any written or published curriculum, or any curriculum-related product (e.g., program evaluation, curriculum resources, etc.). Please include a copy of the original projected outcomes or goals for your grant proposal.
2. An additional follow-up report must be given to Paul Molinelli by February 14, 2011, detailing the success and difficulties attributable to this project.

SUMMER CURRICULUM GRANT RUBRIC

TITLE: _____

	4	3	2	1	Notes
Proposal Completeness & Project Timeline	Proposal is clearly written, completely follows application guidelines, and the project timeline reflects a highly accurate estimate of the scope & pacing of the work.	Proposal is reasonably well-written, follows most application guidelines, and the project timeline reflects a fairly accurate estimate of the scope & pacing of the work.	Proposal is marginally written, follows some application guidelines, and/or the timeline reflects a vague or questionable estimate of the scope & pacing of the work.	Proposal is poorly written, fails to follow many application guidelines, and/or the timeline reflects an unreasonable estimate of the scope & pacing of the work.	
Purpose, Need, & Department Support	Purpose is clear, need for project is substantial, and department(s) approval is high.	Purpose is reasonably clear, need for project is appropriate, and/or department(s) approval is secure.	Purpose is somewhat unclear, need for project is limited, and/or department(s) approval is marginal.	Purpose is unclear, need for project is minimal, and/or department(s) approval is lacking.	
Scope of Project	The curriculum program will significantly influence the achievement of key student outcomes for a large number of students and will significantly contribute to department and school-wide goals.	The curriculum program should influence the achievement of key student outcomes for a significant number of students and should contribute to department and school-wide goals.	The curriculum program may have some impact upon the achievement of key student outcomes, may benefit a small group of students, and/or will marginally contribute to achieving department and school-wide goals.	The curriculum program will have little or no impact upon the achievement of key student outcomes, will benefit relatively few students, and/or will contribute little to achieving department and school-wide goals.	
Curriculum Design	Outcomes, assessments, and instructional methods are expertly designed, well aligned, and highly consistent with Understanding by Design principles.	Outcomes, assessments, and instructional methods are effectively designed, reasonably aligned, and/or generally consistent with Understanding by Design principles.	Outcomes, assessments, and instructional methods are marginally designed, inconsistently aligned, and/or partially congruent with Understanding by Design principles.	Outcomes, assessments, and instructional methods are poorly designed, misaligned, and/or incongruent with Understanding by Design principles.	
Collaboration & Roles	Collaboration is an essential feature of the work, and members' roles are clearly defined and completely appropriate to assigned task(s).	Collaboration is a feature of the work, and members' roles are reasonably defined and appropriate to assigned task(s).	Collaboration is limited, and members' roles are vaguely defined and possibly inappropriate to assigned task(s).	Collaboration is artificial or completely lacking, and members' roles are undefined and/or inappropriate.	
Scope of Professional Duties	Project work significantly exceeds normal professional expectations for curriculum development.	Project work generally exceeds normal professional expectations for curriculum development.	Project work is somewhat within normal professional expectations for curriculum development.	Project work is primarily within normal professional expectations for curriculum development.	
Evaluation	Methods described for evaluating the project are detailed, rigorous, and valid.	Methods described for evaluating the project are fairly complete and reasonably valid.	Methods described for evaluating the project are incomplete and/or partially valid.	Methods described for evaluating the project are superficial and/or invalid.	
Presentation	Highly focused and exceptionally clear; presentation highlights project's essential features and addresses the Committee's key questions.	Reasonably focused and clear; presentation generally highlights project's essential features and adequately addresses most of the Committee's key questions.	Occasionally unfocused or unclear; presentation only marginally highlights project's essential features and/or partially addresses most of the Committee's key questions.	Overall lack of clarity and focus; presentation does little to address Committee's questions or concerns.	
Overall	Excellent	Good	Mediocre	Poor	

COMMENTS:
