

## Nevada STEM Teacher of the Year Scoring Rubric

Each criterion will be scored individually by the reviewers (OSIT, NDE, Regional STEM Network Committees) using this rubric to ensure a fair and comprehensive evaluation of each applicant's contributions to STEM education.

Applicant Name:	
Reviewer Name:	

<b>Final Score (100 points possible)</b>		
<b><u>Criteria</u></b>	<b><u>Points Possible</u></b>	<b><u>Points Given</u></b>
1: Impact on Students	30	
2: Leadership & Advocacy	25	
3: Community Engagement	20	
4: Beliefs, Philosophy, and Training	20	
5: Quality of Application	5	
6: <i>Bonus Points for Innovation</i>	3	
<b>Total:</b>		
Notes/Comments:		



**Criterion 1: Impact on Students (30 points possible)**

<u>Descriptors</u>	<u>Points Possible</u>	<u>Points Given</u>
<p>26-30 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates exceptional impact on students' STEM learning and mindset.</li><li>• Shows evidence of innovative teaching methods that engage students effectively in STEM subjects.</li><li>• Illustrates a clear commitment to developing students' STEM interests and identities.</li></ul> <p>21-25 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Significant impact on students' STEM learning and mindset.</li><li>• Implements innovative teaching methods in STEM subjects.</li><li>• Actively promotes development of students' STEM interests and identities.</li></ul> <p>11-20 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Moderate impact on students' STEM learning and mindset.</li><li>• Applies some innovative teaching methods STEM subjects.</li><li>• Shows occasional development of students' STEM interests and identities.</li></ul> <p>0-10 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Minimal impact on students' STEM learning and mindset.</li><li>• Utilizes conventional teaching methods STEM subjects.</li><li>• Rarely develops students' STEM interests and identities.</li></ul>	<b>30</b>	
<p>Notes/Comments:</p>		

**Criterion 2: Leadership and Advocacy (25 points possible)**

<u>Descriptors</u>	<u>Points Possible</u>	<u>Points Given</u>
<p>20-25 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates leadership in STEM initiatives within and beyond the school community.</li><li>• Shows evidence of advocating for STEM education improvements or resources.</li><li>• Demonstrates a dedication to advancing STEM opportunities for students.</li></ul> <p>13-19 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates leadership in STEM initiatives within the school community.</li><li>• Advocates for STEM education improvements or resources occasionally.</li><li>• Shows dedication to advancing STEM opportunities at times.</li></ul> <p>6-12 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates limited leadership in some STEM initiatives.</li><li>• Advocates minimally for STEM education improvements or resources.</li><li>• Demonstrates sporadic dedication to advancing STEM opportunities at times.</li></ul> <p>0-5 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Rare demonstration of leadership in STEM initiatives.</li><li>• Minimal advocacy for STEM education improvements or resources.</li><li>• Little dedication to advancing STEM opportunities at times.</li></ul>	25	
Notes/Comments:		

**Criterion 3: Community Engagement (20 points possible)**

<u>Descriptors</u>	<u>Points Possible</u>	<u>Points Given</u>
<p>16-20 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Shows active involvement in projects or initiatives benefiting the broader community.</li><li>• Illustrates collaborative efforts that engage stakeholders beyond the classroom.</li><li>• Demonstrates a commitment to extending STEM learning beyond traditional boundaries.</li></ul> <p>11-15 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Moderately involved in community projects.</li><li>• Occasionally collaborates with stakeholders</li><li>• Minimal effort to extend STEM learning beyond classroom boundaries</li></ul> <p>6-10 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Limited involvement in community projects.</li><li>• Rare collaboration with stakeholders.</li><li>• Minimal effort to extend STEM learning beyond classroom boundaries.</li></ul> <p>0-5 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Little to no involvement in community projects.</li><li>• No collaboration with stakeholders.</li><li>• No effort to extend STEM learning beyond classroom boundaries.</li></ul>	<p>20</p>	
<p>Notes/Comments:</p>		

**Criterion 4: Beliefs, Philosophy, and Training (20 points possible)**

<u>Descriptors</u>	<u>Points Possible</u>	<u>Points Given</u>
<p>16-20 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Articulates a clear philosophy regarding STEM education.</li><li>• Demonstrates a strong belief in the transformative power of STEM learning with an example.</li><li>• Illustrates alignment between beliefs and implemented practices.</li><li>• Demonstrates a history of high-quality training in STEM education.</li><li>• Positions equity as a key component of STEM education.</li></ul> <p>11-15 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Articulates a mostly clear philosophy on STEM education.</li><li>• Demonstrates a strong belief in transformative power of STEM learning.</li><li>• Partial alignment between beliefs and implemented practices.</li><li>• Demonstrates completion of at least one high-quality training in STEM education.</li></ul> <p>6-10 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Unclear philosophy on STEM education.</li><li>• Moderate belief in transformative power of STEM learning.</li><li>• Limited alignment between beliefs and implemented practices.</li></ul> <p>0-5 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Unclear philosophy on STEM education.</li><li>• Weak belief in transformative power of STEM learning.</li><li>• Minimal alignment between beliefs and implemented practices.</li></ul>	<b>20</b>	
Notes/Comments:		

**Criterion 5: Quality of Application (5 points possible)**

<u>Descriptors</u>	<u>Points Possible</u>	<u>Points Given</u>
<p>5 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Presents a clear, comprehensive, and well-structured application packet.</li><li>• Provides compelling evidence supported by examples and achievements.</li><li>• Articulates responses that effectively demonstrate the nominee’s impact and contributions.</li></ul> <p>3-4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Mostly clear, comprehensive, well-structured application.</li><li>• Some compelling evidence supported by examples/achievements.</li><li>• Mostly articulate responses demonstrating impact.</li></ul> <p>1-2 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Somewhat clear and structured application.</li><li>• Limited compelling evidence supported by examples/achievements.</li><li>• Partially articulate responses demonstrating impact.</li></ul> <p>0 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Unclear or unstructured application.</li><li>• Little to no compelling evidence or examples/achievements.</li><li>• Poorly articulated responses demonstrating impact.</li></ul>	5	
<p>Notes/Comments:</p>		

<b>Criterion 6: Additional Points</b>		
<b><u>Descriptors</u></b>	<b><u>Points Possible</u></b>	<b><u>Points Given</u></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Bonus points awarded for exceptional, outstanding, or innovative practices that significantly exceed the standard expectations.</li></ul>	3	
Notes/Comments:		