ELEMENTRY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

Funded by the U.S. Department of Education

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION PROJECTS

Utah System of Higher Education
Utah State Board of Regents-The Gateway
60 South 400 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101-1284

CLOSING DATE
APRIL 14, 2006

2006 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY
TITLE II, PART A, SUBPART 3
STATE AGENCY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION (SAHE) PARTNERSHIP GRANTS

UTAH SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

FUNDED BY THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT (ESEA)
AS AMEDED BY
NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND (NCLB) ACT OF 2001
PUBLIC LAW 107-110

Table of Contents

Part I: Overview of Title II
- A. Preparing, Training, and Recruiting High Quality Teachers and Principals
- B. Goals for Utah Schools
- C. *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants*
- D. Targeted Priorities

Part II: Application Information
- A. Introduction
- B. Philosophy for Administering NCLB/USHE Funds
- C. Differences between NCLB and Eisenhower Program
- D. NCLB/USHE Funded Activities: Partnerships
- E. Eligible Partnerships
- F. Project Duration
- G. Geographic Distribution
- H. Use of Funds
- I. Definitions
- J. Selection of Awards
- K. Requirements and Priorities for 2005-2006 Awards

Part III: Preparation of Proposals

Part IV:
- A. Budget Guidelines and Grant Administration Procedures
- B. Grant Administration Procedures

Part V: Proposal Review Process, Evaluation Criteria, and Notification
- A. Demonstrated Need and Improvement of Instruction
- B. Plan of Operation
- C. Evaluation
- D. Resources
- E. Budget and Cost Effectiveness
- F. Overall Quality

Part VI: Proposal Submission, Award Notification, and Timeline
- A. Proposal Submission
- B. Award Notification
- C. Important Dates/Timeline

Appendix A: Forms
- Proposal Cover Page
- Abstract
- Evaluation Framework Worksheet
- Proposal Budget Summary
- Cooperative Planning
- Institutional Cooperative Planning
- Participants Involved
- Currently Funded and Pending Proposals
- NPO Demonstrated Effectiveness Documentation
- Statement of Assurances
- USHE Review Panel Evaluation

Appendix B: Utah System of Higher Education/Utah State Office of Education Contacts

Appendix C: Questions and Answers Regarding Pre-Service Teachers in USHE Projects

PART I: OVERVIEW OF TITLE II

From Section 2101 of the bill's text available at: http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02/
and Title II Guidance August 3, 2005: http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/guidance.pdf.

A. Preparing, Training, and Recruiting High Quality Teachers and Principals

The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB) amends the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) by making significant changes in the major Federal programs that support schools' efforts to educate the nation's students by placing emphasis on the importance of teacher quality in improving student achievement. Highly qualified teachers are those who have earned a minimum of a bachelor's degree, obtained state certification, passed the state teacher licensing examination in the core academic subject in which they teach, and who do not have certification nor licensure requirements waived. To help insure that all teachers of core academic subjects are highly qualified no later than the end of the 2005-2006 school year, Title II, Part A provides $3 billion a year to the states. NCLB is based on principles of increased flexibility and local control, stronger accountability for results, expanded options for parents, and an emphasis on instruction based on scientific research that is effective in increasing student academic achievement.

The Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program provides states and districts with the flexibility and opportunity to address the highly qualified teacher challenge in very creative ways. For example, states may support the reform of traditional teacher training as well as the innovative expansion of alternative routes to teacher licensure, as well as establish mechanisms to recruit highly qualified teachers and provide incentives to retain them in high-need schools (Local Education Agencies (LEA) with no less than 20 percent of their students from families living below the poverty line. (See the Census Bureau website at http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/saipe/school/sd99ftpdoc.html). Additionally, Title II, Part A funds can support more effective professional development for teachers currently in the classroom, with a focus on ensuring that teachers have a deep understanding of the core academic subjects.

States are encouraged to use program funds creatively to address the broad challenges of teacher recruitment, retention, hiring, induction, professional development, and the need for more skilled principals and assistant principals to serve as effective school leaders.

B. Goals for Utah Schools

Beyond the federal requirements and following the ESEA definition of "professional development" in section 9101(34), the state will be focused on meeting the major goals identified by the Utah State Board of Education and the ESEA Goals for Accountability:

1. All students will reach high standards at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading and mathematics by 2013-2014.

2. By 2013-2014, all students will be proficient in reading by the end of the third grade.

3. All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English.

4. By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

5. All students will graduate from high school.

C. Improving Teacher Quality State Grants

The purpose of these grants is to increase academic achievement of all students by helping schools and school districts improve teacher instruction and principal quality in terms of instructional leadership. States must develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year. Reaching this goal will require reform of traditional teacher training, which is usually conducted in colleges of education, as well as the innovative expansion of alternative routes to teacher licensure. It also requires effective professional development for teachers in the classroom.

Through the program, state educational agencies (SEAs), LEAs, and the state agency for higher education (SAHE) receive funds on a formula basis. The SAHE provides competitive grants to partnerships comprised, at a minimum, of schools of education and arts and sciences, along with one or more high-need LEAs. *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants* provide these agencies with the flexibility to use these funds to address challenges to teacher quality, whether they concern teacher preparation and qualifications of new teachers, recruitment and hiring, induction, professional development, teacher retention, or the need for more capable principals and assistant principals to serve as effective school leaders. The program focuses on practices grounded in scientifically-based research to prepare, train, and recruit high-quality teachers while giving states and districts flexibility to select the strategies that best meet their particular needs. In exchange, agencies that receive funds are held accountable to the public for improvements in academic achievement.

D. Targeted Priorities

The projects must specifically target effective instructional strategies that are necessary to meet the needs of students in at least one of the subpopulations to master the core academic subjects. This target follows the Utah State Board of Education goals that state achievement gaps between population groups will be eliminated. These subpopulations, as per NCLB (1111)(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), are economically disadvantaged students, students with limited English proficiency, and students with low academic achievement.

PART II: APPLICATION INFORMATION

A. Introduction

The NCLB annually awards federal funding to states for the purposes of strengthening teacher preparation and providing high quality in-service professional development for practicing teachers and other educators.

Most of the federal funding received in Utah is distributed to schools or projects through the Utah State Office of Education. However, up to $463,787 is available to faculty members at colleges and universities, or to non-profit organizations, through the Utah System of Higher Education. The same amount or some small increase is anticipated in project years 2006-2007. This request is for proposals for projects to be supported through the competitive grant program. Projects are to be conducted within a period from July 1, 2006 through September 30, 2007. Multiple-year proposals are allowable, but should prepare budget requests at or about the same funding level in each year.

B. Philosophy for Administering NCLB/USHE Funds

NCLB/USHE grants provide an excellent opportunity for the educational community to address serious concerns related to instruction in English language arts, mathematics, and science. The USHE has a strong commitment to increased in-service opportunities for school personnel that support excellent standards-based K-12 education. State core standards for English language arts, mathematics, and science can be obtained from the Utah State Office of Education homepage: http://www.usoe.k12.ut.us. (See Appendix B for information on obtaining state core standards and K-12 contacts). The USHE supports collegiate faculty in English language arts, mathematics, science, and educational disciplines together with elementary, middle, and secondary school teachers to provide an environment where creative ideas and methods of teaching can flourish. The USHE invites proposals that contain proven methods for addressing the complex issues surrounding teaching and learning. Proposals must address professional development efforts and initiatives supporting the state English language arts, mathematics, and science core standards.

C. Differences between NCLB and Eisenhower Program

The Eisenhower Program for Professional Development funded in-service opportunities for teachers in mathematics and science. The NCLB focus is on schools that are not performing well and must be improved. As a result, funded USHE proposals will target schools that are at the most serious risk of not achieving state goals in English language arts, mathematics, and science. The NCLB serves Title I high-need LEAs, where at least 20 percent of the student population is considered living at the poverty level as defined by the Federal Government. The new NCLB legislation will allow projects that train pre-service teachers but under specific conditions. (See Appendix C for questions and answers regarding the inclusion of pre-service teachers in NCLB/USHE projects.)

Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Non-Regulatory Draft Guidance document dated August 3, 2005 is available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/guidance.pdf.

D. NCLB/USHE Funded Activities: Partnerships

The USHE will make awards from NCLB funds to support the following partnership activities to enhance student achievement in participating high-need LEAs:

1. Professional development activities in core academic subjects to ensure that:

- Teachers and highly qualified paraprofessionals (and, when appropriate, principals) have subject matter knowledge in the academic subjects that the teachers teach (including knowledge of how to use computers and other technology to enhance student learning); and

- Principals have the instructional leadership skills to help them work more effectively with teachers to help students master core academic subjects.

2. Development and provision of assistance to LEAs and to their teachers, paraprofessionals, or school principals, in providing sustained, high-quality professional development activities that:

   - Ensure that those individuals can use challenging state academic core standards, student academic achievement standards, and state assessments to improve instructional practices and student academic achievement;

   - May include intensive programs designed to prepare individuals to provide instruction related to the professional development described in the preceding paragraph to others in their schools; and

   - May include activities of partnerships between one or more LEAs, one or more of the LEAs' schools, and one or more IHEs for the purpose of improving teaching and student performance.

E. Eligible Partnerships

1. Must include:
   - a department, division, or college of education, and
   - a college of arts and science, and
   - an LEA.

2. May include:
   - another LEA,
   - a charter school,
   - an elementary or secondary school,
   - an educational service agency,
   - a nonprofit educational organization,
   - another institution of higher education,
   - a school of arts and sciences or education within such an institution,
   - a nonprofit cultural organization,
   - an entity carrying out a pre-kindergarten program,
   - a teacher organization,
   - a principal organization, or
   - a business

F. Project Duration

Subject to the preceding requirement of sustained professional development, projects may be of any appropriate length up to three years, but approved funding for this period is from July 1, 2006 through September 30, 2007.

G. Geographic Distribution

The review panel will strive to ensure that funded projects are equitably distributed to schools in Utah.

H. Use of Funds

Partnerships may use funds in the preparation, training, and recruiting of high quality teachers and principals through the following: promotion activities, tuition and book fee waivers, graduate credit, registration payments, travel, meals and lodging, stipends, faculty salaries, and other justifiable program administration costs.

I. Definitions

See Appendix A in *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Non-Regulatory Draft Guidance* (http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/guidance.pdf for definitions of terms in this RFP.

J. Selection of Awards

The screening and selection process will include an application review team, scoring criteria, and final review. The review team consists of administrative faculty from USHE institutions and representatives from the Utah State Office of Education.

K. General Requirements and Priorities for 2006-2007 Awards

Several federal and state requirements must be met by any project funded in this competition. To be considered responsive to this request, proposals must meet each of the following requirements:

1. **Eligible Sponsoring Institutions**
   Proposals must be submitted by a regionally accredited institution of higher education in Utah.

2. **Eligible Disciplines**
   Projects may address professional development of elementary, middle, or high school teachers in English language arts, mathematics, or science.

3. **Consistent with Systemic Reform of Education**
   Although use of these funds is limited to a specified period, projects must also be consistent with longer-term systemic reform of education. Projects must:
   - be aligned with state core standards for language arts, mathematics, and science;
   - set high expectations for all students to close the achievement gap;
   - encourage collaboration and networking between content specialists, teacher education specialists, and practicing teachers;
   - employ research-based educational strategies; and
   - provide high-quality in-service professional development for elementary, middle, or high school teachers.

4. **Cooperative Planning and Collaboration**
   - **LEA/School Collaboration**
     Evidence of LEA involvement in project planning, and a formal agreement between the college, university, or Nonprofit Organization (NPO) and the LEA(s), or consortium of LEAs must be included in the proposal. This requirement is consistent with a federal requirement and with a

priority of the USHE to encourage a seamless system of education, kindergarten through postsecondary levels (See Appendix A for the Cooperative Planning Agreement Form). Applicants must align their projects with the existing infrastructure of district, regional, and Utah State Office of Education (See Appendix B for K-12 contacts) professional development activities in order to:

- expand statewide professional activities based on identified needs and long term goals,
- support systemic educational reform,
- develop a second generation of leadership in English language arts, mathematics, science, and
- promote educational partnerships.

- **Participant Input and Involvement in Planning**
  Teacher participants and/or administrators from the school(s) to be served by the project must have input and be involved in project content, planning, and proposal preparation for all professional development projects. This requirement is intended to ensure that the nature, content, and academic credit (if any) for a course, workshop, or other activities will meet the needs of the teachers to be served and will promote efficient use of funds. Projects must be aligned with Utah's English language arts, mathematics, and science core standards.

- **Joint Effort within Higher Education Institutions**
  Faculty members representing one or more of the language arts, mathematics, and science core disciplines must have major roles in design and/or operation of the proposal and project. In addition, a faculty member from the college, school, division, or department of education must be an active collaborator in design, conduct, and evaluation of the project and submission of the proposal (See Appendix A for Institutional Cooperative Planning Agreement Form). Faculty in either a core content area or a teacher education program may serve as the project director.

5. Nonprofit Organizations (NPOs) of Demonstrated Effectiveness

Nonprofit organizations are responsible for submitting documentation of their demonstrated effectiveness in delivering high-quality professional development in language arts, mathematics, and/or science. This includes the NPO's prior experience in providing professional development and other relevant factors that bear on the NPO's ability to provide effective delivery service. (See NPO Demonstrated Effectiveness Form, Appendix A).

6. Sustained, Intensive Professional Development

The U.S. Department of Education requires the USHE to show sustained professional development of teachers using methods based on scientific research. To receive support, a professional development project must include activities for individual teachers spread over at least a six-month period. The project must increase teachers' knowledge of subject matter and effective instructional strategies, and be designed to document the application of the knowledge and pedagogy in the classroom to increase student achievement. Projects concentrated entirely upon summer activities will not be funded. Summer projects must include substantial follow-up components in the succeeding months. Follow-up components may be in person or may use distance learning technology.

7. Project Duration

Subject to the preceding requirement of sustained professional development, projects may be of any appropriate length, but must be completed within the period running from July 1, 2006 through September 30, 2007.

8. Alignment with Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science State Core Standards

Professional activities must be directly linked to state core standards for English language arts, mathematics, and science.

9. Professional Development in the Use of Educational Technology and/or the Use of Distance Education in Professional Development

The USHE has a priority for increased access to needed educational experiences for Utah's K-12 teachers, which includes utilizing distance education. Effective use of technology in the classroom may be considered in NCLB initiatives.

10. Collaboration with Other Student and Teacher Enhancement Programs

Colleges and universities are encouraged to determine whether similar initiatives already exist and to work cooperatively with existing initiatives in developing their proposal. These institutions should explore options for a continuing commitment, including establishment of formal courses in academic departments, to meeting the needs of the teacher.

11. Projects Must Target Subpopulations in Greatest Need

The projects must specifically target effective instructional strategies to enable students in at least one of the subpopulations to master the core academic subjects. This target is consistent with state efforts to eliminate achievement gaps between population groups. These subpopulations, as per NCLB (1111)(b)(2)(C)(i)(II) and needs identified in Utah, are economically disadvantaged students, students with limited English proficiency, and students with low achievement.

12. Private School Involvement

The Institution of Higher Education (IHE)-LEA partnerships must offer services equitably to public and private educational personnel. If the IHE-LEA partnership notifies public schools of a project for their participation, then the partnership must also notify private schools. If the IHE-LEA partnership includes schools in the planning process, then the partnership must also notify private schools to participate in the planning.

However, private schools may not have the criteria that the IHE-LEA partnership looks to serve (such as, teachers of low-performing students). As a result, not all private schools will be included in a project since they may not have teachers with low performing students.

To provide services on an equitable basis to private schools, the partnership must send a letter to the appropriate private school official from each non-profit private school in the LEAs targeted for participation. In your proposal, describe the IHE-LEA partnership efforts to include the private nonprofit schools in the design and/or participation in the professional development project.

PART III: PREPARATION OF PROPOSALS

All proposals must be submitted on the official forms provided in Appendix A, except for those sections indicated. Proposals must be typed and adhere to the following format. The proposal narrative must not exceed **ten (10)** double-spaced pages written in 12 point font.

The complete proposal includes, in this order: (1) Cover Page form, (2) Abstract, (3) maximum 10 page Narrative (use the headings identified below, in the order indicated below), (4) Evaluation Plan, (5) Budget Summary form, (6) Budget Narrative, (7) Vitae (one page per person), (8) Cooperative Planning Agreement, (9) Letters of Support, (10) Participants Involved form, (11) Currently Funded and Pending Proposals form, (12) NPO form (non-profit organizations only), (13) Statement of Assurances, and (14) Review Panel Evaluation form. All major subject headings must be underlined and/or highlighted. All pages must be numbered. ***Appendices are limited to 5 pages. No previous program materials or published items are allowed in the Appendices. Proposals submitted with these disallowed items will be returned without consideration.***

1. **Cover Page (form in Appendix A)**
   - List of collaborating LEAs (must include Title I LEAs)
   - Signature of project director
   - Signatures of appropriate officials of the applying institution

2. **Abstract (form in Appendix A)**
   - A one-page concise summary that includes: collaborating groups and participants, main activities, and expected project outcomes. This information will be used in the review process and may be used to announce and/or advertise funded projects.

3. **Narrative (print on plain pages, 10 pages maximum, 12 point font). Use these headings, in this order:**

   Cooperative Planning
   - Identify specific local professional development needs that the project will address. (e.g., alignment with school and/or teacher needs; participant involvement in planning).
   - Describe needs, roles, and contributions of each collaborative unit, including how these collaborations fulfill needs identified in LEA professional development plans.
   - Describe how the collaborative structure will enhance project's success.

   Objectives and Anticipated Outcomes
   - State objectives in concise terms and in a measurable format.
   - Anticipated outcomes must address effect of project on target audience.

   Issues to be addressed
   - State how professional development priorities will be implemented.
   - Describe how professional development addresses state core standards for language arts, mathematics, and science.
   - State how professional development including follow-up will be sustained.

   Activities
   - Describe proposed activities, including the following information for each activity: time allotted, staff person responsible, and relationship to a specific measurable objective.
   - Describe how proposed activities will lead to meeting the measurable objectives.

- Describe how the activities address priorities listed above in this RFP. If the activities involve a college course and/or teacher workshop, the description should include the following information: course of study or syllabus, identification of textbooks and/or reference materials, methods of participant evaluation, and name(s) of person(s) teaching the course/workshop.

Achievement and Impact of Similar Current/Previous Projects
This section applies only if this project is an expansion or continuation of an earlier project of the project director or institution.

- Include data on previous project's effect on participants (e.g., how participants' involvement changed their ability in English language arts, mathematics, or science; changed their teaching methods; changed their attitudes and/or learning styles).
- Describe the relationship between success of previous project(s) and anticipated outcomes of proposed project.

Replication and Dissemination
- Describe specific plans for replication of project by the USHE institutions and local school districts.
- Outline plans for dissemination of project's successes.

4. **Evaluation Plan**
The following evaluation framework components are required:

- The program goal written in terms of increased student academic achievement,
- Measurable objectives for teachers and students to include expected change and to what degree,
- Information/data needed to indicate if there is a change,
- Date source/collection methods,
- Data analysis,
- Date for data collection,
- Where the data will be collected,
- Who will be responsible for data collection and analyses.

See the sample Evaluation Framework Worksheet you could use in Appendix A. A resource which explains the evaluation framework components is "Assessing Impact: Evaluating Staff Development" by Joellen Killion. Examples of evaluation tools are also provided, such as "Innovation Configuration Maps," surveys for observations, and self-assessments by teachers about their use/implementation of the knowledge gained. (Order from: National Staff Development Council, nsdc.org, (800)727-7288.

- Full references must be provided for any materials cited in the narrative.

5. **Budget Summary (form in Appendix A)**

6. **Budget Narrative (no form, print on blank page)**
   - Use a separate sheet following the budget summary to provide a concise narrative description for each budget line item, including a description of time involvement, roles, and responsibilities of the project director and staff.

7. **Vitae**

- Provide a one-page vita for each of the following: project director, project staff members, graduate students, and teachers who have a major role in the project.

8. **Cooperative Planning Agreement(s) (form in Appendix A)**
   - Description of collaboration and previous planning including methods used to involve school personnel.

9 **Letters of Support**
   - A brief letter from the superintendent of the LEA and the principal(s) of the school(s) verifying their intent to participate in your program.

10. **Participants Involved (form in Appendix A)**
    - Provide an estimate of the number of teachers to be served.
    - Provide an estimate of the number of schools and/or school districts to be served.

11. **Currently Funded Projects and Pending Proposals (form in Appendix A)**
    - Provide a list of currently funded projects and pending proposals involving the project director and associated staff members.

12. **NPO Demonstrated Effectiveness Form (if required) (form in Appendix A)**

13. **Statement of Assurances (form in Appendix A)**
    - The proper institutional representative must sign this form.

14. **Review Panel Evaluation Form (form in Appendix A)**
    - Type in the title of your proposal and principal investigator name(s).

PART IV: BUDGET GUIDELINES AND GRANT ADMINISTRATION PROCEDURES

A. Budget Guidelines

The USHE recognizes the need for grants to serve as many teachers as possible. With limited funds available, proposal writers are encouraged to develop efficient and highly effective proposals that incorporate funds available from other sources when appropriate.

The following budget guidelines are to be used in budget preparation:

- **Grants and Indirect Costs**
  Grants should pay the direct costs of the project (see Indirect Costs below).
  Summer or reassigned-time for faculty salaries and fringe benefits; wages for secretarial assistance, graduate and undergraduate students; and/or peer teachers should directly benefit proposed project activities.

- **Consultant Fee**
  Maximum of $200 per day plus expenses for those employed as instructors. Must not exceed institutional salary levels. USHE institutions' employees cannot be paid as consultants on these grants.

- **Supplies, Materials, Copying**
  Must be for items not associated with a credit course and *must be* fully justified. Routine office supplies and operating expenses are not allowable. Supplies and copying are only allowable for special purposes such as workshop materials.

- **Travel Expenses for Staff and Participants**
  Reasonable expenses for participants at in-state meetings integral to project success are allowed; travel for project staff to conduct on-site evaluations and follow-up is allowed.

  Out-of-state travel requests will be carefully reviewed. Alternative sources of funding for out-of-state travel should be sought.

- **Equipment**
  NCLB funding should not be viewed as a mechanism to provide equipment for an ongoing program. Although equipment purchases are not prohibited, proposals that request substantial amounts for equipment will be scrutinized carefully and may receive lower priority.

- **Indirect Costs**
  The IHE may charge a five percent indirect cost to administer the grant. An LEA may not charge indirect costs to the grant.

  Special Rule—No single participant in an eligible partnership may use more than 50 percent of the funds made available to the partnership under this section.

B. Grant Administration Procedures

All federal funds for these grants will be assigned to a specific account. If an institution receives more than one grant, separate accounts must be established for each project. Shifting funds between projects is not permitted. Expenditures in excess of approved budget amounts will be the responsibility of the recipient institution. With

one exception, reallocations of funds between budget items may be done at the project director's discretion if the amount of funds involved is less than 10 percent of the total budget for the project. All such changes must be tracked and documented in writing to the USHE prior to the final fund request for the project. The exception: Any changes that involve an increase in the personnel budget must be submitted to the USHE in advance in writing.

The USHE must be notified of changes in personnel.

If the number of participants is less than anticipated, it is expected that participant expenditures for the grant will be reduced accordingly. If the teacher enrollment is at 50 percent or less of the level for which the grant was approved, USHE approval is required before proceeding with project expenditures and activities.

During the time period covered by this award, a site visit from the USHE Coordinator or another representative may be expected.

PART V: PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS, EVALUATION CRITERIA, AND NOTIFICATION

All proposals will be reviewed and rated by a review panel to be chosen by the USHE Coordinator. The proposals will be scored according to the guidelines and requirements detailed in this RFP, using the Review Panel Evaluation Form (form in Appendix A). The panel will include representatives from the USHE and Utah State Office of Education (USOE) in the disciplines of education, language arts, mathematics, and science. Each applicant will be notified in writing about the status of the application. Copies of evaluators' written evaluations will be provided. In addition to the guidelines and requirements mentioned previously, reviewers will pay particular attention to the following elements of each proposal.

A. Demonstrated Need and Improvement of Instruction for Student Subpopulations

- Plan cooperatively with one or more schools and/or school districts or members of a consortium.
- Propose activities that meet professional development needs identified by the schools and/or school districts involved in the planning.
- Emphasize priorities as listed in the RFP.
- Design project to provide for measurable improvement in the quality of teaching, classroom performance of teachers, and/or student learning and performance, especially students in the identified subpopulations (see "Part II. Targeted Priorities" under "K. Requirements and Priorities for 2005-2006 Awards").
- Design project to serve as a model or provide information that other institutions and schools could use to meet similar local needs.

B. Plan of Operation

- Management plan assures proper and efficient administration.
- Project staffing is appropriate for proposed activities.
- Project objectives are reasonable, clearly identified and linked to local professional development needs, and contain anticipated outcomes that have potential for success.
- Evidence that LEAs were involved in the development of the proposal and the proposed workshop activities.
- Timeline is appropriate for the program and appears reasonable.
- Proposed activities are practical, creative, innovative, and use state-of-the-art knowledge and practices.

C. Evaluation

- Include an evaluation of the project's expected impact in the proposal.
- Include an evaluation of participant expected outcomes in the proposal.
- Include performance indicators and outcomes (qualitative and quantitative) that demonstrate the past effectiveness of the program and justification for continued funding for projects funded in the past.

D. Resources

- Proposed resources are adequate to fully implement the project.
- Institutional commitment to the project, including appropriate staff time, is apparent.
- Qualifications and experiences of project staff fit proposed assignments.

E. Budget and Cost Effectiveness: A budget that …

- is clear, concise, and justified in the proposal narrative.
- is appropriate for the project's stated objectives and activities.
- meets the requirements listed in the RFP.

- is cost effective. Includes additional resources, such as LEA matching funds, and/or in-kind support.

F. Overall Quality: The proposal …

- is well conceived.
- is appropriate for USHE funding.
- uses a format the is organized, clearly written, concise, complete, and meets the requirements stated in the RFP.
- has potential for replication in other regions of the state and is consistent with the aims and goals of major reform efforts in the state.

PART VI: PROPOSAL SUBMISSION, AWARD NOTIFICATION, AND TIMELINE

A. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION\

Applicants must submit ten (10) complete copies and the original of the proposal stapled in the upper left corner.

Proposals must be received by 4:00 p.m., on Friday, April 14, 2006. Proposals received after that time will not be accepted, and faxed proposals will not be accepted.
Submit proposals to:

Janice Christensen
Utah Systen of Higher Education
Utah State Board of Regents-The Gateway
60 South 400 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101-1284
Email: jchristensen@utahsbr.edu

Proposal receipt will be acknowledged via e-mail by **Friday, April 21, 2006**.

B. AWARD NOTIFICATION

Approval of grant awards is expected to be made the week of **May 8, 2006**. All institutions submitting proposals will be notified in writing soon thereafter regarding funding decisions.

An applicant may appeal these decisions and has thirty (30) days to request a hearing from the USHE Office. Within thirty (30) days of receiving such a request, the NCLB Coordinator will hold such a hearing and shall review its action. No later than ten (10) working days after the hearing, the USHE Office will issue its written ruling including finding of fact and reasons for the ruling. If the USHE Office determines that its action was contrary to State or Federal Statutes or Regulation that govern the program, the USHE Office will rescind its final action. If the USHE Office does not rescind its final action, and the applicant is still unsatisfied, the applicant may appeal to the Secretary of Education as outlined in federal regulations.

Questions regarding the program should be addressed to:

Phyllis 'Teddi' Safman, Ph.D.
Utah System of Higher Education
Utah System Board of Regents-The Gateway
60 South 400 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101-1284
Phone: (801) 321-7127
Email: psafman@utahsbr.edu

C. IMPORTANT DATES/TIMELINE

The following dates generally reflect the proposal and program process. These are target dates and subject to change.

April 14, 2006	**Closing date for receipt of applications**
May, 2006	Evaluation of applications
May 8-12, 2006	Project directors notified of application status
September 30, 2007	Interim Program Evaluations due (final evaluations for one-year projects)
September 30, 2009	Date all projects will end and funds terminate (for three-year projects)
September 30, 2009	Final Program Evaluations due (for three-year projects)

APPENDIX A

FORMS

PROPOSAL COVER PAGE
UTAH SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION
Applicant Information:

1. **Institution of Higher Education**:

_____

Project Director: _____

Telephone: _____Fax.: _____ Email: _____

Address:_____
_____
_____

2. **PROJECT**

Title: _____

Discipline(s) involved: _____

Project Type: Pre-Service _____ In-service _____

Estimated # of Teacher/Student Participants _____Grade Levels_____
Contact Hours _____ Graduate Credit if any _____ Undergraduate Credit if any_____

Main activities: _____
_____

3. **BUDGET**

Requested NCLB Funds: $ _____
Estimated Cost per Teacher/Student Participant: $ _____

4. **COLLABORATING ORGANIZATIONS** (School Districts, Other Agencies, and Representatives)

_____
_____

5. **CERTIFICATION AND ENDORSEMENT**

The institution certifies the accuracy of the information in this proposal, and assures that the program and financial conditions stated in the proposal will be completed as proposed.

Project Director _____ Title _____

Signature _____ Date _____

Institutional Representative _____ Title _____

Signature _____ Date _____

UTAH SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

NCLB Professional Development Program
ABSTRACT

Please type a concise summary of your proposal in the space provided on this page.

Project's Evaluation Plan to Assess Impact of Professional Development

(The form is adapted from *Assessing Impact, Evaluating Staff Development*, Killion, NSDC, p. 226)
A copy of this form may be obtained on the NSDC website at www.nsdc.org

Program Goal: Increase Students' Academic Achievement in Science.

Measurable Objectives For Teachers and Students Include: - expected change - to what degree	**Information/ Data Needed** *What will indicate if there is a change?*	**Data Source/** Collection Method *Who / what can tell me about the change and how will I collect it?*	**Data Analysis** *How will I measure or depict change in the information I collect?*	**When will I Collect the Data?**	**Where will the data be collected?**	**Who will be responsible for the data collection and analysis?**
Ex. #1: 95% of teachers who complete the science PD program will show a 50% increase in knowledge of the inquiry process.	pre/post assessment of knowledge of the inquiry process teacher interview of knowledge of the inquiry process	pre-assessment collected post-assessment collected/ teacher interview	Compare pre-assessment to post-assessment of knowledge of the inquiry process and teacher interview regarding knowledge gained		pre-assessment collected thru mailing post-assess. collected/ teacher interview conducted during classroom visit	DOE science consultant
Ex. #2: To demonstrate impact of increased teacher knowledge of the inquiry process on student achievement- 100% of these teachers will establish a measurable objective & timeline for their students as measured by a formative assessment	increased student knowledge of the inquiry process	teacher determined formative assessment of student learning collected by teachers	formative assessment comparisons of student knowledge e.g., teacher made tests, student interviews, demonstration videotapes		teachers' classrooms	teachers will analyze and submit to DOE science consultant

USHE
PROPOSAL BUDGET SUMMARY
2006-2007

Project Title:

Project Director:

	REQUEST	SAHE ONLY
1. Salaries and Fringe (Attach a detailed list, showing each position)		
A. Professional		
B. Classified		
C. Student		
D. Consultant		
E. Other (Explain)		
F. Fringe		
Total Personnel Costs		
2. Travel (Attach explanation as appropriate)		
A. In-State		
B. Out-of-State		
Total		
3. Operating		
A. Office Copying/ Supplies/Expenses (for special purposes only)		
B. Instructional		
C. Equipment		
D. Printing		
E. Other (Explain)		
Total		
TOTAL COSTS		

COOPERATIVE PLANNING

(This page must be completed for all proposals).

Instructions: Describe how this proposal has been coordinated with the curriculum and instruction specialists from the local school districts and representatives from the USOE and how those plans address USHE-USOE priorities. Include information on meetings, names of schools or school districts involved, number of participants involved, and job titles of participants. Use additional sheets as needed. A simple letter of support will ordinarily not be accepted as satisfying the cooperative planning requirement.

INSTITUTIONAL COOPERATIVE PLANNING

(Only institutions with teacher education programs must complete this page).

Instructions: Describe the collaborative institutional planning efforts that have occurred between the education and the language arts, mathematics, and/or science colleges or departments. Describe how both colleges and/or departments will be involved with project implementation. Include information on meetings, names of participants and schools and/or departments of participants. A simple letter of support will ordinarily not be accepted as satisfying the cooperative planning requirement.

PARTICIPANTS INVOLVED

NCLB/USHE Proposal

Instructions: Provide an estimate of the number of teachers and/or principals from each identified school that will participate in your program.

School	**Number of Teachers**	**Number of Principals**
Total		

CURRENTLY FUNDED AND PENDING PROPOSALS

Currently funded projects and pending proposals involving the project director and associated staff members. (If no funded proposals, enter "none" under Project in the table below).

Project	**Funded /Pending**	**Project Member**	**% Annual Time**	**Total Award**	**Funding Agency**

NPO DEMONSTRATED EFFECTIVENESS DOCUMENTATION

(Institutions of higher education need not complete this form.)

Each NPO applicant must provide written evidence of: (a) past demonstrated effectiveness in providing professional development for teachers in English language arts, mathematics, and/or science in Utah; and (b) financial stability.

Documentation of past effectiveness:

The following evidence must be provided (as an attachment to this form) for one or more past professional development activities:

*Title, dates, and location of activity,
*Number of teacher participants,
*Names of director and instructional personnel,
*A summary of course/workshop content and activities,
*Some evidence of program outcomes in English language arts, science, and/or mathematics, such as:
-Documentation of improved student outcomes following participants' classroom implementation of the new material,
-Final evaluative report on program,
-Participant evaluations of program effectiveness,
-Letters from past participants describing the benefit they gained from participation.

Evidence of financial stability:

Each NPO applicant must submit (as an attachment to this form):

*A complete copy of the organization's most recent independently reviewed financial statement.
*Evidence that the NPO is not dependent on receipt of this grant for its continued existence.
*Evidence of official recognition of nonprofit corporation status.

Name of NPO: _____

Name and address of chief executive officer:

_____

I hereby provide assurances that the attached evidence accurately reflects the fiscal stability and demonstrated effectiveness of this organization.

_____ _____
Typed name executive officer Date

Signature _____

STATEMENT OF ASSURANCES

I, _____, chief executive officer/financial officer of _____,
(Typed name of person) (Typed name of institution)
hereby provide assurances to the Utah System of Higher Education that should this institution receive a grant under the terms of the No Child Left Behind Act, it will:

1. Upon request, provide the USHE with access to records and other sources of information that may be necessary to determine compliance with appropriate federal and state laws and regulations;

2. Conduct educational activities funded by this project in compliance with the following federal laws:
   a. Title VI of the Civil Rights act of 1964
   b. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972
   c. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973
   d. Age Discrimination Act of 1975
   e. Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990
   f. Improving America's Schools Act of 1994;

3. Use grant funds to supplement and not supplant funds from nonfederal sources;

4. Take into account during the development of programming the need for greater access to and participation in the targeted disciplines by students from historically under-represented and under-served groups;

5. The institution further assures that all program and evaluation reports required by the U.S. Department of Education and/or the USHE will be submitted in accordance with stated guidelines and deadlines.

I hereby certify that the information in this application is correct and that the project will be carried out as described in the application.

_____	_____	_____
Signature	Title	Date

USHE REVIEW PANEL EVALUATION FORM

Number: _____

Title: _____

Project Director: _____

<u>Any 'no' answer will cause the proposal to be rejected.</u>

Eligible Sponsoring Institutions	yes / no	
Eligible Disciplines	yes / no	
Consistent with Systemic Reform of Education		
♦ alignment with state core standards	yes / no	
♦ improvement of instruction for subpopulations	_____ pts	(15)
♦ collaboration among content specialists, teacher education specialists, and practicing teachers	_____ pts	(5)
♦ literature citations demonstrate that activities and educational strategies are based on scientific research	_____ pts	(10)
Cooperative Planning and Collaboration		
♦ Collaboration with other programs	_____ pts	(5)
♦ Participant input and involvement in planning	_____ pts	(5)
♦ Joint effort within higher education institutions	_____ pts	(5)
NPO Demonstrated Effectiveness	yes / no / NA	
Sustained, Intensive Professional Development	_____ pts	(10)
Project Duration	yes / no	
Educational Technology and/or Distance Education	_____ pts	(5) (if appropriate)
Quality of Personnel	_____ pts	(5)
Demonstrated Need and Improvement of Instruction	_____ pts	(5)
Plan of Operation	_____ pts	(5)
Evaluation Plan	_____ pts	(5)
Resources and Institutional Commitment	_____ pts	(5)
Budget and Cost Effectiveness	_____ pts	(5)
Overall Quality	_____ pts	(10)
Panelist # _____ Total	**_____ pts**	**(100)**

Proposal ranking (best proposal #1) _____

APPENDIX B

UTAH SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION/UTAH STATE OFFICE OF EDUCATION CONTACTS

Documents referred to in this RFP and state core standards in English language arts, mathematics, and science may be obtained from:

Homepage for Utah State Office of Education: www.usoe.k12.ut.us

K-12 Evaluation and Assessment
Judy Park, Director (801) 538-7811 **jpark@usoe.k12.ut.us**

K-12 Educational Equity, Title 1, English Language Learners
Richard Gomez (801) 538-7643 **rgomez@usoe.k12.ut.us**

Curriculum and Instruction
Brett Moulding (801) 538-7791 **bmouldin@usoe.k12.ut.us**

Mathematics, Science, Language Arts, Fine Arts, Social Studies
Brett Moulding, (801) 538-7791 **bmouldin@usoe.k12.ut.us**

Home Page for the Utah System of Higher Education: www.utahsbr.edu

NCLB/SAHE Coordinator
Phyllis 'Teddi' Safman, Assistant Commissioner for Academic Affairs (801) 321-7127 **psafman@utahsbr.edu**

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS REGARDING PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS IN NCLB/USHE PROJECTS

Some questions that address the issue of pre-service teachers are in the Guidance Supplemental questions document (U.S. Department of Education). This document was in the Policy Review process as of January 16, 2004. These are the questions and answers as they are currently known.

Q. May a State Agency for Higher Education (SAHE) devote some Title II, Part A funds to pre-service teacher training?

A. Yes, but only if the project creates:

1. School-based teacher training programs that provide prospective teachers and beginning teachers with an opportunity to work under the guidance of experienced teachers and college faculty [Title IX, section 9101(34)(B)(i)]; or

2. Programs to enable paraprofessionals to obtain the education necessary for those paraprofessionals to become certified and licensed teachers [Title IX, section 9101(34)(B)(ii)].

Q. How else might a SAHE use Title II, Part A subgrants to influence improvement in pre-service teacher training programs?

A. In addition to the permissible uses cited above, a SAHE may exercise leadership in other ways, such as:

1. Conditioning a partnership's receipt of a subgrant on its submission of specific information from an Institution of Higher Education's (IHE) administration to confirm that the school of education (or teacher preparation entity) and the school of arts and sciences will embed the professional development into the curriculum the teacher preparation program offers; or

2. Require partnerships applying for subgrants to offer a work plan and commitment of IHE funds (or provide a competitive preference to those that do) for improving specific aspects of the teacher preparation program, such as ensuring that teacher candidates demonstrate content knowledge of the subject(s) they intend to teach, as well as how such content knowledge supports the state's academic core standards.

Q. In some cases, individuals who are enrolled in teacher preparation programs will "student teach" in K-12 schools that are part of a SAHE-funded partnership. May Title II, Part A funds be used to enable these individuals to participate in professional development activities in the schools where they are teaching?

A. Yes, this is permissible.