



# ***Improving Teacher Quality Grant***

## **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)**

### **Cycle-11 Grant Competition**

**INTENT to APPLY DEADLINE:**

***INTENT TO APPLY FORMS MUST ARRIVE AT THE MDHE BY  
4 p.m. on Monday, November 13, 2012.***

**PROPOSAL SUBMISSION DEADLINE:**

**All proposals must ARRIVE at the MDHE by  
4 p.m. on Monday, December 17, 2012.**

**Contact:**

**Elizabeth (Liz) Valentine  
ITQG Coordinator**

**Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE)  
PO Box 1469  
Jefferson City, MO 65102-1469  
(573) 751-1764  
elizabeth.valentine@dhe.mo.gov**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>COVER LETTER.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>5</b>
No Child Left Behind, Title II, Part A .....	5
Missouri Absolute Priorities.....	5
Multi-year Projects .....	6
Intent to Apply .....	7
Technical Assistance Workshop .....	7
<b>PROPOSAL FORMAT AND REQUIREMENTS.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>PROPOSAL NARRATIVE (EXPLANATION AND INSTRUCTIONS) .....</b>	<b>10</b>
A. Demonstrated Need .....	10
B. Primary Project Partners .....	10
Additional Partners.....	10
C. Partnership Commitments .....	11
D. Project Participants .....	11
E. Private School Participants .....	12
F. Project Design and Objectives .....	12
G. Absolute & Competitive Priorities.....	14
H. Project Activities & Structure .....	14
I. Information Dissemination Process .....	15
J. Project Evaluation.....	15
Internal Evaluation .....	15
External Evaluation .....	16
External Evaluator Responsibilities .....	16
Project Directors' Evaluation Responsibilities .....	18
Evaluation.....	19
Narrative Discussion Components .....	19
Evaluation Reimbursement .....	19
Evaluation Summit.....	20
K. Project Personnel.....	20
<b>PROPOSAL SCORING RUBRIC.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>DEADLINES, SUBMISSION PROCESS, AND REVIEW .....</b>	<b>24</b>
Intent to Apply .....	24
Deadline Date .....	24
Endorsement.....	24
Proposal Submission Instructions .....	24
Grant Coordinator Review .....	24
Late Proposals .....	25
Review Process .....	25
Equitable Geographic Distribution of Grants.....	25
Announcement of Awards.....	25
Contracts.....	26
Use of Funds.....	26
Stipends .....	26

Substitute Reimbursement.....	26
Reporting and Budget Related Deadlines for 1-Year Funded Projects.....	27
Progress Reports.....	27
Final and Annual Reports.....	28
Accounting and Auditing Procedures .....	28
Requesting Funds .....	28
Re-Allocating Funds in the Budget.....	28
Number of Participants and Students Impacted .....	29
Other Program Compliance Requirements .....	29
<b>RFP APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>31</b>
APPENDIX A: Definitions of Important Terms and Acronyms .....	31
APPENDIX B: Intent to Apply Form .....	36
APPENDIX C: High-Need Missouri School Districts.....	37
APPENDIX D: Proposal Forms and Instructions .....	41
Form C101 - Proposal Cover Page.....	42
Form C102 - Project Abstract .....	43
Form C103 Budget Summary – Cycle-11 ITQG.....	48
Form C104 - Collaborative Planning Team Document .....	50
Form C105 - Joint Effort Document .....	51
Form C106 - Letter of Commitment: K-12 Partner(s).....	52
Form C107 - Letter of Commitment Higher Education Partner(s) .....	53
Form C108 - Certificate of Assurances.....	54
Form C109 - Previous Project Outcomes .....	55
APPENDIX E: Cycle-11 Timeline .....	56

## COVER LETTER

Dear Colleagues:

The economic future of Missouri and the quality of life of its citizens are inherently linked to a strong P-20 partnership that results in better and more widespread preparation for post-secondary options, successful participation in college, and performance excellence in all educational institutions. Effective professional development that is designed collaboratively is an important strategy for achieving these essential state goals.

For almost a decade, the Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE) has provided professional development opportunities for teachers across the state through the Improving Teacher Quality Grants (ITQG) program. To date, 78 projects have been offered in over 200 districts across Missouri. More than 2,000 teachers have participated in at least one of these projects, and these teachers have directly impacted almost 140,000 students. The ITQG program is fulfilling a need for subject-specific and on-going professional development in the state, and has the potential to have a sustained impact on science and mathematics education in Missouri.

The MDHE is pleased to issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Cycle-11 of the *Improving Teacher Quality Grants* (ITQG) program. This RFP invites K-12/higher education partnerships dedicated to professional development for K-12 teachers in *core academic subjects*<sup>1</sup> and is funded by the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) under Title II, Part A of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Cycle-11 proposals will target grades kindergarten to twelve (K-12) and the core academic subjects of math and/or science with a competitive focus on *environmental education* and developing competencies for building and using data systems to assess learning outcomes. Cycle 11 proposals will also have a competitive focus on **integrating the new Common Core State Standards (CCSS)**.

There will be approximately \$300,000.00 available to fund new *eligible partnerships* that have the greatest potential to produce positive results as they address the following goals of the ITQG program:

- Student achievement in targeted math and/or science content areas.
- Teachers' content knowledge.
- Teachers' instructional practices in inquiry-based instruction.
- Teachers' design and use of student-learning assessment methods to improve instruction.
- The preparation of pre-service teachers at partner institutions of higher education.

The MDHE encourages Missouri's educational leaders to submit high quality proposals that will generate systemic change and benefit students, high-need school districts, and higher education institutions.

Sincerely,

Rusty Monhollon, Ph.D.  
Assistant Commissioner for Academic Affairs

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix A for definitions of terms in *bold italics*

## INTRODUCTION

### **No Child Left Behind, Title II, Part A**

The Title II, Part A *Improving Teacher Quality Grant* program operates under the federal legislation known as the *No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 (CFDA 84.367)* and represents the largest federal initiative that supports professional development projects for teachers and principals. The purpose of the *Improving Teacher Quality Grant* program is to increase the academic achievement of students by helping schools and districts improve K-12 teacher and principal quality and helping to ensure that all K-12 teachers are **highly qualified**. Through this legislation, state education agencies (SEA), local educational agencies (LEA) and state agencies for higher education (SAHE) receive funds on a formula basis.

The Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE) receives approximately \$1.2 million in federal funds annually to administer a competitive grants program for K-12 teacher and administrator professional development projects designed to benefit students and members of partnerships, with a focus on **high-need school districts** and higher education institutions. For Cycle-11, approximately \$300,000 will be available for new projects. Typically, the grant amounts range from \$70,000 - \$200,000 per project, depending on the number of project participants and the extent and quality of the professional development provided by each project.

### **Missouri Absolute Priorities**

The MDHE will use Missouri's Cycle-11 *Improving Teacher Quality Grant* funds to improve math and/or science achievement in high-need school districts, targeting all grade levels Kindergarten to twelve (K-12). Individual proposals may focus on one grade level or multiple grade levels within this grade span. Professional Development (PD) projects that integrate math and/or science with other **core academic subjects** such as reading or communication arts are strongly encouraged.

### **Missouri Competitive Priorities**

For Cycle-11, a competitive preference will be given to projects that integrate the following into the project design:

- ***Environmental Education***
- ***Data System Competencies***
- ***Common Core State Standards***

Environmental education integrated into math and/or science content is targeted for Cycle-11 because of the following issues:

- Missouri industries targeted for economic growth, including alternative energy, advanced manufacturing, information technology, and the life sciences, require a workforce proficient in math, science, and sustainability concepts.
- Under the leadership of the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Coalition a greater emphasis has been placed on strengthening student performance and economic development in STEM fields. Please refer to [www.momathandscience.com](http://www.momathandscience.com) for more details about STEM.
- An increasing number of entry-level jobs, regardless of occupational classification and level of educational attainment, require strong foundations

- in these academic disciplines and exposure to environmental education.
- Environmental education was advanced to a national priority with the creation of the *No Child Left Inside Act* (2009).<sup>2</sup>

The integration of data systems competencies into math and/or science content should do the following:

- Be connected to student achievement.
- Link achievement data to the school district's data systems.
- Be connected to teacher performance.
- Link performance data to the school district's data systems.

The integration of *Common Core State Standards* is targeted for Cycle-11 to align with the following current state initiatives and priorities:

- Missouri has adopted the Common Core State Standards
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education as well as Missouri Department of Higher Education are participating in consortia with Smarter Balanced Assessment to design assessments around the Common Core Standards.
- The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education has developed and is piloting model curricula around the Common Core State Standards.

Therefore, projects must be designed to do the following:

- Increase the subject matter knowledge of teachers and help them implement the Common Core State Standards for Math and/or English Language Arts, provided that the project's main emphasis is on mathematics and/or science.

### **Multi-year Projects**

This RFP provides an opportunity for multi-year proposals (up to three years), involving collaboration among multiple partners and/or spanning wide geographic areas. If awarded, multi-year projects must focus on one grade level or groups of grade levels for the entirety of the project. Projects must also provide a description of how they will obtain reasonable expectations from teacher participants that they will stay in the same grade level for the duration of the project (to best allow for the validity of data regarding student progress and teacher success). The continuation of multi-year awards depends on:

- Availability of funding.
- Demonstration of acceptable project performance in relationship to the completion of proposed activities.
- Extent of progress toward achieving state and project objectives, and compliance with grant administration regulations.

In order to receive final approval for funding and implementation in the next cycle, multi-year projects will be required to submit a brief Project Continuance Proposal including discussion on the following:

- Acceptable project performance in completing proposed activities from the previous cycle.
- Progress made in the previous cycle towards achieving state and project

---

<sup>2</sup> For more information, see H.R. 2054 and S. 866 (introduced 22 April, 2009).

objectives.

- Changes to be made to align project with grant administration or other ITQG program requirements in the next cycle.
- Changes the project is proposing for the next cycle's implementation, including those to address agency or evaluation comments or concerns communicated during the course of the previous cycle.

The specific Project Continuation Proposal format to be used will be included with the Final Report Guidelines (See Appendix E: Cycle 11 Timeline). This communication will include any requisite changes that need to be incorporated in the project plan because of changes in the ITQG program or grant administration requirements since the last cycle. The Continuation Proposal will be due at DHE offices by 4:00pm on the same day as Final Reports. Based on this proposal and other requisite funding criteria, projects will be informed of their funding status prior to the start of the next cycle's activities. **Absence of the Continuation Proposal will result in automatic cessation of funding.**

#### **Intent to Apply**

The Cycle-11 application process requires that an *Intent to Apply* form be submitted by each project director who plans to submit a complete proposal and for those intending to submit a Project Continuation Proposal.

Intent to Apply forms (Form C100 found in Appendix B) are to **arrive** at the MDHE by **Tuesday, November 13, 2012 by 4:00pm**. Forms received after this time and date will not be accepted.

**If an applicant does not submit an *Intent to Apply* form by the deadline above, the applicant may NOT submit a proposal for consideration in the grant competition.**

#### **Technical Assistance Workshop**

Technical assistance workshops will be held to provide a public venue to explore potential partnerships and an opportunity to receive technical assistance concerning the Cycle-11 RFP. All interested applicants are encouraged to attend the face-to-face workshop to be held Thursday, October 18, 2012 at the Harry S. Truman Building in Jefferson City, MO. Those not able to attend face-to-face may teleconference in. A recorded webinar will also be available, however the face-to-face meeting is highly encouraged. Please watch for announcements on the Missouri Department of Higher Education website at [www.mdhe.mo.gov](http://www.mdhe.mo.gov).

**Please contact Elizabeth (Liz) Valentine at (573) 751-1764 or mail to: [elizabeth.valentine@dhe.mo.gov](mailto:elizabeth.valentine@dhe.mo.gov) to register for the workshop. Please register at least five (5) days before the workshop. If less than five (5) face-to-face participants register for the workshop in Jefferson City, the meeting in Jefferson City will be canceled and ONLY a pre-recorded workshop will be offered.**

Additional resources are available online here:  
<http://www.dhe.mo.gov/ppc/grants/teacherquality.php>.

## PROPOSAL FORMAT AND REQUIREMENTS

Each proposal must be submitted in the format outlined below. Please use the following as a checklist in assembling your completed proposal. All forms are provided in Appendix D and are **required** unless otherwise stated. These forms will also be posted on the MDHE website: <http://mdhe.mo.gov/ppc/grants/teacherquality.php>. Please also see the scoring rubric located on pages 21-22 for further details expected in each section below.

1. **Proposal Cover Page (Form C101):** This form must be completed, dated, and signed by an Authorized Officer of the higher education partnership member institution that will serve as the fiscal agent.
2. **Project Abstract (Form C102):** Limit to **300 words, single-spaced**. Briefly summarize the overall design of the project, the intended outcomes, and anticipated systemic impact. Also include a table outlining the timeline for the project.
3. **Table of Contents**
4. **Proposal Narrative** (See RFP pages 10-20 for more details): Limit to **twenty double-spaced pages** and provide the following information:
  - A. **Demonstrated Need:** Provide clear and specific evidence of the need for the proposed professional development project. Identify the population(s) to be served.
  - B. **Project Partners:** Describe the structures and participants of the partnership and provide information about its formation and operation. This must include the three required partners as well as any additional permissible partners.
  - C. **Partnership Commitments:** Provide a description of the identified needs of district partners addressed by the project, the involvement of all partners, and the collaborative commitments between all representatives in **all** phases of the proposed project.
  - D. **Project Participants:** Describe the participants to be targeted in the proposed project, including an estimate of their probability of participation. Explain why these participants were selected.
  - E. **Efforts to Include Private School Participants:** Describe the efforts made to include nonprofit private schools in proposed project.
  - F. **Project Design & Objectives:** Provide a detailed description of the project, including how the project will achieve results for the five Missouri objectives, align with various standards, and address required additional components as described in the following pages.
  - G. **Absolute and Competitive Priorities:** Describe how the proposed professional development project meets the absolute and competitive priorities of the Request for Proposals.
  - H. **Project Activities/Structure:** Describe the desired duration of the project and expected accomplishments and/or outputs for each year. Provide a timeline for all proposed activities and expected progress toward objectives. Describe options and potential for sustainability.
  - I. **Information Dissemination Process:** Provide a detailed description of how participants will reflect and provide feedback on participation and growth.

Identify strategies to be used to communicate project results to appropriate audiences.

- J. **Project Evaluation:** Provide an evaluation plan that includes appropriate measures/data sources for each output and outcome, a description of data analysis methods, and timelines for data collection and analysis.
  - K. **Project Personnel:** Describe the key project personnel, their qualifications, and their roles and responsibilities. Provide a two (2) page or less curriculum vita or resume for each key project personnel (does not count in the 20 page limit).
5. **Budget Summary and Budget Justification (Form C103):** The requested information must be submitted on the form provided and shall be certified by the President/CEO of the applicant/lead institution on the Cover Page (Form C101). No more than 8 percent of total project costs can be used to recover indirect costs. Additionally, no single partner in the eligible partnership may use more than fifty percent (50%) of the grant funds. Other sources of funds that will be used to support the proposed project shall be provided on this attachment and described in the Budget Justification as matching funds. The project budget must be accompanied by a description justifying the anticipated expenditures as set forth in the line items included on the Budget Summary form. (See the Budget Justification page in Appendix D.)
  6. **Collaborative Planning Team Document (Form C104):** Complete this form as evidence of collaborative planning activities completed in preparing this proposal.
  7. **Joint Effort Document (Form C105):** Provide documentation for all eligible partnership members on this form.
  8. **Letter of Commitment: K-12 Partner (Form C106):** One form for each K-12 partner should be submitted.
  9. **Letter of Commitment: Higher Education Partner (Form C107):** One form for each higher education partner should be submitted.
  10. **Certificate of Assurances (Form C108):** The certificate of assurances shall be certified by the chief executive officer of the lead institution to provide assurance that if funding is received, the institution will follow the terms of the grant.
  11. **Previous Project Outcomes (Form C109).** This form must be submitted **only** if:
    - A. One or more of the individuals having a *major role* in the proposed project previously received funds under the CBHE Eisenhower Grants program or Cycles 1-10 of the MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grant* program;  
**AND/OR**
    - B. The proposed project is a continuation of a project that previously received funds under the CBHE Eisenhower Grants program or Cycles 1-10 of the MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grant* program.

## PROPOSAL NARRATIVE (EXPLANATION AND INSTRUCTIONS)

**A. Demonstrated Need** Proposals must demonstrate that all professional development activities are developed based on the professional development needs of teachers and administrators in partnering schools. Evidence must clearly demonstrate that the proposed activities are an integral part of school-wide and district-wide educational improvement plans. Identify the population(s) to be served and how these activities address their particular needs.

**B. Primary Project Partners** The authorizing federal legislation requires that professional development projects funded through the grant include *eligible partnerships*. Applicants must ensure that the narrative identifies the following three (3) statutory partners:

- One partner must have a representative who has a full-time appointment in a division or department that prepares teachers and school principals at an institution of higher education (IHE), public or independent, with a DESE-approved teacher education program.
- One partner must have a representative who has a full-time appointment in a school or department of arts and sciences at a public or independent IHE.
- **At least one partner should be a high-need school district** (local educational agency). (See Appendix C for a list of eligible high-need school districts and charter schools.). A representative from at least one of these partner high-need districts must play a meaningful role on the project staff.

In addition, an institution of higher education must be designated as the lead fiscal agent.

A community college may be a principal partner only if the college has a Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)-approved program that prepares teachers. A list of community colleges with DESE-approved teacher education programs is available at <http://dese.mo.gov/divteachqual/teached/directory/jrcollegedrcty.pdf>. If a community college is designated as the lead institution and/or fiscal agent for the grant, a four-year IHE must be the other higher education partner.

**Additional Partners** The proposed project partnership may also include any or all of the following:

- Additional school district(s) (LEA)
- Additional elementary, middle, and/or high school(s)
- Additional school(s) of arts and sciences and/or the division(s) preparing teachers and principals within a higher education institution(s)
- Public charter school(s)
- Two-year college(s)
- Private elementary, middle, or high school(s)
- Educational service agency(ies)
- Nonprofit educational organization(s)
- Nonprofit cultural organization(s)
- Teacher organization(s)

- Principal organization(s)
- Business(es)

### C. Partnership Commitments

Cycle-11 *Improving Teacher Quality Grant* projects are expected to clearly and specifically demonstrate that:

1. The needs of the high-need school district(s) are identified and addressed by the proposed project.
2. Project content and methods are aligned with school district/building curriculum and classroom materials, especially the Comprehensive School Improvement Programs (CSIPs). (**Please provide a table detailing this alignment.**)
3. The involvement of all partners in the development of the proposed project is described.
  - a. Outline the specific commitments made by each partner.
  - b. Identify collaborative roles and responsibilities for each partner during the life of the project.
4. There is genuine collaboration between higher education **and** K-12 representatives in the planning, design, and implementation of the proposed projects.

### D. Project Participants

Project participants can be the following:

- Teachers in grades Kindergarten to twelve (K-12)
  - **Primary participants** should be teachers in high-need school districts with current math and/or science assignments or those with an interest in specializing to teach math and/or science. Participants from high-need school districts **should account for 50% or greater of the total number of participants in the project.**
  - Projects may also include teachers from non-partner schools.
  - Funded projects must provide opportunities for teachers from private schools to participate.
- Pre-service teachers and paraprofessionals may also be included as participants when the following respective conditions exist:
  - **Pre-service teachers** may participate in project activities but may not be supported by funds provided through this grant. Institutions with teacher preparation programs may use *Improving Teacher Quality Grant* funds for pre-service teacher training only if projects involve 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 (This must be clearly described).
  - **Highly-Qualified Paraprofessionals** may be included as project participants if there is a mechanism to enable them to work with teachers in participating high-need school districts to obtain the education necessary for the paraprofessionals to become certified and licensed teachers (must be clearly documented).

- **Administrators** may be included as project participants. Recognizing that administrators can be the key element in the success of implementing project objectives in the school, participation by administrators should be deliberately pursued. Principals who are knowledgeable about science and math contents, state standards, and approaches to teaching science and math are more likely to provide leadership and commitment to ensure high quality instruction and learning of science and math sequences. Projects are permitted to offer an incentive for meaningful administrator participation. Meaningful participation is expected to equal **at least half** of the contact hours required of teacher participants. Meaningful participation means that the principal is participating in ways similar to teacher participants. A principal only observing the project would not be considered to have meaningfully participated in the project.
  - An amount up to \$500 may be included in the budget that will be used as an award to the administrator’s school for follow-up activities that support the project and/or purchase of materials that will be used in the school to implement modules derived from the project.

Proposals should not only identify the proposed project’s targeted participants but should also estimate their probability of participation and explain why these participants were selected. All projects are expected to have **no fewer than 20 teacher participants**. Any funded project expecting less than 20 participants will be reviewed for cost-effectiveness and will need approval from the grant coordinator before the project activities can be continued. Applicants are encouraged to secure firm commitments for teacher participation from high-need school districts. With appropriate personnel and project design, proposals may target larger numbers of participants.

**E. Private School Participants**

Federal law requires that projects provide the opportunity for nonprofit private K-12 teachers to participate in funded projects. This means that each project shall identify the nonprofit private schools that are located within the boundaries of the partner high need school district(s) and consult with staff of the nonprofit private schools concerning the design of and participation in the project. The goal is to notify the private schools of the existence of the project, inquire about their interest in working with the project, and, with interested schools, consult concerning the professional development needs of their teachers. Their needs, like the needs of the teachers in participating public schools, should be taken into consideration as the activities are designed, and the teachers at these schools should be considered eligible to become project participants.

Proposal narratives should describe the efforts made by project staff to include private school teachers in the planning process and as participants in the project. If no private schools wished to participate in the project this information should be included along with the description of the efforts that were made to include private school teachers including a list of private schools contacted.

**F. Project Design and Objectives**

Proposal narratives should describe the project’s design in detail and emphasize how the project will achieve and produce results for **all** of the following Missouri objectives:

- Objective 1: Improve student achievement in targeted **mathematics and/or science content** areas.
- Objective 2: Increase teachers' knowledge and understanding of key concepts in *targeted mathematics and/or science content areas*.
- Objective 3: Improve teachers' pedagogical knowledge and practices that utilize *scientifically-based research* findings and best practices in inquiry-based instruction.
- Objective 4: Improve teachers' knowledge and skills in designing and implementing **assessment tools** and use of **assessment data** to monitor the effectiveness of their instruction.
- Objective 5: Improve **the preparation of pre-service teachers** through improvements in mathematics and/or science content and/or pedagogy courses.

Additional objectives for the project should be clearly stated in the narrative and should identify measurable outcomes. It is expected that outcomes related to the five state objectives will be evaluated through internal and external evaluation processes.

The project design should be closely aligned with district, state, and national standards where appropriate. All projects must be explicitly linked with partner school district/building improvement plans, and should demonstrate alignment with the following as appropriate:<sup>3</sup>

- Missouri math and/or science Show-Me Standards and, when available,
- The most current Grade-Level Expectations (GLE) and/or Course-Level Expectations (CLE);
- *Common Core State Standards* developed by the Common Core State Standards Initiative
- *Model Core Teaching Standards* developed by the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC); and
- North American Association for Environmental Education (NAAEE).

The project design should also inform participants about how to align project content and pedagogical methods with district/building curriculum and classroom materials. Project directors are encouraged to review released items on past MAP tests. Released items are available at [http://www.dese.mo.gov/divimprove/assess/Released\\_Items/riarchiveindex.html](http://www.dese.mo.gov/divimprove/assess/Released_Items/riarchiveindex.html). Competitive project designs will also describe how the incorporation of data systems competencies are linked to the district/building improvement plans.

The project design should also address the following:

- Incorporating activities that utilize scientifically-based research on instructional strategies and best practices for professional development and for K-12 education. **Appropriate citations to be included in proposal.**
- How project directors and/or instructors will model research-based

---

<sup>3</sup> In addition please ensure that the proposal is well-aligned with national standards for professional development such as those put forth by Learning Forward: <http://www.learningforward.org/evidence/search.cfm>.

instructional strategies and best practices throughout the professional development project.

- Integrating the utilization of technology in grade level appropriate ways.
- A description of how the environmental education component is aligned with the standards of the North American Association for Environmental Education (NAAEE).

Proposal narratives should explain the project’s design in detail, which includes, but is not limited to:

- A description of the needs assessment process and baseline data used to determine the design and structure of the project.
- Discussing how teachers and other participants will be actively engaged over the life of the project and the potential for the project’s **sustainability** beyond the end date of the grant.
- The number of contact hours per participant (**minimum of 120 contact hours per project**), including any follow-up sessions, and explain why the estimated number of contact hours is sufficient for learning, practice, and follow-up. **Follow-up shall constitute a minimum of 25% of the total contact hours** provided as part of the professional development program.
- Identifying the anticipated location of project activities and estimating the number of anticipated participants.
- Identifying the geographic area(s) within the state that projects are designed to serve.
- The number of students directly impacted by teacher participants (e.g. enrolled in classrooms, tutored, involved in student organizations, and/or other activities).
- A description of how each of the five state objectives will be achieved, including:
  - Measures and development of baseline data, and
  - Realistic estimates of improvement. **Please provide citations for the basis of these estimates.**

Proposal narrative **should not** include a discussion of national needs in math and science education as reviewers will have extensive perspectives of national issues.

### **G. Absolute & Competitive Priorities**

Proposal narratives should describe how project objectives and activities meet the absolute priorities and competitive priorities as explained in the Introduction of the Request for Proposals (see pg. 5).

### **H. Project Activities & Structure**

Proposal narratives should clearly indicate the desired duration of the proposed Cycle-11 project and the expected accomplishments each year. **Multi-year projects are expected to show specific value-added student learning in achieving the objectives of the project to justify its longer duration.**

The MDHE reserves the right to negotiate modifications in project duration, implementation and/or content during the award process.

Please Note: For each year, proposals should describe the estimated dates or timelines for all proposed project activities and expected progress toward achieving the state’s five objectives and any additional project objectives. The anticipated periods of Cycle-11 awarded projects are indicated in the table below.

**Table 1. Cycle 11 Period for Projects Activities**

	<b>One-Year Award</b>	<b>Two-Year Award</b>	<b>Three-Year Award</b>
Total Period for Project Activities	February, 2013 – June 30, 2014	February, 2013 – June 30, 2015	February, 2013 – June 30, 2016

**Proposal narratives should provide specific options and potential for sustainability of interventions beyond project end date, including commitment from lead institutions for sustainability.**

**I. Information Dissemination Process**

Proposal narratives should:

- Describe how participants will be given the opportunity to reflect on their new practices and to give other K-12 teachers and administrators, within the partner district(s) and schools, feedback on how participation in this professional development activity/experience **specifically** affected their teaching practices and student learning.
- Explain how the project results that are useful to other K-12 teachers, school administrators, teacher educators and higher education institutions will be made available on a statewide basis.
- Identify what strategies will be used to communicate project results to the education and math/science departments or divisions in the partnership’s higher education institution(s), and explain the mechanism(s) that will be used to determine if courses/programs at the higher education institutions should be targeted for change.

Project activities and modules may be made public through website postings. Project directors are encouraged to share useful information from their projects at meetings of one of Missouri’s math and/or science teachers’ professional organizations, teacher education organizations, or other professional organizations. Although the MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grant* will not support out-of-state travel for dissemination purposes, project personnel and others are encouraged to locate other funds to support trips to national meetings for dissemination.

**J. Project Evaluation**

Evaluation is an integral part of the professional development projects funded by ITQG. The sections below discuss the various aspects of evaluation in this program including the role of the external evaluator, project director responsibilities, evaluation reimbursement, and the evaluation narrative discussion components.

**Internal Evaluation**

Each individual project is responsible for conducting internal evaluation on its own project implementation and outcomes. This internal evaluation may include, but not be limited to (1) formative evaluation feedback from teachers on the content

and pedagogy included in summer and academic year activities, (2) summative evaluation outcomes for all key stakeholders, including teachers and their students; pre-service teacher outcomes, and institutional change.

The internal evaluation team is responsible for assuring that the project plan as described in the proposal is being conducted with efficacy, and for evaluating progress towards achieving specific project goals and objectives. Included is collecting and analyzing formative feedback from participants on both the summer and academic year activities. The internal evaluation team will provide demographic information on their participants, documentation of participation in all activities through **sign-in sheets**, and outcomes as they align with ITQG and project objectives. Outcomes include but are not limited to teacher pre/post content gains, student achievement on focus content through MAP/EOC scores or valid and reliable student tests administered by the district. Teacher or project designed pre/post student or teacher tests must show reliability scores along with reported student or teacher achievement.

External  
Evaluation

The utilization of an *external evaluator* provides an opportunity for analysis of both the individual projects and the collective impact of the ITQG program across projects. External Evaluators will work in collaboration with internal project evaluators to assist in enhancing internal evaluation processes and instrumentation.

External  
Evaluator  
Responsibilities

External evaluators are responsible for showing cross-project effects. This includes looking at each project individually and at program effects across the state. Evaluators will make use of internal evaluation data, including teacher pre/post scores, and will be collecting data across projects that focus on implementation efficacy, pedagogical effects, student outcomes, and effects on higher education pre-service teachers and programming. These data will be collected in various ways including interviews with project staff, graduate students and faculty and project teachers; online teacher content tests on program focus areas and information on teacher professional status and growth across the time of the project. While projects may be observing teachers as they teach for the purposes of mentoring and coaching, evaluator observations of randomly selected teachers across the projects will inform MDHE of program effects of all projects in enhancing teacher pedagogy.

The following table outlines the state’s five objectives and other anticipated evaluation methods that will be used by both the internal and external evaluation team and project directors. **This table is not meant to be inclusive of all data collection.** External evaluators will keep PIs informed of the timing of data collection and will minimize the impact on programming as much as possible. In return, external evaluators request the support of PIs to assure complete coverage of their project and participation by the maximum number of teachers and students.

**Table 2. Anticipated Methods of Data Collection and Evaluation**

Missouri Objectives for All Projects	Internal Evaluation Method(s) of Data Collection and	External Evaluation Method(s) of Data Collection and Evaluation
--------------------------------------	--	---

	<b>Evaluation</b>	
Objective 1 Improve student achievement in targeted mathematics and/or science content areas.	Valid and reliable student pre/post tests	Missouri MAP/EOC scores; other standardized tests for non-public students
Objective 2 Increase teachers' knowledge and understanding of key concepts in targeted mathematics and/or science content areas.	Project-developed pre/post content test	External Evaluator-developed teacher test focused on ITQG content focus for this cycle; observations of treatment in summer academies and academic year
Objective 3 Improve teachers' pedagogical knowledge and practices that utilize scientifically-based research findings and best practices in inquiry-based instruction.	Documentation of implementation through project-selected method which may include classroom observations	Academic year observations of select teachers across the program; observation of treatment in summer academies and academic year
Objective 4 Improve teachers' knowledge and skills in designing and implementing assessment tools and use of assessment data to monitor the effectiveness of their instruction	May include addition of data usage within the treatment, development of assessments, implementation and analysis of effectiveness of assessments	Examination of teacher-designed tools, classroom observation, interviews with teachers and project staff
Objective 5 Improve the preparation of pre-service teachers through improvements in mathematics and/or science content and/or pedagogy courses.	May include syllabi that document changes due to project, must include changes in pre-service teachers as a result of focus courses, not just treatment they may have participated in	Interviews with faculty of focus courses on documentation of pre-service effects will inform analysis of individual project change; analysis of extant documents demonstrating that change
Additional Project Objectives	Determined by project directors.	External Evaluators will be available to assist PIs with effective processes and instrumentation for additional objectives

External evaluators will assist projects and meet commitments to MDHE by:

1. Conducting an initial **mandatory** meeting for project directors and internal evaluators to explain the external evaluation, describe interface between external and internal evaluations, inform projects about data required from internal evaluators, and promote uniformity in data collection strategies and evaluation techniques among projects.
2. Assuring ongoing and continuous contact with the evaluation team, including timely response to questions.
3. Providing an opportunity for project directors to meet with the evaluation team prior to the project's start.
4. Develop an evaluation process that incorporates formative and summative evaluation for the program and assist projects in the development of internal evaluation plans.
5. Submit reports to MDHE by November 30, 2014 and subsequent years of multi-year projects, including an oral public report highlighting findings for projects and across the program.

Project  
Directors'  
Evaluation  
Responsibilities

Project directors are expected to complete the following tasks:

1. Secure assurances that the External Evaluation team will have access to confidential data from both the K-12 and higher education partners for reporting and evaluation purposes.
2. Support the external evaluation by strongly encouraging participants to complete all instruments requested by the external evaluators.
3. Guarantee the confidentiality of data through use of internal codes for all data collected.
4. Coordinate with the External Evaluation team for external evaluation data collection with minimal impact in participants' learning.
5. Administer content pre-tests and both short-term and long-term post-tests to teacher participants. Both short-term and long-term posttests are required to measure the content knowledge gained and retained throughout the life of the project.
6. Cooperate with the external evaluation team by collecting and submitting daily, detailed participant sign-in sheets, participant contact information, individual teacher pre/post test scores, coded individual student data for each participant teacher, and any other requested data related to evaluation of the individual projects.
7. Report information for every participant (Participant Data Form) by **May 31, 2013** before the beginning of the project; on or before **October 15, 2013**; and a final submission no later than **July 31, 2014**. **These forms will be submitted to**

**the grant coordinator.**

Evaluation  
Narrative  
Discussion  
Components

With regard to evaluation issues, proposal narratives should include a table indicating how each project objective (aligned with ITQG objectives) will be evaluated, what processes or instrument will be used, how baseline data are to be obtained and improvement goals are set, and the timeline for administration. Please refer to Table 3 for an example.

**Table 3. Sample Internal Evaluation Process, Instrumentation, Baseline/Improvement Goals and Timeline**

<b>Project Objective/ITQG Objective</b>	<b>Process or instrument used</b>	<b>Baseline/Improvement Goals</b>	<b>Administration Timeline</b>
1. Improve student achievement in targeted mathematics and/or science content areas.	(Describe student test and validity/reliability procedures, if needed)	(Describe how baseline is established and improvement goals)	(Describe timeline for administration)
Etc.	Etc.	Etc.	Etc.

In addition,

1. Describe the internal evaluation team members and their role in the evaluation.
2. Provide assurances of commitments from districts/buildings to conduct mathematics/science standardized tests, whether Missouri tests or other standardized tests and access to these scores for evaluation.
3. Describe how the project will provide evidence of implementation and improvement of participants’ pedagogical knowledge and use of best practices as indicated through scientifically-based research, including inquiry-based instruction.
4. Describe how the project leadership and internal evaluators will meet their obligations to the external evaluation.
5. Describe the value-added for multi-year projects.

Evaluation  
Reimbursement

Projects will be awarded monies outside of their project award that should be set aside for reimbursement for the external evaluation. These monies are flow-through monies and are not considered the project award for the purposes of F&A adjustments. External evaluators will invoice the projects directly for payment of evaluation services. Projects must commit to payment of these external evaluation invoices in a timely manner and the PIs commit to accepting responsibility for assuring timely payment from their institution.

Projects will be notified by the MDHE Program Coordinator when external evaluation commitments have been met for each invoice and payment may be made at that time. Projects are then authorized to make reimbursement requests to MDHE for external evaluation fees. External evaluation invoices are authorized to be submitted on April 15, 2013, October 15, 2013 and October 15, 2014 to the projects. **The external evaluation reimbursements may be submitted before the official project start date and after the project end date of June 30, 2014. Requests for reimbursements for external evaluation will not be considered as one of the three reimbursement requests submitted during the life of the project.**

Evaluation  
Summit

A one-day meeting in late fall of 2014 will showcase the external evaluation report for ITQG professional development projects funded during Cycle-11. Project staff and selected participants from each project are required to attend.

**K. Project  
Personnel**

Proposal narratives should include a description of key project personnel, their qualifications, and their roles and responsibilities. Curriculum vitas or resumes should be submitted for key project personnel documenting only relevant experiences to the project and **not exceeding two (2) pages per person.**

## PROPOSAL SCORING RUBRIC

Proposals will be reviewed and rated by a peer review team chosen by the MBHE which will include an out-of-state expert. The following criteria will be used to rate the proposals. **(140 total possible points, of which up to 30 points to be allotted for Competitive Priorities).**

\_\_\_\_\_ (√) **Required Proposal Elements:** The proposal includes all required elements listed in the Proposal Format section (pp. 10-20 of the Request for Proposals. (Note: proposals that are missing required proposal elements will not be scored on the remaining criteria.)  
*For this reason, the MBHE strongly suggests projects submit a draft for grant coordinator review by November 26, 2012.*

\_\_\_\_\_ (√) **Absolute Priorities:** The proposal meets the Absolute Priorities identified in the Request for Proposals. (Note: proposals that do not meet the Absolute Priorities will not be scored on the remaining criteria.)

- **(A) Demonstrated Need (10 points):** The proposal provides clear and specific evidence of the K-12 school educators' and administrators' need for professional development, is integral with school- and district-wide educational improvement plans, and is aligned with ESEA Title II, Part A (D-11 – D-12) needs assessments in high-need school districts. Clearly identifies the population(s) to be served.
- **(B) Project Partners, (C) Partnership Commitment, Collaboration, & (E) Private School Participants (10 points):** The proposal provides clear evidence of involvement of all partners—including teachers, administrators, colleges or departments of education, colleges or departments of arts and sciences—in the collaborative design and implementation of the *Improving Teacher Quality State Grant Program*. The proposal describes how each primary (teachers in high-need school districts) and additional partner(s) will contribute to the success of the project, including a table detailing alignment between project goals/activities with school/district goals and CSIPs. Provide details of efforts to include non-profit private school participants and identifies the three statutory partners and the lead fiscal agent.
- **(F) Project Design (20 points):** (D) The proposal clearly describes the participants to be targeted and specifically explains how the professional development activities can produce long-term, systemic change, and includes goals, objectives (Missouri and additional), and activities that reflect a program of sufficient duration, size, scope and quality that, if implemented, will yield improvements in teaching and learning. The proposal explains how the professional development activities are based on research documenting student achievement outcomes and where appropriate demonstrates alignment with district, state, and national standards. The proposal clearly and specifically explains how collaboratively (between K12 and Institutions of Higher Education) developed professional development activities will be effectively aligned with existing district professional development efforts in partner district(s). The proposal clearly and specifically explains how the project's professional development activities and action research will be utilized to inform and improve curricula and pedagogy in teacher and school principal preparation programs. The proposal outlines how participants will learn about aligning project content and pedagogical methods with district/building curriculum and classroom materials. The proposal clearly explains the needs assessment process and baseline data used to determine the design and structure of the project. The proposal also includes a description and table of how each of the five state objectives will be achieved. Logic models are highly encouraged. Appropriate citations are included in the proposal.

- **(G) Absolute and Competitive Priorities & (H) Project Activities/Structure (5 points):** The proposal clearly explains the duration of the project and expected accomplishments and/or outputs for each year. A timeline detailing proposed activities, expected progress toward objectives and any milestones is clearly displayed evidencing a thoughtfully planned project structure. The proposal explains how the project meets the absolute and competitive priorities of the RFP.
- **(G cont.) Program Sustainability (10 points):** The proposal provides convincing evidence of institutional support (monetary and non-monetary) and the potential to sustain efforts of the project after the life of the grant.
- **(I) Information Dissemination (10 points):** The project proposal describes clearly and in detail how participants will reflect and provide feedback on participation and growth. The proposal details how teachers and project personnel will inform colleagues and make results of project available to other educators on a statewide basis. Identifies strategies to communicate project results to the education and math/science departments or divisions in the partnership's higher education institutions, and explain the mechanism(s) that will be used to determine if courses/programs at the higher education institutions should be targeted for change.
- **(J) Evaluation Plan (20 points):** The evaluation plan clearly indicates the measures and scientifically based research methods that will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the project in relationship to its stated intended outcomes. The evaluation plan includes measures and a timeline appropriate for the stated outcomes. Data collection and analysis methods are clearly described and appropriate for the stated outcomes. Evaluation plan includes formative and summative evaluations. Evaluation plan includes how reliability will be determined for teacher or project designed pre/post student or teacher tests. Evaluation plan includes a table indicating how each project objective will be evaluated, what processes or instrument will be used, how baseline data are to be obtained and improvement goals are set. See Table 3 page 19 for an example.
- **(K) Project Personnel (10 points):** Describe the key project personnel, their qualifications, and their roles and responsibilities. Provide a two page or less curriculum vita or resume for each key project personnel.
- **Budget (15 points):** The proposal clearly presents a cost-effective budget and narrative justification that is consistent with the scope of the proposed objectives and activities. The use of ITQG funds seems reasonable and effective for meeting the need described for proposed professional development activities. All budgetary guidelines and limitations were followed.

**Additional Points - Competitive Priorities (10 points each, up to 30 points total):**

- **Environmental Education:** The project includes environmental education integrated into math and/or science content in a meaningful way with a clear connection to project goals and objectives. Alignment with NAAEE standards and clear description of environmental education activities integrated across project timeline also included.
- **Data Systems:** The project includes the integration of data systems competencies into math

and/or science content that would be connected to both student achievement and teacher performance. This integration would also link student achievement and teacher performance data to school district data systems.

- **Common Core State Standards:** The project includes activities and outcomes related to increasing the subject matter knowledge of teachers and helping them implement the CCSS for Math and/or English Language Arts, while still maintaining a project emphasis on mathematics and/or science. If using the English Language Arts Standards, they must be an integral part of the Math and/or Science component. If using the Math Standards with Science, they must clearly be an integral part of the Science component.

## DEADLINES, SUBMISSION PROCESS, AND REVIEW

**Intent to Apply** The Intent to Apply form (Appendix B – Form C100) is due from each project director that intends to submit a complete proposal. The form is to **arrive** at the MDHE by 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 13, 2012.

**Deadline Date** Final proposals are to **arrive** at the MDHE on Monday, December 17, 2012, by 4:00 p.m.

**Endorsement** Each proposal submitted shall be signed by the sponsoring institution's chief executive officer or a specifically designated representative for grant applications. The endorsement constitutes a commitment on the part of the institution to support the project. When two or more eligible institutions collaborate on a proposal, each institution shall submit an endorsement; however, only one of the institutions should be designated as the custodian of the grant funds. An eligible institution may endorse more than one proposal.

**Proposal Submission Instructions** Please adhere to the following instructions when submitting your proposal:

- Submit proposal beginning with cover page (Appendix D – Form C101) and abstract (Form C102).
- Limit narrative to twenty (20) double-spaced pages:
  - Use a font equivalent to 12-point Times New Roman
  - Use 1-inch margins on standard 8 ½ x 11-inch paper
  - Paginate beginning with the cover page
- Provide one (1) electronic copy of the proposal in Microsoft Office formatting sent as (an) attached file(s) to [elizabeth.valentine@dhe.mo.gov](mailto:elizabeth.valentine@dhe.mo.gov). The electronic copy must be received by **Monday, December 17, 2012, by 4:00 p.m.** **Submission of only the electronic copy will NOT suffice as the completed proposal.**
  - Signatures are not required on the electronic copy.
- Provide six (6) hard copies of the proposal by **Monday, December 17, 2012, by 4:00 p.m.** One (1) of the hard copies should be unbound and unstapled. Mail hard copies to:

**Elizabeth (Liz) Valentine, ITQG Coordinator**  
**Missouri Department of Higher Education**  
**PO Box 1469**  
**Jefferson City, MO 65102-1469**

**Grant Coordinator Review** We **strongly** encourage applicants to submit **draft** proposals and budgets **prior** to the submission deadline for early review by the grant coordinator. The grant coordinator is not the primary reviewer but is available to review the draft proposal for areas that might enhance the proposal, or correct errors, particularly in the budget area.

In order that the grant coordinator will have adequate time to complete the early reviews, please submit your proposals, electronically, **no later than November**

26, 2012 to Dr. Elizabeth (Liz) Valentine at [elizabeth.valentine@dhe.mo.gov](mailto:elizabeth.valentine@dhe.mo.gov).

Proposals submitted for early review after November 26, 2012 may not be reviewed due to time constraints. Early submissions will be reviewed in the order they are received.

**Late Proposals** Proposals that are late or incomplete, that involve activities outside of program guidelines or the appropriate time frame, or that do not include the required partners will NOT be reviewed.

**Review Process** A panel of qualified representatives with expertise in math, science, education, environmental education, data systems, the Common Core State Standards, and internal evaluation will review and rate proposals and make recommendations for funding to the MDHE. The MDHE will have final authority on funding decisions for both one-year and multi-year projects. For more information on proposals scoring please see the scoring rubric on pages 21-22.

**Equitable Geographic Distribution of Grants** While the MDHE determines proposals to be funded and the amount funded, the MDHE must also distribute grants equitably by geographic area within the state. This means that the MDHE must consider the location of the school districts served by a project and take into account school districts potentially served by other proposed projects and those served by existing projects.

**Announcement of Awards** Awards will be announced on or about February 15, 2013, and are subject to the availability of federal funds. An institution or partnership with a grievance regarding the awards for this grant cycle must make its intent to appeal known to the MDHE grant coordinator within 10 working days of the announcement of awards. Further information concerning the grievance process is available from the grant coordinator.

If enough quality applications are not received, the MDHE reserves the right to reopen the competition.

## GRANT ADMINISTRATION AND REGULATIONS

### Contracts

Every lead institution within a partnership receiving funds from the MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grants* program is required to sign a contract. This contract obligates the project directors and their institutions or partnerships to follow program administration regulations.

The grant project director is the MDHE point of contact for project-awarded grants in this program. Therefore, it is incumbent on the project director to assume responsibility for all administrative matters related to the grant, including – but not limited to – coordinating all financial details, completing forms, and assuring that all requirements and guidelines are followed. In addition, if the institution has an office that handles grants, e.g. a Sponsored Programs Office; the project director must provide their contact information so they can be properly informed of administrative matters.

### Use of Funds

Awarded funds may be used for:

- Project personnel and instructional costs.
  - Total personnel costs **must not exceed 35%** of the total requested funding.
- Participant stipends and materials.
- In-state travel expenses.
- Other expenses related to the project.

**Matching funds must equal at least 20% of the total budget request.**

**No single partner may benefit from more than 50% of the grant award.**

**No individual may receive more than 1% of the total grant request if that individual is participating in more than one grant.**

Awarded funds may not be used for capital equipment purchases. Capital equipment is an item that costs \$5,000 or more and have a useful life of more than one (1) year.

### Stipends

If a project provides a stipend to teacher participants it must be for non-contracted time only. Teachers may not be given a stipend for time that they are also being paid by their school or district. For example, if a project holds a follow-up session during the school day the teachers may not receive a stipend for their contracted hours during which they were attending the follow-up session.

### Substitute Reimbursement

If a project requires that a teacher attends a project activity during the school day during which he or she would have been teaching, the project may reimburse the school for the cost of the substitute teacher.

Federal regulations prohibit project funds from being the only source of substitute pay. To this end, a project may only reimburse a school or district up

to 90% of the daily cost of a substitute, when a teacher is absent from the classroom for a project activity using project funds. Matching funds may be used to cover the rest of the cost of a substitute.

**Non-public schools/districts may not be reimbursed for the cost of a substitute.**

**Reporting and Budget Related Deadlines for 1-Year Funded Projects**

The following table lists the deadlines for reports, completion of grant activities requiring funds, and reimbursement requests for PD projects. **Any request for a change in start date or end date must be submitted in writing to the MDHE for approval at least two weeks in advance of any change.**

**Table 4. Cycle 11 Deadlines**

Date	Event
April 15, 2013	External evaluation invoices are authorized to be submitted
October 15, 2013	External evaluation invoices are authorized to be submitted
October 15, 2013	Cycle-11 progress reports are due at the MDHE.
October 31, 2013	First request for reimbursement is due. The first request will be reimbursement for expenses through September 30, 2013.
April 30, 2014	Second request for reimbursement is due. The second request will be reimbursement for expenses from October 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014.
June 30, 2014	Completion of all project activities requiring funds.*
July 31, 2014	Cycle-11 final project report due at the MDHE.
August 15, 2014	Final reimbursement requests due. This final request will be reimbursement for expenses from April 1, 2014 through June 30, 2014. Requests received <b>after</b> August 15 will not be reimbursed.*
October 15, 2014	External evaluation invoices are authorized to be submitted

*\* The external evaluation reimbursements may be submitted before the official project start date and after the project end date of June 30, 2014. Requests for reimbursements for external evaluation will not be considered as one of the three reimbursement requests submitted during the life of the project.*

**Progress Reports**

The progress report, which must be submitted by October 15, 2013, serves three purposes:

- Provides information beyond that contained in the external evaluator’s *formative evaluation*. Project directors should discuss any project activities that have been completed or accomplishments that have been achieved that were not included in the external evaluator’s formative report.
- Discusses the project’s progress toward the attainment of state and individual project objectives.
- Outlines, if appropriate, any project challenges or unmet expectations.

The progress report narrative should not exceed ten (10) typed pages excluding attachments.

**Final and Annual Reports**

The Cycle-11 year 1 final reports for one-year projects and annual reports for multi-year projects should take a narrative form and should not exceed twenty-five (25) pages, excluding attachments. The guidelines for the final report will be given to the project directors by April 1, 2014.

**Accounting and Auditing Procedures**

The lead institution in the partnership is responsible for:

- Administering the grant received through the MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grant* program, including continuation grants, through a separate account—**shifting funds between different MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grant* cycles, including funds for multi-year projects, is NOT permitted.**
- Sending the MDHE a copy of the complete audit report and any findings for each fiscal year in which grant monies were expended.
- Complying with all provisions of Form C108 - Certificate of Assurances submitted with the grant proposal.

**Requesting Funds**

The award contract will indicate a start date and an end date for the project. **Expenses incurred outside the approved project start date and end date will not be reimbursed.**

The authorized institutional officer may request (up to three times per year as outlined in the “Deadlines for Funded Projects” section above, not including the reimbursement for the external evaluator) the reimbursement of funds by submitting an official “Cycle-11 Reimbursement Request for MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grants*” form to be made available on the MDHE website. **Reimbursement request forms received after August 15, 2014 will not be reimbursed.** Additionally, **the final one third of annual project funds will not be released** until the final report has been received by the MDHE and the external evaluation team has received all necessary data. **Project directs must use the MDHE reimbursement request forms and ledger** example provided when requesting reimbursement. These forms will be posted on the MDHE website and provided as attachments to award letters.

**Re-Allocating Funds in the**

Any changes in the personnel budget must be justified in writing and in advance to the MDHE for approval. For non-personnel expenses, re-

**Budget** allocations of funds between budget items may be done at the discretion of the project director and the recipient institution/partnership if the sum of all re-allocated funds is less than 10% of the project’s yearly non-personnel budget. **However, all such changes must be tracked and documented in writing to the MDHE prior to the final reimbursement request for the project.**

**Number of Participants and Students Impacted** The amount of the award is based in part on the projected number of participants and the number of students who will be impacted by the project. If these numbers are less than anticipated, it is expected that the portion of the grant related to participant expenditures will be reduced accordingly. **If participant enrollment is less than 75 percent of the level for which the grant was awarded, the MDHE’s approval is required before proceeding with project expenditures and activities.**

The number of students impacted by teachers should include all students that teacher participants teach in the classroom as well as other students tutored outside of class time. For an administrator, the number of students impacted is the student population of the school or district, as appropriate.

**Other Program Compliance Requirements** **Audit Checklist and 50% Rule Certification Form**  
The Compliance Audit Checklist and 50% Rule Certification Form must be submitted with the final reimbursement request. These forms will be available on the MDHE website.

#### **Unused Materials**

Unused materials and equipment purchased for the project must support partner schools. In the event that participants leave the district or the profession, the materials and equipment must remain in the partner school or district.

#### **Changes in Grant Personnel**

The MDHE must *approve* any personnel changes at the project director or co-director levels. The MDHE should be *notified* of other personnel changes. It is expected that when staff or personnel that are changed, the replacements will hold substantially similar qualifications to those that they are replacing.

#### **Monitoring and Site Visits (EDGAR 80.40(a))**

During the time period covered by the award, one or more members of the external evaluation team will be visiting the project in consultation with the project director. The coordinator of the MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grants* program or another representative of the MDHE will also visit project sites to ensure that progress is being made toward meeting objectives.

#### **Attribution**

Program advertisement brochures, written materials distributed to participants, and all disseminated materials must bear the following acknowledgement (with the appropriate figures/numbers inserted):

“Funds for this project were provided by a grant from Title II, Part A, of the *Improving Teacher Quality Grants* program

administered by the Missouri Department of Higher Education.  
The total costs of the project were financed with \$\_\_\_ (\_\_\_%) in  
federal funds and \$\_\_\_ (\_\_\_%) from non-governmental sources.”

**Copyrights and Patents**

Copyrights, patents, and other proprietary interests resulting from the grant activities are governed by applicable federal regulations and local institutional policies.

## RFP APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A: Definitions of Important Terms and Acronyms

#### **Definitions of Important Terms**

**CFDA:** (Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance) A directory which organizes and categorizes federal assistance programs into a uniform and standardized system.

**Common Core State Standards:** These are standards developed by the Common Core State Standards Initiative in English Language Arts and Mathematics. They are designed to communicate what knowledge and skills are essential for high school graduates to have in order to succeed in careers and in college. Additional information about these standards is available online here: <http://www.corestandards.org/the-standards>.

**Core Academic Subjects:** English, reading or language arts, math, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, or geography. These should be aligned with the Common Core Standards as applicable.

**Data Systems Competencies:** The ability to effectively work with and understand data to improve assessment, instruction and student outcomes.

**EDGAR:** The Education Department General Administrative Regulations. A copy of the regulations can be seen at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/fund/reg/edgarReg/edgar.html>.

**Eligible Partnership:** An affiliation of a private or public institution of higher education and the division of the institution that prepares teachers; a school of arts and sciences at a higher education institution; and a high-need school district. These partners are statutorily required.

**Environmental Education:** Environmental education is a learning process that increases people's knowledge and awareness about the physical environment and associated challenges, develops the necessary skills and expertise to address the challenges, and fosters attitudes, motivations, and commitments to make informed decisions and take responsible action (UNESCO, Tbilisi Declaration, 1978).

Environmental education enhances critical thinking, problem-solving, and effective decision-making skills, and teaches individuals to weigh various sides of an environmental issue to make informed and responsible decisions. Environmental education does not advocate a particular viewpoint or course of action.

The components of environmental education are:

1. Awareness and sensitivity to the environment and environmental challenges
2. Knowledge and understanding of the environment and environmental challenges
3. Attitudes of concern for the environment and motivation to improve or maintain environmental quality
4. Skills to identify and help resolve environmental challenges

5. Participation in activities that lead to the resolution of environmental challenges (UNESCO, 1978).<sup>4</sup>

The following provide additional information:

- [A Report to Congress on the Status of Environmental Education in the United States](#) [PDF, 2.1 MB, 55 pages] prepared for Congress by the National Environmental Education Advisory Council. 2005.
- [Environmental Education in the United States — Past, Present, and Future](#). Discussion papers from the 1996 National EE Summit, Burlingame, CA. Edited by M. Archie. 1998. ISBN 1-884008-53-4.
- North American Association for Environmental Education (NAAEE) web site: <http://www.naaee.org/>

**External Evaluator:** An individual or team, selected by the Missouri Department of Higher Education through a competitive process, that uses formative and summative methods of evaluation to analyze the effectiveness of all Cycle-11 MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grant* funded projects.

**Formative Evaluation:** A method of judging the effectiveness of a program while the program activities are happening in order to obtain feedback that can be used to improve the program or activities. Formative evaluation focuses on the processes by which the activities are conducted.

**High-Need School District:** A school district that either serves no fewer than 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line or has no less than 20 percent of the children served by the district from families with incomes below the poverty line and has either a high percentage of teachers who are not teaching in the academic subjects or grade levels in which they were trained to teach or has a high percentage of teachers with emergency, provisional, or temporary certification or licensing.

**Highly Qualified Paraprofessional:** The term highly qualified paraprofessional means a paraprofessional who has not less than 2 years of:

- experience in a classroom; and
- postsecondary education or demonstrated competence in a field or academic subject for which there is a significant shortage of qualified teachers.

**Highly Qualified Teacher:**

- 1) The term “highly qualified teacher,” when used with respect to any public elementary school or secondary school teacher teaching in Missouri, means
  - the teacher has obtained full state certification as a teacher (including certification obtained through alternative routes) or has passed the state teacher licensing examination and holds a license to teach in Missouri, except that when the term is used with respect to any teacher teaching in a public charter school, the term means that the teacher meets the certification or licensing requirements set forth in Missouri’s public charter school law; and
  - the teacher has not had certification or licensure requirements waived on an emergency, temporary, or provisional basis.

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/enviroed/> Accessed 01 October 2012.

- 2) When the term “highly qualified teacher” is used with respect to
- a) an elementary school teacher who is new to the profession, it means that the teacher has met the requirements of paragraph (1) above, and
    - holds at least a bachelor’s degree
    - has demonstrated, by passing a rigorous state test, subject knowledge and teaching skills in reading, writing, math, and other areas of the basic elementary school curriculum (which may consist of passing a state-required certification or licensing test(s) in these core areas).
  - b) a middle school or secondary school teacher who is new to the profession, it means that the teacher has met the requirements of paragraph (1) above, holds at least a bachelor’s degree, and has demonstrated a high level of competency in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches by:
    - passing a rigorous state academic subject test in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches (which may consist of a passing level of performance on a state-required certification or licensing test(s) in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches), or
    - successful completion, in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches, of an academic major, a graduate degree, coursework equivalent to an undergraduate academic major, or advanced certification or credentialing.
- 3) When the term “highly qualified teacher” is used with respect to an elementary, middle, or secondary school teacher who is not new to the profession, it means that the teacher has met the requirements of paragraph (1) above, holds at least a bachelor’s degree, and
- a) has met the applicable standard in the clauses of subparagraph (B), which includes an option for a test, or
  - b) demonstrates competence in all the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches based on a high, objective, uniform state standard of evaluation that:
    - is set by Missouri for both grade-appropriate, academic, subject-matter knowledge and teaching skills;
    - is aligned with challenging state academic content and student academic achievement standards and has been developed in consultation with core content specialists, teachers, principals, and school administrators;
    - provides objective, coherent information about the teacher’s attainment of core content knowledge in the academic subjects in which a teacher teaches;
    - is applied uniformly to all teachers in the same academic subject and the same grade level throughout the state;
    - takes into consideration, but is not be based primarily on, the time the teacher has been teaching in the academic subject;
    - is made available to the public upon request; and
    - may involve multiple objective measures of teacher competency.

**Major Role:** Having key responsibilities such as those of a project director, co-director, or consultant, or it may also be defined in terms of the amount of money received in compensation from the grant.

**Model Core Teaching Standards:** These standards provide principles for effective teaching and are being updated by the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC). More information about these standards is available online here:

[http://www.ccsso.org/resources/programs/interstate\\_teacher\\_assessment\\_consortium\(intasc\).html](http://www.ccsso.org/resources/programs/interstate_teacher_assessment_consortium(intasc).html). Please also see those standards recently adopted by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) available online here: <http://www.dese.mo.gov/eq/>.

**Scientifically-Based Research:** The term “scientifically-based research” means research that involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs and includes research that:

1. employs systematic, empirical methods that draw on observation or experiment;
2. involves rigorous data analyses that are adequate to test the stated hypotheses and justify the general conclusions drawn;
3. relies on measurements or observational methods that provide reliable and valid data across evaluators and observers, across multiple measurements and observations, and across studies by the same or different investigators;
4. is evaluated using experimental or quasi-experimental designs in which individuals, entities, programs, or activities are assigned to different conditions, with appropriate controls to evaluate the effects of the condition of interest and with a preference for random-assignment experiments or other designs to the extent that those designs contain within-condition or across-condition controls;
5. ensures that experimental studies are presented in sufficient detail and clarity to allow for replication or, at a minimum, to offer the opportunity to build systematically on their findings; and
6. has been accepted by a peer-reviewed journal or approved by a panel of independent experts through a comparably rigorous, objective, and scientific review.

**Summative Evaluation:** A method of judging the effectiveness of a program at the end of the program activities. Summative evaluation focuses on the outcomes of program activities.

**Targeted math and/or science content areas:** The focus of knowledge content and pedagogical strategies for Cycle-11 is math or science or the integration of these two fields, and the competitive preference focus on environmental education and data systems competencies. The knowledge content must be related to national and state standards.

**Underrepresented students:** Members of historically disadvantaged groups usually characterized as belonging to a minority or ethnic group or other category of persons who have experienced discrimination and are specifically protected by anti-discrimination statutes. Minority groups include African Americans, Hispanics, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asians, and Pacific Islanders.

**Underserved students:** Students having one or more of the following characteristics: disabled, poor, minority-born, homeless, or unemployed; underserved students may include migrant workers, refugees, and persons living in rural/remote areas or other underserved regions of the state. Underserved populations are often difficult to reach, either physically or by the sheer force of circumstances.

## **ACRONYMS**

<b>CBHE</b>	– Coordinating Board for Higher Education
<b>CD</b>	– Compact Disc
<b>CLE</b>	– Course-Level Expectation
<b>DESE</b>	– (Missouri) Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
<b>GLE</b>	– Grade-Level Expectation
<b>IHE</b>	– Institution of Higher Education
<b>ITQG</b>	– Improving Teacher Quality Grant
<b>LEA</b>	– Local Educational Agency
<b>MAP</b>	– Missouri Assessment Program
<b>MDHE</b>	– Missouri Department of Higher Education
<b>NAAEE</b>	– North American Association for Environmental Education <sup>5</sup>
<b>NCLB</b>	– No Child Left Behind
<b>OMB</b>	– Office of Management and Budget
<b>RFP</b>	– Request for Proposal
<b>SAHE</b>	– State Agency for Higher Education
<b>STEM</b>	– Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics
<b>USDE</b>	– United States Department of Education

---

<sup>5</sup>See <http://www.naaee.org/> for more information.

## APPENDIX B: Intent to Apply Form

### Form C100 – Intent to Apply Due November 13, 2012 by 4:00 p.m.

Please complete the form below and return to:

**Elizabeth (Liz) Valentine, ITQG Coordinator (address provided on RFP Cover)**

**THIS FORM IS AVAILABLE ONLINE AT**

<http://dhe.mo.gov/ppc/grants/teacherquality.php>.

Project Title (not to exceed 20 words)	
1. Name of Lead Higher Education Institution	
2. Project Director from Lead Higher Education Institution	Name <span style="float: right;">Title</span>
	Address <span style="float: right;">Telephone Number</span> <small style="text-align: center;">Please specify college/department (e.g. Professor, Chemistry)</small>
	E-mail Address
	Signature <span style="float: right;">Date</span>
3. Co-Director(s)  (Information for additional co- directors may be entered in the Abstract Form)	Name <span style="float: right;">Title</span>
	Address <span style="float: right;">Telephone Number</span> <small style="text-align: center;">Please specify college/department or school level (elem. or middle) or subject area</small>
	E-mail Address
	Signature <span style="float: right;">Date</span>
4. Grade Level	
5. Content Area	
6. Length	<input type="checkbox"/> One Year 2013-2014 <input type="checkbox"/> Two Years 2013-2015 <input type="checkbox"/> Three Years 2013-2016
7. Planned School District Partners	

**Please attach a brief description of the proposed project (no more than 300 words, single-spaced).**

## APPENDIX C: High-Need Missouri School Districts

### Determination of High-Need School Districts

The *No Child Left Behind Act* focuses on high-need school districts. The federal definition of high-need addresses issues of poverty and of teacher quality because these issues have been most closely linked to low student performance. In Missouri, high-need eligibility adopts federal standards for poverty level and district-level data on percent of courses taught by highly qualified teachers. Local school districts must meet both criteria to be considered high-need.

Districts that serve at least 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line; **or**  
 At least 20 percent of the children served by the district are from families with incomes below the poverty line; **and**  
 Have a higher than statewide average number of courses taught by teachers with emergency, provisional, or temporary certification or licensing, as reported to DESE, have qualified as a high-need district are listed in the table below.

The school districts, listed below, and any schools within these districts are eligible for statutory partnership in Cycle-11 of the MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grants* Program. Please note that federal data is subject to change. If awarded a multi-year project, the partner districts may remain partner districts, even if they are not listed in the following year's RFP as a high-need district.

District ID	School District	County
048914	ACADEMIE LAFAYETTE*	JACKSON
001090	ADAIR CO. R-I	ADAIR
048909	ALLEN VILLAGE	JACKSON
048902	ALTA VISTA CHARTER SCHOOL*	JACKSON
061150	ATLANTA C-3	MACON
048911	B. BANNEKER ACADEMY*	JACKSON
115922	BETTER LEARNING COMM ACADEMY*	ST LOUIS CITY
094076	BISMARCK R-V	ST FRANCOIS
027055	BLACKWATER R-II	COOPER
084001	BOLIVAR R-I	POLK
082105	BONCL R-X	PIKE
106001	BRADLEYVILLE R-I	TANEY
013061	BRAYMER C-4	CALDWELL
058112	BROOKFIELD R-III	LINN

District ID	School District	County
048916	BROOKSIDE CHARTER SCHOOL*	JACKSON
058107	BUCKLIN R-II	LINN
090077	BUNKER R-III	REYNOLDS
041001	CAINSVILLE R-I	HARRISON
042117	CALHOUN R-VIII	HENRY
061157	CALLAO C-8	MACON
035093	CAMPBELL R-II	DUNKLIN
056015	CANTON R-V	LEWIS
115915	CARONDELET LEADERSHIP ACADEMY*	ST LOUIS CITY
078012	CARUTHERSVILLE 18	PEMISCOT
090075	CENTERVILLE R-I	REYNOLDS
067061	CHARLESTON R-I	MISSISSIPPI
023101	CLARK CO. R-I	CLARK
035097	CLARKTON C-4	DUNKLIN

District ID	School District	County
115906	CONFLUENCE ACADEMIES*	ST LOUIS CITY
115901	CONSTRUCTION CAREERS CENTER*	ST LOUIS CITY
027056	COOPER CO. R-IV	COOPER
078004	COOTER R-IV	PEMISCOT
075084	COUCH R-I	OREGON
044078	CRAIG R-III	HOLT
029002	DADEVILLE R-II	DADE
048923	DELASALLE CHARTER SCHOOL*	JACKSON
048912	DELLA LAMB ELEMENTARY*	JACKSON
078009	DELTA C-7	PEMISCOT
033093	DENT-PHELPS R-III	DENT
048917	DERRICK THOMAS ACADEMY*	JACKSON
050014	DESOTO 73	JEFFERSON
347347	DIVISION OF YOUTH SERVICES	MULTIPLE
048903	DON BOSCO EDUCATION CENTER*	JACKSON
067055	EAST PRAIRIE R-II	MISSISSIPPI
066102	ELDON R-I	MILLER
101107	EMINENCE R-I	SHANNON
115904	ETHEL HEDGEMAN LYLE ACADEMY*	ST LOUIS CITY
048924	EWING MARION KAUFFMAN SCHOOL*	JACKSON
084002	FAIR PLAY R-II	POLK
062072	FREDERICKTOWN R-I	MADISON
048922	FRONTIER SCHOOL OF INNOVATION*	JACKSON
115916	GATEWAY SCIENCE ACAD/ST LOUIS*	ST LOUIS CITY

District ID	School District	County
048905	GENESIS SCHOOL INC.*	JACKSON
072073	GIDEON 37	NEW MADRID
048913	GORDON PARKS ELEM.	JACKSON
099078	GORIN R-III	SCOTLAND
115918	GRAND CENTER ARTS ACADEMY*	ST LOUIS CITY
048074	GRANDVIEW C-4	JACKSON
033092	GREEN FOREST R-II	DENT
040100	GRUNDY CO. R-V	GRUNDY
084003	HALFWAY R-III	POLK
064075	HANNIBAL 60	MARION
043001	HICKORY CO. R-I	HICKORY
088075	HIGBEE R-VIII	RANDOLPH
048904	HOGAN PREPARATORY ACADEMY*	JACKSON
035094	HOLCOMB R-III	DUNKLIN
106005	HOLLISTER R-V	TANEY
048920	HOPE ACADEMY*	JACKSON
048925	HOPE LEADERSHIP ACADEMY*	JACKSON
107152	HOUSTON R-I	TEXAS
046128	HOWELL VALLEY R-I	HOWELL
007126	HUDSON R-IX	BATES
084004	HUMANSVILLE R-IV	POLK
115907	IMAGINE ACAD. ACADEMIC SUCCESS*	ST LOUIS CITY
115909	IMAGINE ACADEMY ES AND MATH*	ST LOUIS CITY
115908	IMAGINE ACADEMY OF CAREERS*	ST LOUIS CITY
048919	IMAGINE REN ACAD ENV SCI & MA*	JACKSON
047065	IRON CO. C-4	IRON
048078	KANSAS CITY 33	JACKSON

District ID	School District	County
035102	KENNETT 39	DUNKLIN
110014	KINGSTON K-14	WASHINGTON
115914	KIPP ST LOUIS*	ST LOUIS CITY
048918	KIPP: ENDEAVOR ACADEMY*	JACKSON
061154	LA PLATA R-II	MACON
053111	LACLEDE CO. R-I	LACLEDE
040104	LAREDO R-VII	GRUNDY
048910	LEE A. TOLBERT COM. ACADEMY*	JACKSON
042118	LEESVILLE R-IX	HENRY
090078	LESTERVILLE R-IV	REYNOLDS
023099	LURAY 33	CLARK
077104	LUTIE R-VI	OZARK
063067	MARIES CO. R-II	MARIES
106008	MARK TWAIN R-VIII	TANEY
062070	MARQUAND-ZION R-VI	MADISON
060077	MCDONALD CO. R-I	MCDONALD
058108	MEADVILLE R-IV	LINN
097116	MIAMI R-I	BATES
069104	MIDDLE GROVE C-1	MONROE
105124	MILAN C-2	SULLIVAN
066103	MILLER CO. R-III	MILLER
201201	MO SCHLS FOR THE SEV DISABLED	MULTIPLE
115414	MO SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND	ST LOUIS CITY
088081	MOBERLY	RANDOLPH
068072	MONITEAU CO. R-V	MONITEAU
070093	MONTGOMERY CO. R-II	MONTGOMERY
046130	MOUNTAIN VIEW-BIRCH TREE R-III	HOWELL
091091	NAYLOR R-II	RIPLEY

District ID	School District	County
012108	NEELYVILLE R-IV	BUTLER
072074	NEW MADRID CO. R-I	NEW MADRID
105125	NEWTOWN-HARRIS R-III	SULLIVAN
096109	NORMANDY	ST LOUIS
078001	NORTH PEMISCOT CO. R-I	PEMISCOT
115913	NORTH SIDE COMMUNITY SCHOOL*	ST LOUIS CITY
108147	NORTHEAST VERNON CO. R-I	VERNON
033091	OAK HILL R-I	DENT
075086	OREGON-HOWELL R-III	OREGON
115905	PAIDEIA ACADEMY*	ST LOUIS CITY
048921	PATHWAY ACADEMY*	JACKSON
078003	PEMISCOT CO. R-III	PEMISCOT
080116	PETTIS CO. R-V	PETTIS
081097	PHELPS CO. R-III	PHELPS
084006	PLEASANT HOPE R-VI	POLK
012109	POPLAR BLUFF R-I	BUTLER
115919	PRECLARUS MASTERY ACADEMY*	ST LOUIS CITY
005124	PURDY R-II	BARRY
107158	RAYMONDVILLE R-VII	TEXAS
023096	REVERE C-3	CLARK
007124	RICH HILL R-IV	BATES
046132	RICHARDS R-V	HOWELL
103127	RICHLAND R-I	STODDARD
091095	RIPLEY CO. R-III	RIPLEY
091093	RIPLEY CO. R-IV	RIPLEY
072066	RISCO R-II	NEW MADRID
096111	RIVERVIEW GARDENS	ST LOUIS
093121	ROSCOE C-1	ST CLAIR
099082	SCOTLAND CO. R-I	SCOTLAND

District ID	School District	County
100059	SCOTT CITY R-I	SCOTT
100062	SCOTT CO. CENTRAL	SCOTT
048915	SCUOLA VITA NUOVA*	JACKSON
115917	SHEARWATER EDUCATION FOUNDATION*	ST LOUIS CITY
108144	SHELDON R-VIII	VERNON
034121	SKYLINE R-II	DOUGLAS
115920	SOUTH CITY PREPARATORY ACADEMY*	ST LOUIS CITY
078005	SOUTH PEMISCOT CO. R-V	PEMISCOT
090076	SOUTHERN REYNOLDS CO. R-II	REYNOLDS
035099	SOUTHLAND C-9	DUNKLIN
096119	SPECL. SCH. DST. ST. LOUIS CO.	ST LOUIS
115912	ST LOUIS LANG IMMERSION SCHOOL*	ST LOUIS CITY
011082	ST. JOSEPH	BUCHANAN
115903	ST. LOUIS CHARTER SCHOOL*	ST LOUIS CITY
115115	ST. LOUIS CITY	ST LOUIS CITY
015001	STOUTLAND R-II	CAMDEN
107151	SUCCESS R-VI	TEXAS
107153	SUMMERSVILLE R-II	TEXAS
106002	TANEYVILLE R-II	TANEY
077100	THORNFIELD R-I	OZARK
031122	TRI-COUNTY R-VII	DAVIESS
048901	UNIVERSITY ACADEMY*	JACKSON
048907	URBAN COM. LEADERSHIP ACADEMY*	JACKSON
018050	VAN BUREN R-I	CARTER
088080	WESTRAN R-I	RANDOLPH
043002	WHEATLAND R-II	HICKORY

District ID	School District	County
005120	WHEATON R-III	BARRY
101105	WINONA R-III	SHANNON
009079	ZALMA R-V	BOLLINGER

\*Denotes the listing as a Charter School

## APPENDIX D: Proposal Forms and Instructions

### PROPOSAL FORMS

#### Table of Contents

Form C101 – Proposal Cover Page

Form C102 – Project Abstract

Budget Information:

Budget Instructions

Form C103 – Budget Summary

Budget Justification

Form C104 – Collaborative Planning Team Document

Form C105 – Joint Effort Document

Form C106 – Letter of Commitment: K-12 Partner(s)

Form C107 – Letter of Commitment: Higher Education Partner(s)

Form C108 – Certificate of Assurances

Form C109 – Previous Project Outcomes must be submitted only if:

- a. One or more of the individuals having a *major role* in the proposed project previously received funds under the CBHE Eisenhower Grants program or Cycles 1-10 of the MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grant* program; **AND/OR**
- b. The proposed project is a continuation of a project that previously received funds under the CBHE Eisenhower Grants program or Cycles 1-10 of the MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grant* program

**Digital files for all attached forms are available online at**

**<http://www.dhe.mo.gov/ppc/grants/teacherquality.php>**



## Form C102 - Project Abstract

**Project Title:**

---

**Lead Institution:**

---

**Partnerships:** (Please expand or condense appropriate rows as needed)

	Institution/District/Organization	Location/Contact Person		
Education Division				
Arts & Sciences Division				
	District Name	District ID	County	Contact Person
High-Need School District(s) See Appendix C for more information	1. 2. 3.			
Other School District(s) Please see <a href="http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/school_data.html">www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/school_data.html</a> for district ID numbers.	1. 2. 3.			
	Institution/District/Organization	Location/Contact Person		
Additional Partner(s)	1. 2. 3.			

**Project Information:**

Length of Project: <input type="checkbox"/> One Year 2013-2014 <input type="checkbox"/> Two Years 2013-2015 <input type="checkbox"/> Three Years 2013-2016	
Grade-level focus (Note: one or more from grades K to 12):	
Project area(s) of focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Math <input type="checkbox"/> Science <input type="checkbox"/> Integrated Math and Science
Anticipated number of participants	
Anticipated number of participants from high-need districts	
Anticipated Start Date of Actual Project Activities	
Anticipated number of students directly impacted	
Total number of contact hours per project year	
Number of credit hours to be provided:	
	Undergraduate
	Graduate
Continuing Education Units (CEU)	

**Form C102 – Project Abstract (Con't)**

**Project Summary (300 words, single-spaced):**

**Timeline for Project (Table format only):**

**Logic Model:**

## BUDGET INSTRUCTIONS

This section contains instructions for completing the **Budget Summary Form** for aggregated expenses. A written **Budget Justification** is also required. In all cases, expenses must be directly related to the professional development experience for the participants.

Federal law requires that no single participant in an *eligible partnership*, (i.e., no single high-need LEA, no single IHE and its division that prepares teachers and principals, no single school of arts and sciences and no other single partner), may **benefit more than 50% of the award**.

### 1. Personnel Costs

Personnel should be listed individually to include director(s), additional instructor(s) and/or peer teacher(s), if any, and support staff. After each name, indicate (in parentheses) the role of that person in the project. Salaries cannot be drawn at a rate higher than that which the individual would normally receive in his/her regular duties. Graduate students employed as project personnel should be paid a fair wage in the same manner as other grant personnel. Graduate educational fees for employees cannot be charged to the grant.

**Fringe benefits** can be paid only to those individuals who are employees of, and who would normally receive benefits from, the partnership institutions/school districts. **Please specify the benefit rate in percent form.**

### 2. Additional Personnel Costs

This section is for additional personnel with different benefit rates from those in (1) above. Explain the roles of additional personnel and justify inclusion of such personnel in the project.

**Total personnel costs (section 1 and 2 on the Budget Summary Form, including fringe benefits) must not exceed 35% of the total requested funding.**

### 3. Participant Costs

All items must be listed individually with per-item cost information and estimated quantities detailed in the Budget Justification. Books and materials and/or equipment are limited to those that will actually be needed during the project's duration. It is expected that materials will be purchased as inexpensively as possible and that reasonable effort will be made to obtain materials as an in-kind donation from other public agencies and private enterprises whenever possible.

If course credits are offered to participants, the higher education institution partner that is able to grant the credits is expected to waive the fees.

**Participant stipends** may be written into the budget proposal as a line item under this section. Participants' stipends **should not exceed \$15 per hour of organized activity** and **presupposes individuals' active participation during any period in which the stipends are earned.**

- Pre-service teacher and paraprofessional participants may be paid in-kind through course credits or other avenues.
- Participants may not receive stipends for attending workshops for which substitute teacher pay has been provided or for a day the school or district normally pays them.
- Stipends for private school participants must be paid directly to the teachers and not to the private school.
- See page 25 for more information on participant stipends and substitute reimbursement.

If the grant is to pay participant travel to the workshop, reimbursement is allowed at the sponsoring institution's rate per mile, up to \$0.37. Room and board may constitute a reasonable expense.

#### **4. Additional Costs**

This section is for costs other than salaries and participant expenses. Expenses may be lumped into logical categories but all items must be itemized and explained in the Budget Justification.

**Consultant fees (EDGAR 75.515, 75.516, and 75.519) may not exceed \$300 per day** in addition to any reimbursement for travel, food, and lodging. List the number of days and costs per day. Instructors and peer teachers, if used, are not considered to be consultants; they should be listed as personnel. Properly documented contractual agreements for expenditures to consultants or outside agencies for fees, travel, and routine supplies must be filed per institutional policy. Documentation for consultant services performed should be filed showing:

1. Consultant's name, dates, hours, amount charged to grant.
2. Names of grant recipient staff to whom services were provided.
3. Results or subject matter of the consultation.

#### **5. TOTAL DIRECT Costs**

This is the total of Items 1 through 4.

#### **6. MODIFIED TOTAL DIRECT Costs**

The modified total direct cost base is defined as total direct costs **less stipends and tuition and related fees**.

#### **7. FACILITIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE Costs**

Institutions may recover facilities & administrative costs up to a maximum of eight percent (8%) of modified total direct cost base. (EDGAR 75.562) Facilities and administrative costs may only be applied to the lead institution/fiscal agent and is included in calculations for the 50% rule.

#### **8. TOTAL Costs**

This is the sum of TOTAL DIRECT Costs and FACILITIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE Costs.

#### **9. Percent of Grant Funds per Partner**

No single partner may benefit more than 50% of the total award amount.

**Matching Funds:** The partnership must contribute at least **20% of the total budget** request in matching funds and/or in-kind contributions as a sign of commitment to the project's success. Matching fund commitments may be in the form of stipends, course credits, substitute teacher pay, travel reimbursement, classroom or teacher materials, cash, equipment, personnel time, and/or other expenses. An indirect rate maximum of 8% can be used on matching funds to meet the requirement. No other rate can be used (*EDGAR 75.562(c)(3)*). Tuition and fees paid by participants **may not** be used as matching funds (*EDGAR 76.534*).

## Form C103 Budget Summary – Cycle-11 ITQG

For multi-year proposals, use a separate Budget Summary Form for each year of the project. All budget requests must show the matching funds contributed to the project category. A written Budget Justification must accompany this form as an appendix item. *NOTE: No single partner in the eligible partnership may use more than fifty percent (50%) of the grant funds made available to the partnership.*

**A FILLABLE (EXCEL) FORM IS AVAILABLE ONLINE AT:**

<http://www.dhe.mo.gov/ppc/grants/teacherquality.php>

<b>Lead Institution:</b>						
<b>Project Director:</b>						
<b>Federal ID Number:</b>						
<b>Project Title:</b>						
	<b>Partner 1 Education</b>	<b>Partner 2 Arts &amp; Sciences</b>	<b>Partner 3 High-Need LEA(s) (Combined)</b>	<b>Partner 4 Other Partners (Combined)</b>	<b>Total Grant Request</b>	<b>Matching Funds</b>
<b>1. Personnel Costs</b> (Director(s), instructors, peer teachers, support staff)						
A.						
B.						
C.						
D.						
Fringe benefits (approved institutional rate ___%)						
<b>TOTAL PERSONNEL COSTS</b>						
<b>2. Additional Personnel Costs</b>						
A.						
B.						
C.						
Fringe benefits (approved institutional rate ___%)						
<b>TOTAL ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL COSTS</b>						
<b>3. Participant Costs</b> (Stipends, Travel, Materials, etc.)						
A.						
B.						
C.						
<b>TOTAL PARTICIPANT COSTS</b>						
<b>4. Additional Costs</b> (List individually; detail in budget justification narrative.)						
A.						
B.						
C.						
<b>TOTAL PARTICIPANT COSTS</b>						
<b>5. TOTAL DIRECT COSTS</b> (Sum of items 1-4)						
<b>6. MODIFIED TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (MTDC)</b> (Total Direct Costs less stipends and tuition.)						
<b>7. FACILITIES &amp; ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS</b> (Maximum rate of 8% of MTDC.)						
<b>8. TOTAL COSTS</b>						
<b>9. Percent of Grant Funds.<sup>1</sup></b>						
<b>Project Director(s) Name and Title:</b>			<b>Signature &amp; Date:</b>			
<b>Authorized Institutional Officer Name and Title:</b>			<b>Signature &amp; Date:</b>			

<sup>1</sup> If grant funds percentage exceeds 50% for a partner group, please submit a break down of funds by each individual partner.

## **BUDGET JUSTIFICATION**

The Budget Justification is a written narrative that is submitted with the Budget Summary Form as an appendix to the project proposal. Please use the headings provided below. The Budget Justification should address each of the following categories that are also listed on the Budget Summary Form.

### **Matching Funds**

Provide an explanation of the matching funds listed for the project.

### **Personnel/Additional Personnel Costs**

Explain how the salary amount for each person listed in either personnel section of the Budget Summary Form was derived by providing a clear calculation of the expected real-time contribution of the person to the project. Indicate the salary the person receives as a function of his/her regular appointment. Also, describe the roles of all personnel and justify their inclusion in the project.

### **Participant Costs**

Detail all participant costs and stipends for the project years, and list the per-item cost information and the estimated quantities needed for the project. Explain why these expenses are necessary to achieving the project's objectives and activities.

### **Additional Costs**

Itemize all additional expenses for the project years. Explain why these expenses are necessary to achieving the project's objectives and activities.

---

\*\*A FILLABLE (Excel) version of this form can be found at:  
<http://mdhe.mo.gov/ppc/grants/teacherquality.php>



## Form C105 - Joint Effort Document

The proposal must reflect a joint effort among at least three partners: a high-need school district, a department or college of education, and a department of arts & sciences. This federal requirement is intended to ensure that *Improving Teacher Quality Grant* activities integrate needed teaching skills with substantive content knowledge. (Note: It is generally assumed that a department/college of education is the primary teacher preparation division/unit of a higher education institution. If an institution has a different organizational structure regarding teacher preparation, please provide a brief description for clarity.)

Joint effort can take a number of forms, ranging from informal discussions about the project to full sharing of administrative and instructional responsibilities such as:

- Each unit/partner participating in the planning and implementation of the project.
- Each unit/partner playing a role in the evaluation of the project.
- Instructional staff members are drawn from each unit/partner.

### Statement of Joint Effort:

The lead higher education institution hereby provides assurances that this proposal reflects a joint effort between the three statutory partners. **If more partners are involved, please provide signatures, titles, and names of representatives of the partners on a separate sheet using the format below.**

### Representative of the High-Need School District:

Signature and Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name and Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

### Representative of the Higher Education Department/College of Education:

Signature and Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name and Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

### Representative of the Higher Education Arts and Sciences Department:

Signature and Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name and Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

## Form C106 - Letter of Commitment

### K-12 Partner

Submit one copy of this form for **every** participating K-12 school partner. If two or more schools are in a single school district, only one form needs to be completed by a district administrator on behalf of all participating schools.

As a partner in a project funded by the Cycle-11 MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grant*, I hereby commit my school district or school(s) within the district to provide access to classroom-level teacher and student demographic and achievement data as requested by the Project Director and/or the External Evaluation Team for the purposes of measuring the impact of MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grant* funds.

Examples of data that may be required for evaluation purposes include (but are not limited to):

- pre- and post-test scores in teachers' and possibly students' content knowledge;
- teacher interviews;
- student interviews;
- classroom-level MAP test results;
- aggregated building-wide and/or district-wide MAP test results;
- results of standardized tests administered by the district;
- classroom-level math and/or science assessments administered in the grade levels participating in the project.

The Project Director and External Evaluation Team guarantee the confidentiality of student, teacher, and school information in reporting. Analyses of all data collected will be made available to the K-12 partners so that they can be used to improve school or school district achievement in math and/or science.

Signature and Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name and Title: \_\_\_\_\_

School District: \_\_\_\_\_

School: \_\_\_\_\_

## Form C107 - Letter of Commitment

### Higher Education Partner

Submit one copy of this form for **every** higher education partner. This form must be completed by either

- the dean of a school/college of education and a dean of the school/college of arts and science, OR
- an appropriate administrator of the higher education institution on behalf of participating department faculty or institutional representatives.

As a partner in a project funded by the Cycle-11 MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grant*, I hereby commit my school/college to provide data and information about curriculum design and such processes as requested by the Project Director and/or the External Evaluation Team for the purposes of measuring the impact of MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grant* funds.

Examples of data/information that will be required for evaluation purposes include (but are not limited to):

- teacher education curriculum design,
- relationship between the teacher preparation unit (i.e. school/college of education) and content-specific units (arts and sciences department),
- extent of involvement of the teacher preparation unit in professional development of K-12 educators, and
- pre-service teacher/paraprofessional academic records, or course-specific information, if applicable.

The Project Director and External Evaluation Team guarantee the confidentiality of this information in reporting. Analyses of all data collected will be made available to the institution so that they can be used to improve curriculum design processes within the partner institutions.

Signature and Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name and Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

## Form C108 - Certificate of Assurances

*To be completed and signed by the chief executive officer of the lead institution*

I hereby provide assurances to the Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE) that if this institution receives funding under the terms of the MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grant*, it will:

- Conduct the professional development program or teacher education activities as described in the *Request for Proposals* and the project proposal;
- Provide institutional or organizational funding and resources as stated in the *Request for Proposals*;
- Comply with the state requirement to audit the grant-funded project in accordance with OMB Circulars A-21, A-122, A-133, as appropriate, and, within 60 days of the completion of the audit, to supply the MDHE with a copy of the audit report and any findings for each fiscal year in which those grant monies were expended;
- Keep all records necessary for fiscal and program auditing and give the MDHE, CBHE, USDE, and/or the state auditor through any authorized representative, access to, and the right to examine, all records, books, papers, or documents related to the grant;
- Retain all fiscal records for a period of five years after the end date of the grant;
- Comply with all regulations and requirements of the MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grant*;
- Comply with the administrative procedures of the MDHE, CBHE, and USDE;
- Use funds from the MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grant* only to supplement and not to supplant funds from non-federal sources;
- Take advantage of opportunities to provide greater access to math and/or science disciplines by historically underrepresented and underserved groups;
- Comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000(d)), prohibiting employment discrimination where discriminatory practices will result in unequal treatment to persons who are or should be benefiting from the grant-aided activity; and
- Ensure equitable participation of faculty and students from private schools to the extent feasible.

Signature and Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name and Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

## Form C109 - Previous Project Outcomes

This form must be completed **only if** any individuals with a major role in this project previously received funds under the CBHE Eisenhower grants program or the MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grants* program, or if the proposed project is a continuation of a project that previously received funds under either of these two grant programs. **Limit the summary to one page per previous project.** Submit one copy of the form for each individual and/or project to which it applies.

Past Project Title:

---

Past Project Director(s):

---

Year(s) in which MDHE/CBHE funding was obtained:

---

**Summary of the previous project's goals, activities, and outcomes:**

## **APPENDIX E: Cycle-11 Timeline**

### **Cycle-11 Timeline**

<b>October 2012</b>	Request for Proposals (RFP) released.
<b>October 18, 2012</b>	Technical Assistance Workshop, Jefferson City
<b>November 13, 2012</b>	Letter of Intent due by 4:00 p.m.
<b>November 26, 2012</b>	Last Day for Submission of Proposals for Early Review.
<b>December 14, 2012</b>	Review Panel Orientation, MDHE Offices, Jefferson City
<b>December 17, 2012</b>	Proposals due by 4:00 p.m.
<b>January 2013</b>	Review Session
<b>February 2013</b>	Award Notification
<b>February 2013</b>	Projects begin after award notification.
<b>February 2013</b>	Project directors meet with the External Evaluation Team, to discuss the evaluation process.
<b>April 15, 2013</b>	External evaluation invoices are authorized to be submitted
<b>May 31, 2013</b>	Preliminary Participant Data Form due.
<b>Summer 2013</b>	Summer workshops are held. Site visits from grant coordinator and external evaluation team liaison.
<b>October 15, 2013</b>	Cycle-11 Progress Report due.
<b>October 15, 2013</b>	External evaluation invoices are authorized to be submitted
<b>October 15, 2013</b>	Participant Data Form due.
<b>October 31, 2013</b>	Reimbursement Request due for expenses incurred through September 30, 2013.
<b>April 1, 2014</b>	Final Report Guidelines and Project Continuance Proposal Guidelines sent to project directors.
<b>April 30, 2014</b>	Reimbursement Request due for expenses incurred from October 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014.
<b>June 30, 2014</b>	Completion of all project activities requiring funds.
<b>July 31, 2014</b>	Cycle-11 Final Report and Project Continuance Proposal (if applicable) due by 4:00 p.m.
<b>July 31, 2014</b>	Final Participant Data Form due.
<b>August 15, 2014</b>	Final reimbursement request due from expenses incurred from April 1, 2014 through June 30, 2014.
<b>October 15, 2014</b>	External evaluation invoices are authorized to be submitted
<b>Late Fall 2014</b>	Cycle-11 Summit