

MDHE Improving Teacher Quality Grants

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

Cycle-6 Grants Competition

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION DEADLINE:

**All proposals must ARRIVE at the MDHE by
4 p.m. on, Friday, December 14, 2007.**

**Contact:
Mr. Chad Hampton
Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE)
3515 Amazonas Drive
Jefferson City, MO 65109-5717
(573) 522-1309
Chad.Hampton@dhe.mo.gov**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Cover Letter	4
Introduction	6
No Child Left Behind, Title II, Part A	6
Missouri Priorities	6
Multi-year Projects	7
Proposal Narrative (Explanation and Instructions)	7
Primary Project Partners	7
Additional Partners	8
Partnership Commitments	8
Project Participants	8
Project Design and Objectives.....	10
Project Activities/Structure	11
Information Dissemination Process	11
Project Evaluation	13
External Evaluation	13
External Evaluator Responsibilities	13
Project Directors' Evaluation Responsibilities	14
Narrative Discussion Components	14
Evaluation Reimbursement... ..	15
Evaluation Summit... ..	15
Proposal Deadline, Submission Process, and Review	15
Deadline Date	15
Endorsement	15
Proposal Submission Instructions	15
Grant Coordinator Review	16
Late Proposals	16
Review Process	16
Proposal Review Rubric	16
Equitable Geographic Distribution of Grants	18
Announcement of Awards	18
Grant Administration and Regulations	18
Contracts	18
Use of Funds	18
Deadlines for Funded Projects	19
Progress Reports	19
Final Reports and Annual Reports	20
Accounting and Auditing Procedures	20
Number of Participants and Students Impacted	20
Requesting Funds	20
Re-Allocating Funds in the Budget.....	21
Other Program Compliance Requirements	21
RFP Appendices	22
Appendix A Definitions of Important Terms and Acronyms	23
Appendix B Proposal Format and Requirements	27

Appendix C High-Need Missouri School Districts	28
Appendix D Budget Instructions, Budget Summary Form, and Budget Justification ...	30
Appendix E Proposal Forms	35
Form 1 - Proposal Cover Page	36
Form 2 - Project Abstract	37
Form 3 - Collaborative Planning Team Document	38
Form 4 - Joint Effort Document	39
Form 5 - Letter of Commitment K-12 Partner	40
Form 6 - Letter of Commitment Higher Education Partner	41
Form 7 - Certificate of Assurances	42
Form 8 - Previous Project Outcomes	43

COVER LETTER

Dear Colleagues:

Missouri's economic future and its citizens' quality of life are inherently linked to a strong PreK-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.

The Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE) is pleased to issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) for Cycle-6 of the MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grants* (ITQG) program. This program invites K-12/higher education partnerships dedicated to professional development for K-12 teachers in ***core academic subjects***¹ and is funded through the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) Title II, Part A of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Cycle-6 proposals will target grades kindergarten to twelve (K-12) and the core academic subjects of math and/or science.

There will be approximately \$650,000 dollars available to distribute to ***eligible partnerships*** that have the most promise to produce positive results and positively affect 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' use of student-learning assessment methods to improve instruction.
- The preparation of pre-service teachers at partner institutions of higher education.

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-6 RFP. All interested applicants are encouraged to attend at least one of the following workshops:

1. September 25, 2007, 1:00-4:00, Large Annex Conference Room, MDHE Office Building, Jefferson City.
2. October 16, 2007, 1:00-3:30, University Union 235, University of Central Missouri, Warrensburg.
3. October 30, 2007, 1:00-4:00, Plaster Student Union Room 308, Missouri State University, Springfield.
4. November 6, 2007, 1:00-4:00, Social Sciences Building Room 1203, St. Charles Community College, St. Charles.

Please contact Chad Hampton at (573) 522-1309 to register (required) for the workshop of your choice. If there are no registered attendees for a location, the workshop will be cancelled. Please register at least 5 days before the workshop.

¹ See Appendix A for definitions of terms in ***bold italics***

The Coordinating Board and MDHE encourage Missouri's educational leaders to focus your passion and commitment to design high quality proposals that will generate systemic change and benefit students, *high-need school districts*, and higher education institutions.

Sincerely,

Paul Wagner
Deputy Commissioner

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 and 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 (PD) projects designed to benefit students and members of partnerships, including high-need school districts and higher education institutions. For Cycle-6, approximately \$650,000 will be available for new projects, single and/or multi-year, after setting aside funds for the continuation of existing projects and the external evaluation team. Typically, the awarded grant amounts range from \$70,000 - \$190,000 per project, depending on the number of project participants and the extent and quality of the professional development facilitated by each project.

Missouri Priorities

The MDHE has made a strategic decision to use Missouri's Cycle-6 *Improving Teacher Quality Grant* funds to improve math and/or science achievement in Missouri's 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. PD projects that integrate math and/or science with other **core academic subjects** such as reading or communication arts are strongly encouraged.

Several factors were considered in focusing on grade levels Kindergarten to twelve (K-12) for Cycle-6:

- Grades 4-8 are included because those are the years when Missouri students experience the most significant drop in both math and science performance as evidenced by Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) scores.
- Expanding the eligible grade levels to Kindergarten to twelve (K-12) allows project directors to focus on grade levels that have had minimal PD projects since No Child Left Behind was instituted, e.g. K-3 or 9-12.
- The sequential nature of math and science concepts suggests that early intervention in grades Kindergarten to eight (K-8) should have positive consequences at secondary and postsecondary levels.

Math and/or science content was targeted for Cycle-6 with the following issues in mind:

- Industries targeted for economic growth, including advanced manufacturing, information technology, and the life sciences, require a workforce proficient in math and science concepts.
- Under the leadership of Governor Matt Blunt, Missouri has formed the Mathematics, Engineering, Technology, and Science (METS) Coalition to strengthen student performance and economic development in METS fields. Please refer to www.missourimets.com for more details.
- An increasing number of entry-level jobs, regardless of occupational classification, require stronger foundations in these academic disciplines.

Multi-year Projects

This RFP provides an opportunity for multi-year² proposals, involving collaboration among multiple partners and/or spanning wide geographic areas. If awarded, multi-year projects may focus on different grade levels for the second and third years, from the target grade during the first year of funding. The continuation of multi-year awards depends on:

- Availability of funding.
- 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.

**PROPOSAL NARRATIVE
(EXPLANATION AND INSTRUCTIONS)**

In addition to including a narrative that addresses the required components in this section, applicants are expected to follow Proposal Format and Requirements as outlined in Appendix 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:

- A division or department that prepares teachers and school principals at an institution of higher education (IHE), public or independent, with DESE-approved teacher education programs
- A school or department of arts and sciences at a public or independent IHE
- **At least one *high-need school district*** (local educational agency). (See Appendix C for a list of eligible high-need school districts.)

² Up to three years.

In addition, an institution of higher education must be designated as the lead fiscal agent. A community college may be one of the statutorily required principal partners only if the community college is a member in good standing with the statewide articulated AAT agreement. A list of community colleges affiliated with the AAT is available at <http://www.dhe.mo.gov/signatoryinst.shtml>. If the lead institution is a community college, another IHE that is a four-year public or private institution must be a partner.

Additional Partners

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

- Additional school district(s) (LEA)
- Additional elementary and/or middle 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 (community) college(s)
- Private school(s)
- Educational service agency(ies)
- Nonprofit educational organization(s)
- Nonprofit cultural organization(s)
- Teacher organization(s)
- Principal organization(s)
- Business(es)

Partnership Commitments

Cycle-6 *Improving Teacher Quality Grant* projects are expected to 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.
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.

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 at least 50% 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.
 - **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.
- **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.
 - 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.

**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: To improve student achievement in **math and/or science content** areas.
- Objective 2: To increase teachers’ knowledge and understanding of key concepts in **targeted math and/or science content areas** as aligned with each project’s content focus.
- Objective 3: To improve teachers’ pedagogical knowledge and practices that utilize **scientifically-based research** findings and best practices in inquiry-based instruction.
- Objective 4: To enhance participants’ use of **assessment data** to monitor the effectiveness of their instruction.
- Objective 5: To demonstrate a **measurable impact on the preparation of pre-service teachers** through improvements in math 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. Outcomes related to the five state objectives will be evaluated through collaboration with an external evaluation team.

The project design should be directly linked to the district/building improvement plans, the Missouri math and/or science Show-Me Standards and, when available, the most current Grade-Level Expectations (GLE). 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 at http://www.dese.mo.gov/divimprove/assess/Released_Items/riarchiveindex.html. Please note that for the 2008-2009 academic year, MAP testing for grades 9-12 will be end of course exams as opposed to grade level exams. The courses related to math/science that will be tested are initially Biology and Algebra I.

The project design should incorporate activities that utilize scientifically-based research on instructional strategies and best practices for professional development and for K-12 education. Project directors and/or instructors are expected to model research-based instructional strategies and best practices in the classroom(s) of the high-need school district(s). Finally, the project design should integrate the utilization of technology in grade level appropriate ways.

Project Activities/ Structure

Proposal narratives should clearly indicate the desired duration of the proposed Cycle-6 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 and/or content during the award process.

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-6 awarded projects are indicated below.

	One-Year Award	Two-Year Award	Three-Year Award
Total Period for Project Activities	February, 2008 – June 30, 2009	February, 2008 – June 30, 2010	February, 2008 – June 30, 2011

Proposal narratives should explain the project’s design in detail, which includes:

- 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 80 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 should constitute at least a minimum of 5% 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.

Proposal narratives should also estimate the number of students directly impacted by teacher participants (e.g. enrolled in classrooms, tutored, involved in student organizations, and/or other activities).

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) feedback on how participation in this professional development activity/experience affected their teaching practices and student

learning.

- Explain how the project results that are useful to other K-12 teachers, school administrators, 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 Grants* 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.

PROJECT EVALUATION

External Evaluation

The utilization of an *external evaluator* provides an analysis and useful data and information about each project and the collective impact of all projects. The Cycle-6 external evaluation contract was awarded to the team led by Dr. Sandra Abell, Director of the MU Science Education Center.

External Evaluator Responsibilities

Members of the external evaluation team will discuss project goals and methods with leaders of each funded professional development project and will visit each project to observe instruction and conduct interviews with participating teachers and PD staff members. The following table outlines the state’s five objectives and anticipated evaluation methods that will be used by the external evaluation team and the project directors:

	Missouri Objectives for All Projects	Anticipated Method(s) of Data Collection and Evaluation
Objective 1	Improve student achievement in the targeted math and/or science content areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher developed and administered pre/post-tests of targeted content • MAP scores (gain in scores for targeted content) or other standardized tests
Objective 2	Increase teachers’ knowledge and understanding of key concepts in the targeted math and/or science content areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project developed and administered pre/posts-tests of targeted content • Teacher Evaluation Survey items
Objective 3	Improve teachers’ knowledge and practices in inquiry-based instruction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom Practice survey • Project administered observations
Objective 4	Enhance participants’ use of assessment data to monitor the effectiveness of their instruction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher Evaluation Survey items
Objective 5	Impact the preparation of pre-service teachers through improvements in math and/or science content and/or pedagogy courses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher Education Impact Survey
Additional Project Objectives	Determined by project directors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determined and implemented by project directors. The external evaluation team will be available for consultation.

Specifically, the external evaluation team will:

- Conduct a training workshop for project directors in order to disseminate information about the evaluation plan and to ensure uniformity in data collection strategies and evaluation techniques among projects.
- Assign a member of the evaluation team to work closely with each project.
- Ensure ongoing systematic *formative evaluations* and develop *summative evaluations* for funded projects.
- Determine what information will be collected and analyzed regarding participants from partner school district(s)/building(s).
- Measure the outcomes related to the five state objectives and any additional objectives for individual projects and for all projects combined.
- Submit a final report to the MDHE by November 30th, 2009 and subsequent years of multi-year projects.
- Present an oral report to the public highlighting findings regarding individual and combined PD projects, and the implications to Missouri's ITQG goals and priorities.

**Project
Directors'
Evaluation
Responsibilities**

Project directors are expected to complete the following tasks:

- 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.
- Schedule time during workshops and follow-up sessions for the evaluation team to conduct interviews without interfering in participants' learning,
- Guarantee the confidentiality of data.
- Report information for every participant (Participant Data Form) by **May 31, 2008** before the beginning of project; the participant data form will be submitted again no later than **October 31, 2008**; a final submission of the participant data form will be submitted no later than **July 31, 2009**. **These forms will be submitted to the grant coordinator.**
- Collect and submit teacher and student pre- and post-test scores and/or summarized results related to the math/science content of the individual project.
- Regularly encourage participants to complete all survey instruments provided by the external evaluation team.

**Narrative
Discussion
Components**

With regard to evaluation issues, proposal narratives should:

- Discuss how the project will meet external evaluation obligations.
- Specify how, when, and by whom the content pre- and post-tests (specific to individual projects) will be administered to participants and students.
- Describe how the project will provide evidence of improvement of teacher participants' practices of scientifically-based research on pedagogical strategies such as inquiry-based instruction.

- Describe how the project will instruct teacher participants on how to use assessment data to monitor the effectiveness of their instruction.
- Discuss school district(s)/building(s) commitments to conduct math and/or science standardized testing or other math/science student assessments.
- Indicate how the project's impact on math and/or science content delivery or pedagogy at the partnership's higher education institutions might be measured.
- Describe the value-added for multi-year projects.

Evaluation Reimbursement The Office of Sponsored Programs Administration at the University of Missouri will first request reimbursement for evaluation expenditures from the project director's institution during the life of the project. Projects are then authorized to make reimbursement requests to MDHE for external evaluation fees. The external evaluation reimbursements may be submitted after the project end date of June 30, 2009 and will not be considered as 1 of the 3 requests submitted during the life of the project.

Evaluation Summit This one-day meeting, in December 2009, will showcase the external evaluation report for ITQG professional development projects funded during Cycle-6. Project staff and selected participants from each project are strongly encouraged to attend.

PROPOSAL DEADLINE, SUBMISSION PROCESS, AND REVIEW

Deadline Date Final proposals are to arrive at the MDHE on Friday, December 14, 2007, by 4 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 E – Form 1) and abstract
- Limit narrative to fifteen 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
 - **Do not** discuss national needs in math and science education as reviewers will have extensive perspectives of national issues
- Provide one (1) electronic copy of the proposal in Microsoft Word format sent as an attached file to Chad.Hampton@dhe.mo.gov or on a CD that is

shipped with the hard copies. The electronic copy must also be received by **Friday, December 14, 2007, by 4 p.m. Submission of only the electronic copy will not suffice as the completed proposal**

- Provide six (6) hard copies of the proposal by **Friday, December 14, 2007, by 4 p.m.** One (1) of the hard copies should be unbound and unstapled.

Mail hard copies to:

**Mr. Chad Hampton, Research Associate
Missouri Department of Higher Education
3515 Amazonas Drive
Jefferson City, MO 65109-6821**

**Grant
Coordinator
Review**

We 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.

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, and/or education 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.

**Proposal
Review
Rubric**

Commitment (10 points)

- Describes how each primary and any additional partners will contribute to the success of the project by outlining specific commitments
- Clearly identifies three qualifying statutory project partners and any additional partners

Collaboration and Design (40 points maximum)

- Signed Joint Effort Form
- Describes/documents how primary school district partner needs were determined
- Explains the project's design in detail
 - Description of project activities
 - Location and timeline for the duration of the project
 - How participants will be actively engaged throughout the year
 - Number of contact hours per participant
 - Specific Show-me Standards and/or GLEs addressed
 - Alignment with school district/building improvement plans
 - Incorporation of instructional technology
 - Administration of pre- and post- tests
- Describes how each of the five state objectives will be achieved

- Measures and development of baseline data
- Realistic estimate of improvement

Participants (10 points)

- Identifies grade level focus
- Identifies number and type of credit hours to be provided by an IHE (if applicable)
- Identifies the anticipated number of participants from each school district partner
- Identifies the anticipated number of participants directly and indirectly impacted
- Discusses meaningful participation of principals if proposal includes administrators in the project

Sustainability (5 points)

- Describes realistic potential for sustainability beyond the project end date

Dissemination (10 points)

- Describes how teachers will inform colleagues of their experiences in and results from this project
- Describes how project personnel will inform colleagues of the results of this project

Evaluation (5 points)

- Describes cooperation with evaluation team
- Provides assurances of access to data from K-12 and higher education partners

Budget (10 points)

- Personnel costs do not exceed 35% of the total grant request
- Matching funds equal at least 20% of the total grant request
- No one partner benefits from more than 50% of the grant request
- Budget justification adequately explains/supports budget line items

Qualitative Evaluation (10 points)

- Overall significance and clarity

Bonus Points (10 points maximum)

- Extent to which *underrepresented and underserved students* will benefit from the proposed project
- More than 75% of the anticipated participants are from a high-need school district
- Projects that focus on grades K-3 or 9-12
- Incorporation of additional core subjects such as reading or communication arts.

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, 2008, 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.

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 items that cost \$5,000 or more and have a useful life of more than 1 year.

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.

Date	Event
October 15, 2008	Cycle-6 progress reports are due at the MDHE.
October 31, 2008	First request for reimbursement is due. The first request will be reimbursement for expenses through September 30, 2008.
April 30, 2009	Second request for reimbursement is due. The second request will be reimbursement for expenses from October 1, 2008 through March 31, 2009.
June 30, 2009	Completion of all project activities requiring funds.
July 31, 2009	Cycle-6 final project report due at the MDHE.
August 15, 2009	Final reimbursement requests due. This final request will be reimbursement for expenses from April 1, 2009 through June 30, 2009. Requests received after August 15 will not be reimbursed. The Compliance Audit Checklist (available on the MDHE web site) will be submitted with the final reimbursement request.

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.

Progress Reports

The progress report, which must be submitted by October 15, 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-6 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, 2009.

Accounting and Auditing Procedures

The lead institution in the partnership is responsible for:

- Administering the grant received through the MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grants* 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 7 - Certificate of Assurances submitted with the grant proposal.

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.

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-6 Reimbursement Request for MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grants*" form to be made available on the MDHE website. **Reimbursement request forms received after August 15, 2009 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.

**Re-Allocating
Funds in the
Budget**

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

**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.

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 Acronyms23

APPENDIX B: Proposal Format and Requirements.....27

APPENDIX C: High-Need Missouri School Districts.....28

**APPENDIX D: Budget Instructions, Budget Summary Form, and Budget
Justification.....30**

APPENDIX E: Proposal Forms.....35

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.

Core Academic Subjects: English, reading or language arts, math, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, or geography.

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.

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-6 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.
- 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.

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-6 is math or science or the integration of these two fields. 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

CBHE	– Coordinating Board for Higher Education
CD	– Compact Disc
CFR	– Code of Federal Regulations
DESE	– (Missouri) Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

GLE	– Grade-Level Expectation
IHE	– Institution of Higher Education
ITQG	– Improving Teacher Quality Grant
LEA	– Local Educational Agency
MAP	– Missouri Assessment Program
MDHE	– Missouri Department of Higher Education
METS	– Mathematics, Engineering, Technology and Science
NCLB	– No Child Left Behind
OMB	– Office of Management and Budget
SAHE	– State Agency for Higher Education
RFP	– Request for Proposal
USDE	– United States Department of Education

APPENDIX B

PROPOSAL FORMAT AND REQUIREMENTS

All proposals should be written using the following order and headings. Your use of the order and headings provided below will ensure that proposal reviewers are better able to consistently evaluate all of the proposals. All forms are provided in Appendix E and are **required** unless otherwise stated.

- I. Proposal Cover Page
- II. Project Abstract
- III. Table of Contents
- IV. Narrative (See RFP pages 7-12)
 - A. Identification of Project Partners
 1. Three required partners
 2. Additional permissible partners
 - B. Description of Partnership Commitments
 - C. Description of Project Participants
 - D. Specification of Project Design and Objectives
 - E. Description of Project Activities/Structure
 - F. Description of Information Dissemination Process
- V. Proposal Appendices
 - A. Budget Summary Form and Budget Justification
 - B. Form 1 – Proposal Cover Page
 - C. Form 2 – Project Abstract
 - D. Form 3 - Collaborative Planning Team Document
 - E. Form 4 - Joint Effort Document
 - F. Form 5 - Letter of Commitment: K-12 Partner (for each K-12 partner)
 - G. Form 6 - Letter of Commitment: Higher Education Partner (for each higher education partner)
 - H. Form 7 - Certificate of Assurances
 - I. Curricula vitae or resumes for key project personnel
 1. Document only relevant experiences
 2. Limit to two (2) pages per person
 - J. Form 8 - Previous Project Outcomes must be submitted only if:
 1. 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 1-5 of the MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grants* program;
AND/OR
 2. The proposed project is a continuation of a project that previously received funds under the CBHE Eisenhower Grants program or Cycles 1-5 of the MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grants* program.

APPENDIX C

HIGH-NEED MISSOURI SCHOOL DISTRICTS

These school districts and any schools within these districts are eligible for statutory partnership in Cycle-6 of the MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grants* Program

	School District		School District		School District
1	Adair Co R-II	33	El Dorado Springs R-II	65	Mark Twain R-VIII
2	Alton R-IV	34	Fordland R-III	66	Marshall
3	Arcadia Valley R-II	35	Fredericktown R-I	67	Maysville R-I
4	Atlanta C-3	36	Galena R-II	68	McDonald Co R-I
5	Aurora R-VII	37	Gideon 37	69	Miami R-I (Saline County)
6	Bakersfield R-IV	38	Gilliam C-4	70	Middle Grove C-I
7	Bernie R-XIII	39	Gilman City R-IV	71	Milan C-2
8	Bismarck R-V	40	Golden City R-III	72	Mirabile C-I
9	Bradleyville R-I	41	Gorin R-III	73	Morgan Co R-I
10	Breckenridge R-I	42	Green Forest R-II	74	Morgan Co R-II
11	Bucklin R-II	43	Halfway R-III	75	Mound City R-II
12	Bunker R-III	44	Hartville R-II	76	Mountain Grove R-III
13	Butler R-V	45	Hayti R-II	77	Mt. View-Birch Tree R-III
14	Cabool R-IV	46	Holcomb R-III	78	Naylor R-II
15	Cainsville R-I	47	Hollister R-V	79	New Madrid Co R-I
16	Calhoun R-VIII	48	Humansville R-IV	80	Nodaway-Holt R-VII
17	Callao C-8	49	Hurley R-I	81	Norborne R-VIII
18	Canton R-V	50	Jasper Co. R-V	82	Normandy
19	Carthage R-IX	51	Kansas City 33	83	North Mercer Co R-III
20	Cassville R-IV	52	Kingston 42	84	North Wood R-IV
21	Centerville R-I	53	Kingston K-14	85	Northeast Vernon Co. R-I
22	Chadwick R-I	54	La Monte R-IV	86	Norwood R-I
23	Chaffee R-II	55	La Plata R-II	87	Oregon-Howell R-III
24	Clarkton C-4	56	Liberal R-II	88	Pattonsburg R-II
25	Clearwater R-I	57	Licking R-VIII	89	Portageville
26	Cowgill R-VI	58	Linn Co R-I	90	Potosi R-III
27	Crane R-III	59	Livingston Co. R-III	91	Revere C-3
28	Crawford Co. R-I	60	Louisiana R-II	92	Richards R-V
29	Dallas Co R-I	61	Malden R-I	93	Richland R-IV
30	Doniphan R-I	62	Malta Bend R-V	94	Riverview Gardens
31	Dora R-III	63	Manes R-V	95	Roscoe C-I
32	East Carter Co R-II	64	Mansfield R-IV	96	Salem R-80

97	Schuyler Co. R-I	109	Stockton R-I	121	Weaubleau R-III
98	Scott City R-I	110	Stoutland R-II	122	Webb City R-VII
99	Scott Co Central	111	Sturgeon R-V	123	Wellston
100	Seymour R-II	112	Success R-VI	124	Wellsville-Middletown R-I
101	Shell Knob 78	113	Summersville R-II	125	West Plains R-VII
102	Sikeston R-6	114	Swedeborg R-III	126	West St. Francois Co R-IV
103	Skyline R-II	115	Thayer R-II	127	Westran R-I
104	Slater	116	Tri-Co R-VII	128	Wheatland R-II
105	Southwest Livingston Co. R-I	117	University City	129	Winona R-III
106	Southwest R-V	118	Van Buren R-I	130	Wyaconda C-1
107	Spickard R-II	119	Van-Far R-I		
108	St. Louis City	120	Verona R-VII		

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 uses MAP student achievement in math and/or science as a proxy for teacher quality. Local school districts must meet both criteria to be considered high-need.

The MAP test for science has five achievement levels: Step 1, Progressing, Nearing Proficiency, Proficient, and Advanced. School districts where more than 50% of tested students at any grade level performed in the lower two levels (Step 1 and Progressing) were deemed high-need for the State of Missouri.

The MAP test for mathematics has four achievement levels: Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. School districts where more than 50% of tested students at any grade level performed in the Below Basic level were deemed high-need for the State of Missouri.

APPENDIX D

BUDGET INSTRUCTIONS, BUDGET SUMMARY FORM, AND BUDGET JUSTIFICATION

Budget Instructions

This page 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 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.

If the grant is to pay participant travel to the workshop, reimbursement is allowed at the sponsoring institution's rate per mile, up to \$0.485. 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)

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 the participant **may not** be used as matching funds (*EDGAR 76.534*).

Budget Summary Form – Cycle-6 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.*

Lead Institution:						
Project Director:						
Federal ID Number:						
Project Title:	Partner 1 Education	Partner 2 Arts & Sciences	Partner 3 High-Need LEA(s) (Combined)	Partner 4 Other Partners (Combined)	Total Grant Request	Matching Funds
1. Personnel Costs (Director(s), instructors, peer teachers, support staff)						
A.						
B.						
C.						
D.						
Fringe benefits (approved institutional rate ___%)						
TOTAL PERSONNEL COSTS						
2. Additional Personnel Costs						
A.						
B.						
C.						
Fringe benefits (approved institutional rate ___%)						
TOTAL ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL COSTS						
3. Participant Costs (Stipends, Travel, Materials, etc.)						
A.						
B.						
C.						
TOTAL PARTICIPANT COSTS						
4. Additional Costs (List individually; detail in budget justification narrative)						
A.						
B.						
C.						
TOTAL ADDITIONAL COSTS						
5. TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (Sum of items 1–4)						
6. MODIFIED TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (MTDC) (Total Direct Costs less stipends and tuition)						
7. FACILITIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS (Maximum rate of 8% of MTDC)						
8. TOTAL COSTS						
9. Percent of Grant Funds per Partner³:					N/A	N/A
Project Director(s) Name and Title:						
Authorized Institutional Officer Name and Title:						

³ If grant funds percentage exceeds 50% for a partner, 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.

APPENDIX E
PROPOSAL FORMS

(All forms must be submitted with the project proposal, unless otherwise noted.)

- Form 1 - Proposal Cover Page
- Form 2 - Project Abstract
- Form 3 - Collaborative Planning Team Document
- Form 4 - Joint Effort Document
- Form 5 - Letter of Commitment: K-12 Partner(s)
- Form 6 - Letter of Commitment: Higher Education Partner(s)
- Form 7 - Certificate of Assurances
- Form 8 - 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- 5 of the MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grants* 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- 5 of the MDHE *Improving Teacher Quality Grants* program

Form 2 - 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		
High-Need School District(s)	1. 2. 3.	
Additional Partner(s)	1. 2. 3.	

Project Information:

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)	

Project Summary (300 words, single-spaced):

Timeline for Project (Table format only):

Form 4 - 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 5 - 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-6 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 6 - 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-6 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, 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 7 - 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 8 - 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: