

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
Division of Curriculum and Instruction**

**Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) Program
Public Law 107-110
Title II, Part B**

**Request for Proposals (RFP)
2011-2012 Awards**

RFP Published: January 21, 2011

Intent To Apply Due: February 19, 2011

Full Proposals Due: March 21, 2011

Submit completed proposals to:

Beverly G. Vance, Science Section Chief
Division of Curriculum and Instruction
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
301 N Wilmington Street
6352 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-6352

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

The guiding mission of the North Carolina State Board of Education is that every public school student will graduate from high school, globally competitive for work and postsecondary education and prepared for life in the 21st Century.

WILLIAM C. HARRISON

Chairman :: Fayetteville

REGINALD KENAN

Rose Hill

JOHN A. TATE III

Charlotte

WAYNE MCDEVITT

Vice Chair :: Asheville

KEVIN D. HOWELL

Raleigh

ROBERT "TOM" SPEED

Boone

WALTER DALTON

Lieutenant Governor :: Rutherfordton

SHIRLEY E. HARRIS

Troy

MELISSA E. BARTLETT

Roxboro

JANET COWELL

State Treasurer :: Raleigh

CHRISTINE J. GREENE

High Point

PATRICIA N. WILLOUGHBY

Raleigh

JEAN W. WOOLARD

Plymouth

NC DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

June St. Clair Atkinson, Ed.D., State Superintendent

301 N. Wilmington Street :: Raleigh, North Carolina 27601-2825

In compliance with federal law, NC Public Schools administers all state-operated educational programs, employment activities and admissions without discrimination because of race, religion, national or ethnic origin, color, age, military service, disability, or gender, except where exemption is appropriate and allowed by law.

Inquiries or complaints regarding discrimination issues should be directed to:

Dr. Rebecca Garland, Chief Academic Officer :: Academic Services and Instructional Support
6368 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, NC 27699-6368 :: Telephone: (919) 807-3200 :: Fax: (919) 807-4065

Visit us on the Web:: www.ncpublicschools.org

**North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
Request for Proposals
Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP)
2011-2012 Awards**

What is the Mathematics and Science Partnership Grant?

When the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* became law in 2002, a section of the Act allocated money to each state to improve its mathematics and science education. North Carolina has been allotted approximately \$3,617,318.00 for fiscal year 2011-2012 to support projects already funded and to begin new Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) grants. ***Please Note: Due to the reversion cycle of the current federal funding, new grants will only be guaranteed funds for 1 year! A total of three years of funding is possible contingent upon the availability of additional federal funds.*** The goal of these grants is to improve the mathematics and science knowledge of North Carolina students in high-need school districts by providing professional-development activities to their mathematics and science teachers. The funding available is targeted to improve mathematics and/or science instruction in elementary, middle, and high schools. Grants will be awarded on a competitive basis, with grant awards ranging between \$3000 and \$7000 per teacher receiving at least 80 hours of professional development during the three-year period. Grants will be funded for one year and renewed annually pending satisfactory progress toward meeting established goals and continued funding from the United States Department of Education. Funds must be used to supplement, not supplant, funds that would otherwise be used for proposed activities. The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) is responsible for administering this program and for determining funding recipients. ***All funding for this program is contingent upon continued funding from the federal government.***

The deadline to apply for a grant is 5:00 p.m., March 21, 2011

Eligibility

This grant is intended to serve mathematics and science teachers from high-need school districts. See *Appendix A* for information on “high need” designation. Districts must conduct a needs assessment and justify need for the mathematics and/or science professional development outlined in the grant proposal. All teachers who teach mathematics and/or science, including teachers of students with disabilities (SWD) and teachers of English Language Learners (ELL) who teach mathematics and science are eligible to be included.

This is a “partnership” grant. One “partner” must be a Local Education Agency (LEA). The second required “partner” must be an engineering, mathematics, or science department of an institution of higher education (IHE). These two partners are mandatory. A partnership may also include any of the following as *additional* partners:

- Another engineering, mathematics, science, or education department of an institution of higher education.
- Additional local educational agencies, public charter schools, public or private schools or a consortium of such schools.

- A business or organization that has shown it can improve the quality of mathematics and science instruction.

A project with a statewide focus still needs an LEA to act as fiscal agent and at least **four** additional LEA partners. The project with a statewide focus must also include an engineering, mathematics or science department of an institution of higher education.

No matter who is included in the partnership, the local education agency (first partner listed previously) will be the fiscal agent for the grant. The management structure of the partnership must reflect the proposed roles of the various partners.

How the Grant May Be Used

The ultimate goal of this grant is to improve the mathematics and science knowledge of North Carolina students in high-need school districts. These goals are to be accomplished by improving the mathematics and science content knowledge of teachers in high-need districts and by developing closer partnerships between these districts and IHE engineering, mathematics and science departments. An additional goal of these grants is to investigate professional development models to provide a research base for future professional development efforts.

Institutions of higher education partners will be expected to provide professional development to help project teachers improve their mathematics and science content knowledge and teaching skills. The project should also be structured to develop relationships between the science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) faculty and the teachers served in the project as well as institutional relationships between the IHE departments and the LEA(s). Activities proposed should be consistent with the needs of the targeted teachers. **STEM faculty from the IHE partner must directly lead some or all of the professional development sessions.** STEM faculty may be paired with teacher education faculty or master teachers; however, they must directly lead professional development in MSP grants.

The partnerships are expected to be sustainable. A sustainable partnership does not necessarily mean that the same project activities will continue after the end of the funding period, but there should be indicators of sustained change, such as new courses that have been developed, increased IHE faculty knowledge of the *North Carolina Standard Course of Study* and involvement with K-12 schools, and increased K-12 faculty use of IHE resources.

How to Apply

The following proposal format has been prepared by NCDPI as a comprehensive proposal framework to be used by all partnerships in preparing a MSP proposal for funding consideration. The proposal framework is designed to show a logical sequence of activities and planning beginning with the creation of a partnership then determining the needs of teachers, establishing measurable objectives, an implementation plan, how the project will be managed, how the project will be evaluated and finally a budget to support project implementation. All proposals must include the following components, presented in the sequence specified below.

- I. TITLE PAGE, DEPARTMENT FORM (Appendix B parts 1 and 2), STATEMENT OF ASSURANCES (Appendix C), PRIVATE AND NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS CONSULTATION FORMS (Appendix J)

II. PROJECT ABSTRACT

All partnerships must provide a **1-page, single-spaced** abstract of the proposal that briefly and concisely describes the program to be implemented and summarizes the intended results of the program. It should identify the project partners, the focus area described in this RFP, the number of teachers it intends to serve, the academic/instructional need(s) of teachers to be impacted, the partnership goals, and a brief overview of the work plan and evaluation plan.

III. NARRATIVE: (in the following order)

A) Evidence of Meaningful Partnerships

This section describes the partnership submitting this proposal and how it was developed. Provide evidence of participation in long-term active planning and involvement of all partners, to include non-public school representatives, prior to proposal submission. Provide detailed description and evidence of how non-public and private school officials were informed of partnership opportunities including dates and locations of meetings, names of individuals representing the partners, and description of activities carried out in preparing this proposal. Provide a detailed description of how the partnership will maintain meaningful consultation with non-public and private school officials throughout the life of this grant.

Distinguish between “primary” partners and “supporting” partners. Primary partners are those partners – including at least one IHE and one high-need school district – that are engaged in implementing the project and are accountable for its outcomes. Supporting partners are other entities that provide particular resources or services in the project, but are not directly involved in the project’s operation (examples might include a science center hosting a field trip for participants or a business providing materials for project activities).

Finally, provide evidence that all partners will play a role in the ongoing planning, delivery and evaluation of the proposed project. Provide a detailed description of how the partnership will continue the activities funded under this proposal after the grant period has expired. This description must include a plan for building capacity.

B) Results of Professional Development Needs Assessment

This section describes the specific need(s) for teachers’ professional development that will be addressed by the project. The needs described should include (but need not be limited to) specific gaps or weaknesses in teacher content knowledge that the project will target. The existence of the needs must be based on quantitative and qualitative information gathered within the past two academic years in the partner school systems (do not rely solely on information from national or international reports). Identify the methods used by the partnership to determine professional development needs of teachers in each partner school system. Examples of needs assessment data might include EOG/EOC data analyzed to show specific content gaps, information on teachers’ content preparation and background, data on teachers’ practices, and responses to surveys about desired professional development.

C) Project Objectives

This section describes the impact that the project will have on its participating teachers. All projects must list specific, measurable objectives that address the following four goals: 1) Increasing teacher content knowledge; 2) Increasing student achievement; 3) Improving classroom instruction; and 4) Developing a sustainable partnership. Additional goals beyond these may be listed, along with measurable objectives, but are not required. The project objectives must align with and specifically address the needs identified in Section III.B above. Note that objectives are written in terms of measurable participant outcomes, *not* completion of project activities. Objectives should be written in year-long increments so projects may assess progress towards goals qualitatively and quantitatively on an annual basis.

D) Project Implementation Plan

This section describes in detail the activities that will enable project participants to attain the project objectives. The implementation plan should be written with enough detail that the reader could replicate activities from the description provided. This section must address three areas:

- i. Target Audience. Describe the teachers targeted for participation in the project – How many will be served? What grade levels? How will participants be recruited and selected? Will they attend as individuals, grade level teams, school teams, etc?
- ii. Professional Development Design. List the major components included in the project design (e.g., summer institutes, graduate-credit courses, academic year workshops, on-line courses, in-school coaching, etc.).

Summer Workshop/Institute is defined by US Department of Education(USED) as a workshop or institute conducted during the summer that

- is conducted for a period of time not less than 2 weeks;
- includes as a component a program providing direct interaction between students and faculty;
- may provide follow-up training during the academic year that is conducted in the classroom for a period of not less than 3 consecutive or non-consecutive days *except that*
 - if the workshop or institute is conducted during a 2-week period, then the training shall be conducted for a period of not less than 4 days; and
 - if the training is for teachers in rural school districts, it may be conducted through distance learning

For each major component, provide a description as detailed as possible, including duration, focus areas, structure, and who will develop and implement them. Describe how the components will engage teachers with content at a level beyond the level they are expected to teach to students; will model and provide opportunities to learn about content-specific instructional strategies with research evidence for improved student achievement; and describe how the professional learning sessions are specifically aligned to *North Carolina Standard Course of Study*. The discussion should provide

evidence of (a) appropriate roles and collaboration among all organizations that work together to realize the project's objectives, and (b) sufficient capacity of the partners to support the scale and scope of the project, especially the number of teacher participants.

Include a table listing the project components and the contact hours associated with each one, demonstrating that participants will have a minimum of 80 hours of focused, content-related professional learning experiences.

- iii. Project Timeline. Include a specific timeline of activities for the first 12 months of funding, along with a more general timeline of activities for the subsequent two years.

E) Project Management Plan

This section describes how the partnership will operate efficiently and effectively to implement its planned activities, deal with challenges that arise, and monitor progress toward stated goals and objectives. All primary partners should be fully engaged in the management and oversight of the project. This project management team **must** meet regularly to oversee all phases of the project, including design of the project, recruitment and retention of the teacher cohort group, implementation of the project plan, and collection and analysis of data related to its impact on teaching and learning. This section must address three areas:

- i. Project administration. Who will direct the day-to-day operation of the project? Who will be involved in higher-level decisions about planning and budgeting, including making necessary mid-course adjustments to activities and expenditures? Describe the specific roles, responsibilities, and time commitments of the persons involved in project management. If a management team is to be formed, list the members of the team, the schedule of their meetings, and how they will make decisions. Provide qualifications for all persons involved in project administration in Section IX, Vitae for Project Administration, referenced below.
- ii. Fiscal management. Which partner will serve as fiscal agent for the project? Identify the person in the fiscal agent who will oversee the project's financial activities, ensuring that funds are received and disbursed according to approved state procedures.
- iii. Partner roles and responsibilities. For each primary and supporting partner, describe their responsibilities under the implementation plan. In addition, list the STEM faculty and (if applicable) Teacher Education faculty from each partner IHE, and how they will be utilized in the project.

F) Evaluation Plan and Research Design

This section describes how the project will gather credible evidence regarding the impact of its activities on participants. The section must address three areas:

- i. Identification of external evaluator. All projects must identify an external evaluator. "External" in this case means someone not involved with the implementation of project activities. The external evaluator may be someone completely outside the partners or

may be affiliated with a partner institution, but not in a department directly involved in project operations. Describe the responsibilities of the external evaluator and, if applicable, the responsibilities of project persons who will be involved in the evaluation. Provide qualifications for the external evaluator in the form found in Appendix F of the RFP.

- ii. Evaluation plan. The evaluation plan describes how the project will measure its progress towards meeting its stated objectives (summative evaluation). Provide a table listing the project objectives along with the following information for each objective: type(s) of data to be collected, the instrument or protocol to be administered, and how/when it will be administered. The evaluation plan must include a pre/post objective assessment of teacher content knowledge. An existing valid, reliable assessment should be selected whenever possible.

The evaluation plan must describe how the project will engage in formative evaluation – gathering data to document the quality of project activities and using the data as input into project planning and decision-making.

The evaluation plan must also describe whether a comparison group (matched or unmatched) will be incorporated into the evaluation design and, if so, what data collection will occur with this group. By comparing pre/post changes in participants to pre/post changes in the comparison group, the project will gather important evidence to support any claims of impact on participating teachers.

- iii. Evaluation timeline. A timeline for the evaluation should be included, showing major evaluation-related activities and when they will take place.
- iv. Research Design. Institutions of higher education (IHE) partners are expected to collaborate with the LEA(s) and perhaps also with the project evaluator in developing and implementing a rigorous research design to investigate the effects of the professional development model chosen. *[NOTE: Funding beyond the minimum per teacher may be requested to allow for a strong research component. If extra funds for research are requested, then the budget narrative should be very clear regarding the amount of funds to go to the research and evaluation portions of the project.]*
- v. Dissemination. Each partnership will also be expected to disseminate the results of their research including successful strategies and curricula along with lessons learned. The method of disseminating these activities should be included in the partnership's planned activities. In addition, the NCDPI may also require participants to share information at specified times and in specified ways.

IV. BUDGET FORMS (use the forms provided in Appendices G and H)

V. BUDGET AND BUDGET NARRATIVE

Partnerships must submit **one** budget form for the entire proposed project (including all partners) as well as partner funding requests for sub awards to partners. Project funding requests and partner funding requests must each include a corresponding narrative that

describes **in detail** the basis for determining **every** amount shown on the budget form. Both the budget(s) and the corresponding narrative(s) should be aligned with the activities described in the proposal narrative, show evidence of effective, appropriate, and efficient use of funds, and describe clearly the full range of resources that will be used to accomplish the goals of the project. While local matching funds are not required, if resources outside of Title IIB funds will be used to support project activities, list them in the budget narratives along with the requested Title IIB funds.

- VI. PARTNERSHIP FORMS (use the forms provided in Appendices C and D of the RFP)
- VII. NEEDS ASSESSMENT FORMS (use the form provided in Appendix E of the RFP)
- VIII. EVALUATOR FORM (use the form provided in Appendix F of the RFP)
- IX. VITAE FOR PROJECT ADMINISTRATION (no more than two pages per person)

Guide for Planning

Recognizing the support provided by tax dollars to federal programs, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title IX Part E Subpart 1 mandates that all applicants consult with non-public schools during the design and development of the programs **before** making any decision that affects the opportunities of eligible private school children, teachers, and other educational personnel participating in programs under Title II, Part B, and shall continue this consultation throughout the implementation and assessment of activities in accordance with Title IX, Section 9501.

Non-Regulatory guidance for equitable services for eligible private school students, teachers, and other educational personnel maybe found at:

<http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/equitableserviceguidance.doc>

Applicants are requested to submit to the NC Department of Public Instruction (NC DPI) the following non-binding Notice of Intent to Apply. Along with this form, please submit a detailed description and evidence of how non-public and private school officials were informed of partnership opportunities, as well as, dates and locations of meetings. This information will help the NCDPI in planning the review process and will be made available to the NC Division of Non-Public Education.

Monitoring of Non-Public School Participation

In order to ensure that appropriate services have been offered to private school officials via meaningful consultation, the NCDPI will review all artifacts and verify the activities documented in Appendix J annually. Applicants are advised that NCDPI mathematics and science consultants, or a representative, will perform 2 site visits to review evidence and ensure that grantees maintain meaningful collaboration with private school officials throughout the life of the grant. Hence, grantees are asked to engage in efforts to solicit meaningful consultation with non-public school officials and collect evidence prior to a site visit. Grantees will be afforded the opportunity to plan dates for site visits.

Work Plan

A. *Form Partnerships*

The high-need LEA(s) must form a partnership with an IHE Department of Engineering, Mathematics, and/or Science. Other partners such as statewide organizations, businesses, and IHE Education Departments may be included; however the primary role of the high-need LEA and the IHE Engineering, Mathematics, and/or Science Departments must be clear in the project design. A Project with a statewide focus still needs a high-need LEA partner to act as fiscal agent, **at least four** additional LEA partners, and at least one engineering, mathematics or science department of an institution of higher education. Document partner planning sessions, including dates, names, and locations to be provided in the proposal narrative.

B. *Perform a Needs Assessment*

The project should complete a needs assessment, including completion of the form in *Appendix E* of this RFP to determine the professional development needs of the mathematics and science teachers in their target area who will receive professional development under the grant. Specific areas of content knowledge needed should be identified. As part of the grant proposal narrative, the project should describe targeted teacher needs consistent with the proposed professional development and should include any specific data such as teacher survey data, student test scores, and teacher credential information.

C. *Establish Goals and Objectives*

After partnerships are formed, the school district(s) and the other institution(s) which form the partnership must decide on specific goals with measurable objectives addressing the following areas: 1) Increased teacher-content knowledge; 2) Increased student achievement; 3) Improved classroom instruction; and 4) Development of a sustainable partnership.

D. *Plan for Implementing Professional Development*

Describe clearly and in detail the activities each of the partners will perform to accomplish the program goals, and the contributions each partner will make to the program. The plan should show how the partnership funds will be used to supplement, not supplant, existing mathematics and science professional development programs in the applicant districts. Activities planned must be specifically targeted to the professional development needs of the faculty in the applicant school district(s), as described in the needs assessment.

- Describe how teachers will be recruited for the planned professional development.
- Include a description of the number, type, duration and intensity of the professional development activities, including the number of teachers engaged in each.
- Indicate the total number of instructional hours that will be provided to teachers during the grant period.
- Describe how the professional development activities proposed will be aligned with the North Carolina Standard Courses of Study in Mathematics and/or Science, with student accountability

standards in mathematics and science, and with other educational reform activities that promote student academic achievement in mathematics and science.

Next, the partners will choose a focus area for the professional development to be offered by the grant. For the 2011 Round of MSP Proposals, primary consideration for funding will be given to proposals that address the following focus areas:

- **Mathematics K-5:** Preparing teachers to teach the content in the 2003 *North Carolina Essential Standards* and *Common Core Standards* for Mathematics K-5 using reform based curriculum materials.
- **Physical Science strand K-8:** Preparing teachers to teach the physical science strand of the *North Carolina Standard Course of Study* for Science, K-8 and the 2009 *North Carolina Science Essential Standards*.
- **High School Biology:** Professional development or graduate courses to extend teachers' knowledge of the content in the 2004 Revision of the *NC Standard Course of Study for Biology*. Courses and workshops should include an inquiry approach. Particular emphasis should be on areas where scientific knowledge has experienced recent rapid changes including gene regulation, genomics and biotechnology.
- **High School Integrated Mathematics:** Professional development or graduate courses to extend teachers knowledge of the content in the 2003 Revision of the *NC Standard Course of Study for Integrated Mathematics*. Courses and workshops should include high-level applications of the mathematics content, appropriate use of technology and connections to 21st century skills. Courses and workshops should feature reform based curriculum materials.
- **Graduate level university courses:** Graduate level courses in mathematics, science, or mathematics and science related education courses with a focus on deepening teacher content knowledge.

Next, the partners will choose a research-based professional development model that addresses the specific identified needs of the targeted mathematics and/or science teachers.

Professional development activities should:

- Relate directly to the mathematics and/or science content in the *North Carolina Standard Course of Study*, and focus secondarily on teaching skills.
- Be proposed depending upon a review of scientifically based research, with an explanation of how the activities are expected to improve student academic achievement and strengthen the quality of mathematics and/or science instruction.
- Enhance the ability of teachers to understand and use the *North Carolina Standard Course of Study and Common Core Standards* for mathematics and/or for science and to select appropriate instructional strategies.
- Educate teachers to use curricula that are based upon scientific research, aligned with the *North Carolina Standard Course of Study* in Mathematics and/or in Science, and are problem-centered, experiment-oriented, and concept- and content-based.

Examples of professional development activities that could be included in a plan are:

- Establishing and operating mathematics and science summer workshops or institutes (please note the USED definition of Summer Workshop/Institute on page 6), including plans for follow-up training, for mathematics and science teachers.
- Using distance-learning strategies, such as telecasting or e-learning (computer-based learning) together with classroom contact components to deliver professional development curricula.
- Using learning communities, coaching and mentoring as strategies to train and support teachers.

Finally, a project timeline will be developed. It should include specific timeline of activities for the first 12 months of funding as well as a general timeline of activities for the subsequent two year.

E. Create a Management Plan

Describe how the partners will make decisions, communicate, and manage fiscal responsibilities. Give a detailed overview of the role of each partner in the program. Describe staffing for the program, and provide information on the qualifications of proposed personnel who are already employed by the partners. Show a time commitment of key personnel in each organization. Demonstrate that the partners have the ability to manage the project, carry out the research, organize the work and meet deadlines. Describe how the proposed partnership activities are relevant to each of the partners' missions. (Vitae should be included in the Appendices.)

F. Formulate an Evaluation Plan and Research Design

Each proposal must include a description of the evaluation plan that will be used to evaluate the program.

Evaluation Plan: Each project is required have an outside evaluator who is not directly involved in providing professional development for the project and who has no vested interest in the project.

The project's evaluator is responsible for providing, in a timely manner, both formative evaluation reports and a summative evaluation report. Specifically, the evaluator must provide (1) an annual evaluation report to be submitted to the United States Department of Education (USED) as part of the Annual Performance Report for the Mathematics and Science Partnership Program (this evaluation report must include descriptions of evaluation components, identify evaluation measures used, and report findings as documentation of the project's progress toward meeting its proposed goals and objectives) and (2) an evaluation report as part of the project's mid-year implementation report to the state-MSP coordinator. Evaluation reports submitted to USED or to the state-MSP coordinator must include a qualitative description of how teachers were recruited to participate and how program components were implemented, identification and discussion of obstacles encountered, and identification and description of unintended outcomes -- all detailed so that the successful attributes of the program can be replicated. In addition it is expected that the evaluator will

provide frequent and on-going formative evaluation reports toward the purpose of informing the project of areas of concerns and/or recommending modifications to the project's plans to increase the project's impact on student outcomes or partnership sustainability.

A description of the evaluation plan must be included in the application. The evaluation plan must clearly describe what outcomes will be used to measure each goal and how implementation will be documented and described. The evaluation must include:

- Measures of changes in teacher mathematics and/or science content knowledge across the project;
- Measures of student mathematics and/or science content knowledge for students impacted by the project.

The selection and/or construction of evaluation instruments is left to individual projects and their evaluator; however, each project is required, whenever feasible, to rely on instruments with proven reliability and validity. The timeline for the project should include evaluation measures. Some suggested instruments for evaluation and research are listed in *Appendix I*.

Research Participation: Teacher data and student achievement data collected by the project will become a part of the data collected across North Carolina regarding MSP projects. Projects funded in this round of the NC MSP program will be expected to fully cooperate with DPI sponsored researchers conducting research for DPI regarding the results of the MSP projects.

Research Design: Institutions of higher education (IHE) partners are expected to collaborate with the LEA(s), and perhaps also with the project evaluator, in developing and implementing a rigorous quantitative research design to investigate the effects of the professional development model chosen. It is important to note that funding for state-MSP projects is allocated on the premise that increased teacher knowledge of mathematics and science content will result in increased student knowledge of mathematics and science. This link, while it seems plausible, has not been proven by the research community. The purpose of each project's research design is to contribute to our national vision of effective professional development, professional development that is proven to contribute to increased student learning. For this reason, research designs should be based on solid documentation of the detailed nature of professional development provided by the project as well as

- Measures of teacher opportunity to learn within the project (e.g., professional development observations, teacher interviews);
- Measures of changes in teacher mathematics and/or science content knowledge across the project;
- Measures of student opportunity to learn for students impacted by the project (e.g., classroom observations); and
- Measures of student mathematics and/or science content knowledge.

[NOTE: Funding beyond the minimum per teacher may be requested to allow for a strong research component. If extra funds for research are requested, then the budget narrative should be very clear regarding the amount of funds to go to the research and evaluation portions of the project.]

Hence, the project's evaluation should, in part, provide documentation support for the research component. In terms of research design for state-MSP projects, USED strongly recommends randomized control trials but accepts well-matched comparison-group designs as an alternative when randomized control trials are not feasible. USED discourages the use of designs that have no control/comparison groups.

G. Plan to Share Results

Each partnership will also be expected to disseminate the results of their research including successful strategies and curricula along with lessons learned. The method of disseminating these activities should be included in the partnership's planned activities. In addition, the NCDPI may also require participants to share information at specified times and in specified ways.

H. Formulate a Budget

Develop a budget together with your partners for the project time period. A carefully reasoned and thoroughly detailed budget is itself a management tool, providing guidance to the project's leadership on how to expend funds, what to purchase, and whom to contract for services. Funds awarded for the project in year one must be spent by September 30, 2012. LEA indirect costs are limited to the indirect cost rate of the fiscal agent LEA. IHE indirect costs are limited to 8% of their contract with the LEA. Other costs should be budgeted as direct costs. Projects must budget at least \$1000.00 each year of the project for travel to required regional and national MSP meetings.

MSP project budgets are limited according to teacher participation and scope of the project. Cost per teacher involved in at least 80 hours of professional development should range from \$3000 to \$7000 for the life of the project. If a strong research component is part of the project, then an amount more than the stated limit may be requested. All costs must be reasonable.

Reporting and Shared Responsibilities

The project management team has collective program responsibilities:

- Submit a mid-year performance report to the MSP Program manager at NCDPI
- Submit an annual performance report to the U.S. Department of Education (USED) and NCDPI within 60 days of the conclusion of each project year;
- Participate in regional conferences and institutes (1-2 per year) organized by USED;
- Submit a budget to NCDPI Budget Management System within 30 days of funding notification;
- Notify NCDPI of any changes to the initial budget with justification, prior to making the changes;
- Submit data to the NC MSP Data Center; and
- Participate in conference calls and MSP Program leadership team meetings facilitated by the NCDPI

At the conclusion of project year one, the management team will submit a brief application to NCDPI that must include compelling justification for funding to be continued into project year two and subsequent years.

During the grant period, 2 site visits from a representative of NCDPI should be expected. NCDPI mathematics and science consultants will perform site visits to ensure that the Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) maintain meaningful collaboration with private school officials throughout the life of the grant. NCDPI consultants may request budget information during site visits as well as programmatic information documenting compliance to all Federal and State MSP requirements. It is the responsibility of the management team, particularly the project director, to ensure that the MSP Program manager at NCDPI is kept current as to when and where the professional learning sessions and project team meetings will take place.

Preparing an Application

Format

All sections must use one inch side, top and bottom margins. All sections must have a footer and page number on each page. Excluding data tables, all sections must use 12-point font. The narrative section must use double-spacing except for data tables or short, one-paragraph descriptors.

The application must be submitted in two forms: hard copy and compact disc (CD). Please submit one hard-copy document with original signatures and 5 copies of that document. In addition, please submit one complete electronic document on CD. The electronic document should be burned to the CD as one PDF or Word file. NCDPI reserves the right NOT to review applications which fail to adhere to these format instructions until all conditions have been met.

North Carolina Proposal Preparation

The following lists the required components of an application, in the order they must be submitted. Extraneous materials other than the components listed will be discarded and not reviewed. When applicable, the page limit for a section is shown.

Maximum Number of Pages		
1	Table of Contents with page numbers	
1	Title Page	<i>Appendix B</i> with the required signature of the superintendent of the lead LEA
	Debarment Form	Use the Debarment Form in Appendices. This needs to be signed by the Superintendent of the Fiscal Agent LEA.
	Statement of Assurances	Use the Statement of Assurances Form in the Appendices. This form must be signed by the Superintendent and the LEA MSP Representative for <i>each</i> LEA receiving MSP funds.
	Private and Non-public Schools Consultation Form	Use the Private and Non-public Schools Consultation Form found in the appendices to document your contact with all non-public schools. This form <i>must</i> be completed prior to beginning the planning of grant specifics.
1	Project Abstract	Provide a summary that briefly and concisely describes the program to be implemented and summarizes the intended results of the program. It should identify the project partners, the focus area described in this RFP, the number of teachers it intends to serve, the academic/instructional need(s) of teachers to impacted, the partnership goals, and a brief overview of the work plan and evaluation plan.
35	Narrative	The narrative should address the information from the section entitled: North Carolina MSP Guide for Planning / Project Components
	Budget	Use the budget form in <i>Appendix G</i> and the Chart of Accounts in the Appendix to describe the total project funds requested for the grant. Also, include a Individual LEA/IHE Budget (see form in <i>Appendix H</i>) to describe the amount of funding from the total budget that each LEA, IHE or other organization will receive. The amounts shown in the Individual LEA/IHE forms must sum to the total requested on the Total Budget Form (<i>Appendix G</i>).
	Budget Narrative	Describe the basis for determining the amounts shown on the Budget Forms. The budget narrative may be single-spaced. The budget narrative should clarify and support the project plan. Both the project budget and the narrative description must be aligned with the activities described in the proposal narrative and should reflect any coordinated uses of resources from other sources. The budget narratives should accompany Appendix G and Appendix H accordingly.
	Partner IHE Required Signature Page(s)	Use form(s) in <i>Appendix D</i> . The IHE faculty that will be working with the project needs to sign the form.
	Documentation of High Needs School District(s)	Use form in <i>Appendix E</i> . One LEA needs assessment form should be submitted for <i>each</i> LEA partner.
	Evaluator Information Page	Use form in <i>Appendix F</i> .
2/person	Vitae of Project Personnel	No more than two pages per person

Proposal Submission and Review

Submission

Applicants must submit an original bound copy with tabbed section dividers and five copies of the full proposal to the NCDPI. The original must include an original signature of the authorized institutional official on the cover page. Fax transmissions are not acceptable.

In addition, an electronic version must be submitted on a compact disc (CD). A PDF format is preferred as this protects your formatting.

To be considered for funding, proposals must be postmarked or received at the NCDPI by 5:00 pm on **March 21, 2011**.

Proposals should be mailed to:
Beverly G. Vance, Science Section Chief
Curriculum and Instruction Division
6352 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-6352

or delivered to:
301 N Wilmington St.
Raleigh, NC 27601
bvance@dpi.state.nc.us
919-807-3936

Review Process

As proposals are received at the NCDPI, staff will review them for completeness and compliance with the requirements set forth in Title II, Part B of *No Child Left Behind* and Title IX, Part E, Subpart 1 to determine applicant eligibility. If, in the judgment of the NCDPI staff, a proposal is late, significantly incomplete, or an applicant cannot establish its eligibility, the proposal will be omitted from the competition.

The NCDPI will follow SBE policy EEO-O-001 for the grant proposal review process to the extent that this is consistent with the Federal guidelines for the grant. The NCDPI will seek to fund those proposals that show the most promise for successful professional development programs. The decision of the NCDPI/SBE is final.

Following SBE approval, the NCDPI staff will contact eligible project directors to discuss any modifications of the project plan that may be required. To maximize the effects of limited funds, applicants whose grants are recommended at less than the amount requested may be asked to revise the project budget and scope of work.

The following table shows the maximum point values assigned to each review criterion. It also explains the basis on which points will be awarded. For further clarification of the review process and scoring, see Appendix K, NC MSP Rating Form.

Criteria	Points
Partnership and Planning Points will be awarded for evidence of cooperative planning and partnership between all of the partners based on information provided in the narrative.	10
Needs Assessment Points will be awarded for demonstrated teacher need (based on the needs of targeted teachers as described in the narrative).	10
Project Goals and Objectives Points will be awarded for the professional development proposed through the “Program Goals and Objectives” sections of the narrative and a clear relationship between the demonstrated needs.	10
Implementation plan Points will be awarded for thoroughness of planning, likelihood of effectiveness and maximum impact of the program based on the information in the narrative and timeline.	30
Project Management Points will be awarded for clearly defined responsibilities and contributions and for the experience and capability of partners based on information provided in the narrative.	10
Evaluation Plan and Research Design Points will be awarded for the capacity to carry out an effective research design and the appropriateness and thoroughness of the activity proposed in the “Evaluation Plan and Research Design” section of the Program Narrative.	20
Budget and Cost Effectiveness Points will be awarded for the completeness and clarity of the program budget and for the appropriateness of expenditures as described in the Budget and the Budget Narrative.	10
TOTAL	100

Award Administration

Notification of the Award

Within 30 days of completion of the State Board Review process, the Project Director and Lead District Superintendent will be notified of the status of their proposal.

Award Conditions

For the 2011 competition, approximately \$4,929,358 is available for Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) awards. Funding for subsequent years is contingent upon appropriations from the U.S. Department of Education and evaluation of the funded projects.

APPENDICES
Table of Content

Appendix A	Definitions
Appendix B	Title Page (<i>part 1</i>)
Appendix B	Debarment Page (<i>part 2</i>)
Appendix C	Math and Science Partnership Grants Statement of Assurances
Appendix D	Partner IHE Information
Appendix E	LEA Needs Assessment
Appendix F	Outside Evaluator Information
Appendix G	Total Project Budget
Appendix H	Individual LEA/IHE Funding Budget (Chart of Accounts included for your guidance.)
Appendix I	Resources
Appendix J	Title IX, Section 9501 Private and Nonpublic Schools Consultation
Appendix K	Rating Form

Appendix A Definitions

For the purpose of this application, the following definitions apply to the following terms. These definitions are based on the definitions included in the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* and NCDPI criteria.

Low-Wealth LEA:

A listing of the low-wealth LEAs can be found at:

<http://www.dpi.state.nc.us/docs/fbs/allotments/support/prior/lowwealth.xls>

High-Need School District

The term “high-need school district” means a school district that meets one or more of the following:

- Serves no fewer than 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line **OR** a school district for which 20 percent of the children are from families with incomes below the poverty line;
- Is low-wealth;
- Has not made AYP;
- Has high teacher turnover; and,
- Demonstrates significant need for professional development of mathematics and/or science teachers.

Professional Development

The term “professional development” means instructional activities that are:

- Based on scientific research;
- Based on the *North Carolina Standard Courses of Study* for Mathematics and Science; and
- At least 80 hours (including follow-up and coaching) for the grant period.

Summer workshop or institute

The term summer workshop or institute means a workshop or institute, conducted during the summer, that

1. is conducted for a period of not less than 2 full-time work weeks or the equivalent number of hours.
2. includes, as a component, a program that provides direct interaction between students and faculty.

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. Such research includes research that:

- Employs systematic, empirical methods that draw on observation or experiment and involve rigorous data analyses that are adequate to test the stated hypotheses and justify the general conclusions drawn;
- 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;
- 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;
- Ensures that experimental studies are presented in sufficient detail and clarity to allow for replication or, at minimum, to offer the opportunity to build systematically on their findings; and
- Has been accepted by a peer-reviewed journal or approved by a panel of independent experts through a comparably rigorous, objective, and scientific review.

Appendix B (part 1)

FY 2011-12 North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, Office of Academic Services and Instructional Support Mathematics and Science Partnerships Program	Please check all appropriate categories: Proposed Project will include:			
		Mathematics	Science	Other
	Grades K-2			
	Grades 3-5			
	Grades 6-8			
Grades 9-12				
Fiscal LEA:		LEA Code:		
Fiscal LEA MSP Contact Person:				
Title:				
Address:				
City:	Zip Code:	Phone Number:		
Email:				
MSP Project Director:				
Title:				
Address:				
City:	Zip Code	Phone Number:		
E-mail:				
Title of Proposed Project:				
Estimated Number of Teacher Participants:		Grade Levels:		
Number of Other School Personnel:		Contact Hours/Participant:		
Credit Hours (if any): Graduate:		Semester or Quarter:		
Requested MSP Funds	\$			
MSP Cost per Teacher Participant <small>(Divide Requested MSP Funds by # of teachers participating in 80 hours or more of PD)</small>			\$	
Collaborating Organizations (list all partner organizations):				
I hereby certify that all facts, figures, and representations made in this application are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.				
Printed Name of Fiscal LEA Superintendent:				
Signature:			Date:	

Appendix B (part 2)

**Certification Regarding
Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion
Lower Tier Covered Transactions**

This certification is required by the regulations implementing Executive Order 12549, debarment and suspension, 34 CFR Part 85, section 85.510, Participants' responsibilities. The regulations were published as Part VII of the May 26, 1998 *Federal Register* (pages 160-192). Copies of the regulations may be obtained by contacting the person to whom this proposal is submitted. By signing and submitting this proposal, the prospective lower tier participant is providing the certification set out below.

Website Reference for NC Debarred Vendors: <http://www.doa.state.nc.us/PandC/actions.asp>

1. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was entered into, if it is later determined that the prospective lower tier participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.
2. The lower tier participants shall provide immediate written notice to the person to which this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective lower tier participant learns that its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.
3. The terms "covered transaction," "debarment," "suspended," "ineligible," "lower tier covered transaction," "participant," "person," "primary covered transaction," "principal," "proposal," and "voluntarily excluded," as used in this clause have the meaning set out in the Definitions and Coverage sections of rules implementing Executive Order 12549. You may contact the person to which this proposal is submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of those regulations.
4. The lower tier participant agrees by submitting this proposal that should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this covered transaction, unless authorized by the department or agency with which this transaction originated.
5. The lower tier participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include the clause titled "Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion-Lower Tier Covered Transactions," without modification on all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions.
6. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that is not debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it determines the eligibility of its principals. Each participant may, but is not required to, check the Non-procurement List.
7. Nothing contained in the foregoing shall be construed to require establishment of system of records in order to render in good faith the certification required by this clause. The knowledge and information of a participant is not required to exceed that which is normally possessed by a prudent person in the ordinary course of business dealings.
8. Except for transactions authorized under number 5 of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower tier covered transaction with a person who is suspended, debarred, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.

The lower tier participant certifies, by submission of this proposal, that neither it nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any Federal department or agency.

Where the lower tier participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participants shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

Printed Name of Fiscal Agent CFO

Signature of Fiscal Agent CFO

Date

Appendix C
Math and Science Partnership Grants
Statement of Assurances

This assurance form must be completed by *each* Partner LEA and submitted in conjunction with the Private and Nonpublic Schools Consultation Form.

Assurances are hereby provided to the State Education Agency (SEA) that the Local Education Agency (LEA) will:

- Consult with non-public schools during the design and development of the programs **before** making any decision that affects the opportunities of eligible private school children, teachers, and other educational personnel participating in programs under Title II, Part B, and shall continue this consultation throughout the implementation and assessment of activities in accordance with Title IX, Section 9501.
- Use Title II, Part B funds to supplement and not supplant fund from non-federal sources.
- Allot Title II, Part B funds in Program Report Code (PRC) 112 to distinguish these funds from all other funds at the LEA.
- Keep records and provide information to the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) as may be required for fiscal audit and program evaluation consistent with the responsibilities of the NCDPI under Title II, Part B.
- Comply with Title VI & VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (race, color, national origin); Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (handicapped); Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1971 (sex); the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 and the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994.
- Include an engineering, mathematics, or science department of an institute of higher education as part of the partnership.
- Include a high-need local educational agency.
- Involve an evaluator at all stages of grant planning and implementation.
- Use all materials and supplies strictly for instructional purposes and to implement programs, projects, and activities for specific professional development.
- Operate all programs, projects, and activities in compliance with Title II, Part B legislation and Non-Regulatory Guidance, and with policies and procedures issued by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction.
- Be responsible for repayment of Title II, Part B funds in the event of an audit exception.
- Adhere to FERPA and IRB regulations in the implementation of the grant activities.

Typed Name of Superintendent

Signature of Superintendent

Date

E-mail

Typed Name of LEA Representative

Signature of LEA Representative

Date

E-mail

LEA Name

Mailing Address

E-mail

Phone Number

Appendix D
Partner IHE Information

(Duplicate this page as necessary for each partner LEA)

Partner IHE MSP Contact Person:		
IHE:		
Address:		
City:	State:	Zip Code:
Phone Number:	Email:	
Project Director:		
Title:		
Address:		
City:	Zip Code:	
Phone Number:	E-mail:	
<p>CERTIFICATION BY AUTHORIZED OR INSTITUTIONAL OFFICIALS Assurances - The Institute of Higher Education assures that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title II, Part B funds will be used to supplement and not supplant funds from non-federal sources. • The LEA or Charter School will keep records and provide information to the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) as may be required for fiscal audit and program evaluation consistent with the responsibilities of the NCDPI under Title II, Part B. • The applicant will comply with Title VI & VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (race, color, national origin); Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (handicapped); Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1971 (sex); the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 and the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994. • All materials and supplies are used strictly for instructional purposes and are used to implement programs, projects, and activities for specific staff development. • Programs, projects, and activities will be operated in compliance with Title II, Part B legislation and Non-Regulatory Guidance, and with policies and procedures issued by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. • The LEA or Charter School is responsible for repayment of Title II, Part B funds in the event of an audit exception. • Guidelines related to IRB, FERPA must be followed. 		
The applicant(s) certify that to the best of his/her knowledge the information in this application is correct, that the filing of this application is duly authorized by the governing body of this organization, or institution, and that the applicant will comply with the attached statement of assurances.		
IHE Faculty:	Title:	
Signature:	Date:	
IHE Faculty:	Title:	
Signature:	Date:	
IHE Faculty:	Title:	
Signature:	Date:	

Appendix E
LEA Needs Assessment

(Duplicate this page as necessary)

LEA:			
Indicate total number of resident children K-12 and low-income resident children K-12. Calculate percent of low income resident children in the LEA. Use free and reduced lunch data from Child Nutrition office of the LEA.	Total Resident Children	Low-Income Resident Children (K-12)	
		Number	Percentage
Low Wealth LEA? (Yes/No)			
Indicate number of AYP Target Goals made. Calculate percent of AYP Target Goals by dividing the Target Goals made by the number of AYP Target Goals (for LEA)	Targets Made	Total Targets	Percentage
LEA Improvement Status under NCLB: In Improvement or Not in Improvement			
Targeted Teacher Count: Please include a teacher in all categories that apply.			
	Mathematics	Science	
Total Number			
New to the School in the last 2 years			
New to Teaching (Experience level is 3 years or less)			
Alternative Certification			
Break down the data in #6 above to support the identified need(s) of the proposed project. <i>For example, if a project targets biology teachers, give the data specific to those who teach biology.</i>			

Appendix F
Outside Evaluator Information

Name of Evaluator:		
Address:		
City:	State:	Zip Code:
Primary Contact Person:		
Title:		
Address:		
City:	State:	Zip Code:
Phone Number	E-mail:	
Briefly list credentials and experience relevant to evaluating a project of this nature.		
The applicant(s) certify that to the best of his/her knowledge the information in this application is correct, that the filing of this application is duly authorized by the governing body of this organization, or institution, and that the applicant will comply with the attached statement of assurances.		
Evaluator:	Title:	
Signature:	Date:	
Project Director:	Title:	
Signature:	Date:	

Appendix G
Total Project Budget

Title II, Part B Mathematics Science Partnerships

This page must include the **TOTAL** budget for all of the partners included in the project. This page should be followed by an overall budget narrative.

Program Title:

Name of Fiscal Agent LEA:

Names of Partners:

Budget				
<p>The LEA fiscal agent for the project must develop and submit (1) an overall budget; (2) an overall budget narrative and (3) a budget form for each partner. (This form is a required element of the grant application). Add lines as needed. Codes from the attached Chart of Accounts must be used.</p> <p>Justification for <u>each of the categories</u> must be included in the budget narrative portion of the application.</p> <p>Total budget is limited to no more than \$7000 per teacher participant expected to spend at least 80 hours during the three year period for professional development for the project. The \$7000 cap applies to the 3 year period, not just one year.</p>				
Use Chart of Account Codes	Year 1 2011-12 Budget	Year 2 2012-13 Budget	Year 3 2013-14 Budget	Total School Funds Requested
	\$	\$	\$	\$
	\$	\$	\$	\$
	\$	\$	\$	\$
	\$	\$	\$	\$
	\$	\$	\$	\$
	\$	\$	\$	\$
	\$	\$	\$	\$
	\$	\$	\$	\$
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Totals:	\$	\$	\$	\$

Appendix H
Individual LEA/IHE Funding Budget

Title II, Part B Mathematics Science Partnerships

Name of LEA or IHE or other Organization:

On this form, list only the funding this LEA or IHE will receive from the grant.

This form should be accompanied by a detailed budget narrative breaking down and explaining each line item in detail.

(duplicate as needed for each LEA/IHE receiving funds)

Budget				
Any funds going to the partner organization must be listed below using the attached Chart of Accounts. Add lines as needed.				
Justification for <u>each of the categories</u> must be included in the budget narrative portion of the application.				
Use Chart of Account Codes	Year 1 2011-12 Budget	Year 2 2012-13 Budget	Year 3 2013-14 Budget	Total School Funds Requested
	\$	\$	\$	\$
	\$	\$	\$	\$
	\$	\$	\$	\$
	\$	\$	\$	\$
	\$	\$	\$	\$
	\$	\$	\$	\$
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Totals:	\$	\$	\$	\$

Effective Date 7/1/2009

FEDERAL GRANT FUND

Revised Date: 7/1/2009

112

Title II-B Math Science Partnerships

**PROGRAM
REPORT CODE**

PROGRAM TITLE

ACCOUNT CODE	OBJECT CODE DESCRIPTION
5110-112-162	Regular Curricular - Substitute Pay - Reg. Absence
5110-112-163	Regular Curricular - Substitute Pay - Staff Dev.
5110-112-167	Regular Curricular - Tchr. Asst. Pay - Reg. Absence
5110-112-181	Regular Curricular - Supplementary Pay
5110-112-184	Regular Curricular - Longevity Pay
5110-112-196	Regular Curricular - Staff Dev. Participant Pay
5110-112-197	Regular Curricular - Staff Development Instructor
5110-112-211	Regular Curricular - Employer's Soc Sec - Regular
5110-112-221	Regular Curricular - Employer's Retirement - Regular
5110-112-232	Regular Curricular - Employer's Workers' Comp Ins
5110-112-311	Regular Curricular - Contracted Services
5110-112-312	Regular Curricular - Workshop Exp/Allowable Travel
5110-112-332	Regular Curricular - Travel Reimbursement
5110-112-352	Regular Curricular - Employee Education Reimb
5110-112-361	Regular Curricular - Membership Dues and Fees
5110-112-411	Regular Curricular - Supplies and Materials
5110-112-461	Regular Curricular - Furniture and Equipment - Inventoried
5110-112-462	Regular Curricular - Computer Equipment - Inventoried
5110-112-471	Regular Curricular - Sales and Use Tax Expense
5110-112-541	Regular Curricular - Equipment Purchase - Capitalized
5110-112-542	Regular Curricular - Computer Hardware Purchase - Capitalized
5210-112-167	EC - Tchr. Asst. Pay - Reg. Absence
5210-112-181	EC - Supplementary Pay
5210-112-184	EC - Longevity Pay
5210-112-211	EC - Employer's Soc Sec - Regular
5210-112-221	EC - Employer's Retirement - Regular
5210-112-232	EC - Employer's Workers' Comp Ins
5210-112-311	EC - Contracted Services
5210-112-312	EC - Workshop Exp/Allowable Travel
5210-112-332	EC - Travel Reimbursement
5210-112-352	EC - Employee Education Reimb
5210-112-361	EC - Membership Dues and Fees
5210-112-411	EC - Supplies and Materials
5210-112-461	EC - Furniture and Equipment - Inventoried
5210-112-462	EC - Computer Equipment - Inventoried
5210-112-471	EC - Sales and Use Tax Expense
5210-112-541	EC - Equipment Purchase - Capitalized
5210-112-542	EC - Computer Hardware Purchase - Capitalized
5870-112-163	Staff Development - Unallocated - Substitute Pay - Staff Dev.
5870-112-166	Staff Development - Unallocated - Tchr. Asst. Pay - Staff Dev.
5870-112-184	Staff Development - Unallocated - Longevity Pay

Effective Date 7/1/2009

FEDERAL GRANT FUND

Revised Date: 7/1/2009

112

Title II-B Math Science Partnerships

**PROGRAM
REPORT CODE**

PROGRAM TITLE

ACCOUNT CODE	OBJECT CODE DESCRIPTION
5870-112-196	Staff Development - Unallocated - Staff Dev. Participant Pay
5870-112-197	Staff Development - Unallocated - Staff Development Instructor
5870-112-211	Staff Development - Unallocated - Employer's Soc Sec - Regular
5870-112-221	Staff Development - Unallocated - Employer's Retirement - Regular
5870-112-232	Staff Development - Unallocated - Employer's Workers' Comp Ins
5870-112-312	Staff Development - Unallocated - Workshop Exp/Allowable Travel
6110-112-113	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Salary - Director and/or Supervisor
6110-112-135	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Salary - Lead Teacher
6110-112-151	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Salary - Office Support
6110-112-181	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Supplementary Pay
6110-112-184	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Longevity Pay
6110-112-187	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Salary Differential
6110-112-196	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Staff Dev. Participant Pay
6110-112-197	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Staff Development Instructor
6110-112-211	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Employer's Soc Sec - Regular
6110-112-221	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Employer's Retirement - Regular
6110-112-231	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Employer's Hospitalization Ins
6110-112-232	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Employer's Workers' Comp Ins
6110-112-311	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Contracted Services
6110-112-312	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Workshop Exp/Allowable Travel
6110-112-332	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Travel Reimbursement
6110-112-341	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Telephone
6110-112-344	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Mobile Communication
6110-112-351	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Tuition Fees
6110-112-361	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Membership Dues and Fees
6110-112-411	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Supplies and Materials
6110-112-461	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Furniture and Equipment - Inventoried
6110-112-462	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Computer Equipment - Inventoried
6110-112-471	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Sales and Use Tax Expense
6110-112-541	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Equipment Purchase - Capitalized
6110-112-542	Regular Curricular Support & Develop. - Computer Hardware Purchase - Capitalized
8100-112-392	Payments to Other Gov Units - Indirect Cost
8100-112-472	Payments to Other Gov Units - Sales and Use Tax Refund

Revenue Code

3600-112-000	Title II-B Math Science Partnerships
--------------	--------------------------------------

Appendix I

Resources

Resources on this sample list were chosen to assist partners in finding information needed to plan for a MSP proposal. This list is intended to provide samples, not to be exhaustive.

Websites

NC Public Schools <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/> with links to the *North Carolina Standard course of Study*, The State Board of Education Policy Manual, student data, etc.

North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards Commission Homepage, <http://www.ncptsc.org/>.

The National Staff Development Council's standards for teacher professional development may be found at <http://www.nsd.org/standards/index.cfm>.

North Carolina Colleges and Universities: <http://www.50states.com/college/ncarolin.htm>. Provides links to websites of all North Carolina Colleges and Universities

Department of Education: <http://www.ed.gov/index.jhtml>. This website has a search engine that can find scientifically based research on effective teaching and learning strategies. Be sure to click on "archived results" to include older articles.

MSP-net is a site for the National Science Foundation MSP projects. This site includes many helpful resources. You can browse the site as a guest. <http://hub.mspnet.org/index.cfm?>

North Carolina Mathematics and Science Education Network (NCMSEN): <http://www.unc.edu/depts/msen/>. The North Carolina Mathematics and Science Education Network is committed to providing high quality professional development programs in mathematics and science education that enhance teacher learning and support state and national educational guidelines.

Teacher Education Materials Project (TE-MAT): A Database for K-12 Mathematics and Science Professional Development Providers: <http://te-mat.org/>

Developing Mathematical Ideas professional development curriculum for elementary mathematics teachers: <http://www2.edc.org/CDT/dmi/dmicur.html>

Dynamic Classroom Assessment professional development curriculum for elementary, middle, and high school mathematics teachers: <http://www.etacuisenaire.com/professionaldevelopment/math/dca/dynamic.jsp>

Lenses on Learning professional development curriculum for mathematics leaders: http://www2.edc.org/CDT/cdt/cdt_lo11.html

National Science Resource Center: http://www.nsrconline.org/school_district_resources/index.html

North Carolina Partnership in Mathematics and Science: <http://ncpims.northcarolina.edu/>
NC-PIMS was a partnership-driven initiative with a commitment to the quality, quantity and diversity of teachers, to challenging mathematics courses and curricula for students and teachers, and to supporting institutional sustainability within a framework of evidence-based outcomes.

Center for Inquiry Based Learning (CIBL): <http://tasc.pratt.duke.edu/>
CIBL's purpose is to provide North Carolina K-8 students with opportunities to learn to think as scientists: critically, creatively, and independently. CIBL supports teachers in shifting toward inquiry-based science teaching, an effective tool for helping all students learn. CIBL provides intensive professional development in the use of selected curriculum units and inquiry-based teaching techniques. CIBL supplies and refurbishes the curriculum units and provides support from scientists

trained to help teachers use specific curriculum units.

Instruments for measuring student achievement in science

- Partnership for the Assessment of Standards-based Science (PASS). For further information please see the West Ed website at <http://www.wested.org/cs/wew/view/pj/278> or call Sanjay Pardanani at 415-615-3106 or spardan@wested.org.
- Science Process Assessments for Elementary and Middle School Students, Smith & Welliver Educational Services, State College, PA, 814-237-0144.

Instruments for measuring teacher content knowledge

Middle school science: Assessing Teacher Learning About Science Teaching (ATLAST).

- Set 1: Force and motion
- Set 2: Processes that shape Earth (Plate Tectonics)
- Set 3: Flow of matter and energy in living systems

Each set contains instruments for measuring (1) teacher opportunity to learn, (2) teacher content knowledge, (3) student opportunity to learn, and (4) student content knowledge. For further information please see the Horizon Research Inc. website at <http://www.horizon-research.com> under “Current Projects) or call Sean Smith at 919-489-1725.

Middle school mathematics: Diagnostic Mathematics Assessments for Middle School Teachers. Tests are available in six parallel versions in each of four areas:

- Number/Numeration
- Geometry/Measurement
- Probability/Statistics
- Algebraic Ideas

For further information contact Dr. William S. Bush, Director, Center for Research in Mathematics and Science Teacher Development, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY 40292, by phone at 502-852-0590, and by email at bill.bush@louisville.edu.

Middle school science: Diagnostic Science Assessments for Middle School Teachers. Tests are available in six parallel versions in each of three areas:

- Physical science
- Life science
- Earth/space science

For further information contact Dr. Tom Tretter, Director, Department of Teaching and Learning, College of Education & Human Development, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY 40292, or by email to tom.tretter@louisville.edu.

Mathematics: Learning Mathematics for Teaching (LMT). For further information see the website <http://sitemaker.umich.edu/lmt/home> or contact Heather C. Hill, Learning Mathematics for Teaching/Study of Instructional Improvement, University of Michigan School of Education, 610 E. University #1600, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259, or by phone at 734-647-5233, or by e-mail at <http://www.umich.edu/~hhill>.

Printed Resources

Banilower, E. R., Boyd, S. E., Pasley, J. D., & Weiss, I. R. (2006). Lessons from a Decade of Mathematics and Science Reform: A Capstone Report for the Local Systemic Change through Teacher Enhancement Initiative. Chapel Hill, NC: Horizon Research. Available from <http://www.pdmathsci.net/reports/capstone.pdf>.

Cohen, D. K., & Hill, H. C. (2000). Instructional Policy and Classroom Performance: The Mathematics Reform in California. Teachers College Record, 102(2), 294-343.

- Elmore, R. (2002). Bridging the gap between standards and achievement: The imperative for professional development in education. Washington D.C.: Albert Shanker Institute.
- Hill, H. C., & Ball, D. L. (2004). Learning Mathematics for Teaching: Results from California's Mathematics Professional Development Institute. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 35(5), 330-351.
- Loucks-Horsley, S. (1998). Designing professional development for teachers of science and mathematics. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Corwin Press.
- Weiss, I. R., Banilower, E. R., McMahon, K. C., & Smith, P. S. (2001). Report on the 2000 National Survey of Science and Mathematics Education. Chapel Hill, NC: Horizon Research. Available from <http://2000survey.horizon-research.com/reports/>.
- Weiss, I. R., Pasley, J. D., Smith, P. S., Banilower, E. R., & Heck, D. J. (2003). Looking inside the classroom: a study of K-12 mathematics and science education in the United States. Chapel Hill, NC: Horizon Research, Inc. Available from <http://www.horizonresearch.com/insidetheclassroom/reports/looking/complete.pdf>.
- Wilson, S. M., & Berne, J. (1999). Teacher learning and the acquisition of professional knowledge: An examination of research on contemporary professional development. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 173-209.

Appendix J

Private and Non-public Schools Consultation

This form must be completed for *each* partner LEA, following guidelines of Title IX, section 9501 (<http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/equitableseguidance.doc>)

Proposals submitted with incomplete assurance information will not be considered for funding.

Using the form below, provide documentation that each private and non-public school was consulted and have a school official sign the form in the second column to confirm that the consultation took place. In the third column give contact information and in the last column provide the date(s) and type(s) of consultation. Types of consultation include email, fax, telephone calls, letters, etc. If there are no private or non-public schools in the LEA, only complete the first part of the form. Attach additional pages as needed.

A listing of state verified private schools can be found at <http://www.ncdnpe.org/index.asp> .

A listing of charter schools is at <http://www.dpi.state.nc.us/charterschools/schools/counties/>

There are not any private or non-public schools in this LEA.

Typed Name of School Official/Title	Signature of School Official	Date	Name of LEA
Non-Public School Name	Printed Name of School Official ----- Signature of School Official	Phone/email	Dates and Type of Consultation

Appendix K

**NC MSP RATING FORM
2011-2012 Proposal Reviews**

Proposal # _____ **Reviewer Name:** _____ **Date:** _____

LEA/Fiscal Agent: _____

Are any required components missing? (see RFP, page 16) No Yes If yes, which one(s)? _____

Focus Area of the RFP (Mark all that apply)

Mathematics K-5 Physical Science Strand K-8 High School Biology
 High School Integrated Math Graduate Level University Courses Other (please indicate): _____

High Need School District(s): *At least one LEA must meet one or more of the following criteria*

- Criteria are:
- Percentage of children served from families with incomes below poverty level
 - Percentage of children on free or reduced lunch
 - Low wealth LEA
 - High teacher turnover and retention, particularly with regard to targeted teachers
 - District and School progress toward meeting AYP

Reference LEA forms in Appendix E and choose one:

- Demonstrates great need based on criteria
 Demonstrates average need based on criteria
 Demonstrates least need based on criteria

NC MSP Rating Form

Section III, Part A: Evidence of Meaningful Partnerships (10 points possible)				POINTS AWARDED
Identified primary and supporting partners	<p align="center">(4 points)</p> <p>At least one IHE engineering, mathematics, or science department and at least one high-need school district are identified as primary partners who will implement the project and be accountable for its outcomes. Supporting partners are clearly identified as applicable.</p>	<p align="center">(1-3 points)</p> <p>At least one IHE engineering, mathematics, or science department and at least one high-need school district are identified as primary partners but additional partners' roles are not clearly defined.</p>	<p align="center">(0 points)</p> <p>Partners are named, but an IHE engineering, mathematics, or science department is not specifically listed OR primary and supporting partners are not identified.</p>	
Documented active planning and involvement of all primary partners, including dates, location, and names of individuals involved	<p align="center">(4-6 points)</p> <p>Planning is clearly documented with dates, locations and names of individuals from each primary partner. It is evident that collaboration and planning among and between all primary partners has occurred with sufficient frequency and attendance to establish a meaningful partnership prior to the writing of this proposal. Attendees at planning meetings are appropriate representatives for the nature of the project. All primary partners demonstrate a high level of commitment to the project by the level of involvement in the planning and provide input to the writing of the proposal.</p>	<p align="center">(1-3 points)</p> <p>Planning is described but not clearly documented. Most of the primary partners are involved during the planning of the proposal. The level of commitment of primary partners is evident for some but not for others.</p>	<p align="center">(0 points)</p> <p>No documentation of dates, locations and names of individuals is provided. The level of commitment of primary partners to the project is not evident. Planning and proposal writing seems to be the work of a small group of individuals without inclusion or input from all primary partners.</p>	
			SECTION III, Part A TOTAL POINTS	
POINT JUSTIFICATION / REVIEW COMMENTS (REQUIRED):				

NC MSP Rating Form

Section III, Part B: Results of Needs Assessment (10 points possible)				POINTS AWARDED
Referenced multiple sources of relevant and current data as methods of identifying teachers/schools/districts needs	(3 points) Multiple relevant sources of current data (within past 2 years) —both qualitative and quantitative — are presented/referenced (e.g., EOG,EOC, AP, drop out rate, retention rates, number of students taking advanced classes, successful post-secondary transition, student/teacher surveys, etc.).	(1-2 points) Limited sources of data are presented/referenced OR only qualitative or only quantitative data are presented.	(0 points) No specific data is presented OR only anecdotal data is presented OR only data presented is more than 2 years old.	
Identified specific gaps or weaknesses in teacher content knowledge/practice	(4 points) Relevant sources of data in math/science for both teachers and students in targeted grades are disaggregated and analyzed. Student data clearly identify specific content areas in need of improvement. Teacher data clearly identify specific gaps in teacher knowledge and practice.	(1-3 points) Data analysis in math and/or science is included and disaggregated for the targeted grades but does not include both student and teacher data OR does not clearly identify gaps or weaknesses in teacher content knowledge and practice.	(0 points) Data is presented but no analysis OR only superficial 'reading' of the data is presented OR data presented is not current or reliable (i.e., only anecdotal reports from a small subset of students/teachers/districts is presented). Specific gaps or weaknesses in teacher content knowledge/practice are not identified.	
Aligned needs identified and data presented	(3 points) The narrative builds a clear picture of a small set of specific needs to be addressed by the project. Data presented have a clear and direct relationship to these needs, with no extraneous data provided (e.g., AP enrollment data in a proposal addressing K-5).	(1-2 points) Need statements are well documented but are general rather than specific. The overall set of data presented are <u>not</u> clearly aligned with needs stated.	(0 points) Need statements are <u>not</u> well documented or are <u>not</u> supported by the data presented.	
			SECTION III, Part B TOTAL POINTS	
POINT JUSTIFICATION / REVIEW COMMENTS (REQUIRED):				

NC MSP Rating Form				POINTS AWARDED
Section III, Part C: Establish Project Objectives (10 points possible)				
Stated specific measurable objectives for the four goals required in the RFP: 1) increasing teacher content knowledge; 2) increasing student achievement; 3) improving classroom instruction; and 4) developing a sustainable partnership. Additional measurable objectives are stated if appropriate	(3 points) Clear and measurable objectives are stated for each of the four required goals. Objectives are ambitious, yet realistic in scope.	(1-2 points) Some of the objectives appear to support the goals stated in the RFP. Some of the objectives are not measurable or realistic in scope.	(0 points) Objectives are not specific or measurable or realistic in scope.	
Aligned all stated objectives with needs identified in Section III, Part B	(4 points) Objectives are <u>specifically</u> linked to the identified learning needs of both teachers and students.	(1-3 points) Objectives are <u>generally</u> linked to the identified teacher and student learning needs.	(0 points) Objectives are not correlated with the needs assessment. Some needs identified are not addressed in the objectives, or vice versa.	
Described in terms of measurable participant outcomes and in year-long increments	(3 points) Objectives are stated in terms of measurable participant outcomes, with annual milestones stated so the project can assess progress towards goals on an annual basis.	(1-2 point) Most objectives are measurable outcomes and are written in year-long increments but may be difficult to evaluate both qualitatively and quantitatively on a yearly basis.	(0 points) Objectives are stated in terms of activity completion rather than participant outcomes OR are not measurable. No means of assessing progress on an annual basis is evident.	
			SECTION III, Part C TOTAL POINTS	
POINT JUSTIFICATION / REVIEW COMMENTS (REQUIRED):				

NC MSP Rating Form				POINTS AWARDED
Section III, Part D: Project Implementation Plan (30 points possible)				
Provided a detailed description of the target audience including how participants will be selected and retained	(4 points) Describes in detail who the participants are including subject areas, grade levels, numbers of participants to be served and how they will attend (as individuals, grade level teams, school teams, etc.). Also describes participant selection process, emphasizing how those with the greatest need will be enticed to participate and strategies to be implemented to encourage retention in the project.	(1-3 points) Identifies participant group, but does not provide a detailed description of who they are or how they were selected or will be retained.	(0 points) Participants are identified, but no description of how/why they were selected or how they will be encouraged to stick with the project is presented.	
Stated the Focus Area for the project (RFP page 9); Defined Professional Development design clearly in terms of Summer Institutes, graduate courses, on-line courses, workshops, coaching, etc; Described the design and implementation of major components and activities along with the implementation responsibilities of each partner	(5-7 points) The PD focus area is clearly stated and PD design is defined. A detailed description of each major component is provided including total number of instructional hours as well as duration, focus areas, structure and the roles of each partner in the development and implementation of each. Included is a description of how each component will 1) engage teachers with content at a level <i>beyond the level they are expected to teach</i> to students; 2) how each will model and provide opportunities to learn about content-specific instructional strategies with research evidence for improved student achievement; and 3) how each is specifically aligned to the NC Standard Course of Study. Components fit together into a well-integrated model that provides <u>both</u> opportunities for significant teacher learning <u>and</u> support for effective implementation. All activities are likely to be effective and no inappropriate activities are included.	(2-4 points) The PD focus area is clearly stated and PD design is defined. Detailed description of design components is provided for all major components and activities and their implementation. Description lacks some of the detail needed for the reader to replicate the p.d. implementation plan. Most activities are likely to be effective but one or two have been included that are of questionable value. Most activities are aligned to the NC Standard Course of Study. Components appear to be designed to operate independently, not building on or reinforcing each other.	(0-1 points) PD focus area and design may or may not be clearly stated. Activities are not likely to be effective. Project activities may or may not be aligned to the NC Standard Course of Study. Project activities are included that are of questionable value or of no substantial value OR project activities are not included.	
Explained in detail how selected project activities support needs identified in Section III-B and objectives stated in Section III, Part C	(4-5 points) Each of the major activities directly addresses one or more of the needs and objectives established. Each of the objectives is addressed by one or more major activities. The degree of attention to each objective is sufficient to expect	(1-3 points) Some of the major activities appear unrelated to the needs and objectives of the project OR some objectives do not appear to be addressed in project activities.	(0 points) Activities are listed but no description is included or the description is so vague that a direct correlation to the needs and objectives is not possible or appears unrelated.	

	significant progress to be achieved.			
Provided a detailed description of the current research base in mathematics and/or science education to support selected project activities;	(4 points) Includes current scientifically-based research from multiple sources on effective PD for mathematics/science teachers/students specifically. Connects research to the selected activities.	(2-3 points) Includes sufficient research on effective professional learning strategies to support most of the project activities. All activities follow the research base.	(0-1 points) Limited data on the research-base for selected activities is presented OR activities do not follow the research base.	
Provided evidence that the scope of the project is realistic, and there is sufficient capacity of the partners to support the scale and scope of the project (especially the number of participants)	(3-4 points) The narrative provides supporting evidence of sufficient capacity of the partners to support the scale and scope of the project (especially the number of participants).	(1-2 points) The narrative provides some evidence of capacity of the partners to support the scale and scope of the project but more evidence is needed to create confidence that the project can be implemented successfully.	(0 points) The narrative may or may not state the capacity of the partners to support the scale and scope of the project, but in either case does not provide the evidence necessary.	
Provided a table listing project components and contact hours associated with each one, demonstrating a minimum of 80 contact hours of focused, content-related experiences	(3 points) A table is provided and included all the required information.	(1-2 points) A table is provided but lacks all the information requested.	(0 points) No table is included.	
Included a specific timeline of activities for the first 12 months of funding along with a more general timeline of activities for 2 subsequent years	(3 points) A timeline is provided and includes all the required information for 3 years.	(1-2 points) A timeline is provided but lacks all the information requested for 3 years.	(0 points) No timeline is included.	
			SECTION III, Part D TOTAL POINTS	
POINT JUSTIFICATION / REVIEW COMMENTS (REQUIRED):				

NC MSP Rating Form				POINTS AWARDED
Section III, Part E: Project Management Plan (10 points possible)				
Provided a detailed description of how the project will be administered that supports the scope and administrative requirements of the project	<p style="text-align: center;">(4-5 points)</p> <p>Clearly describes how the day-to-day management of the project will be executed. Identifies persons involved in decision-making, budgeting, and making implementation adjustments to activities and expenditures. Roles, responsibilities, and time commitments of persons involved in project management are described. If a Management Team is to be formed, team members are identified, schedule of meetings is provided and decision-making process is described. Management plan strongly supports the scope and administrative requirements of the project.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">(2-3 points)</p> <p>Provides some detail of the day-to-day management of the project; AND/OR</p> <p>Roles, responsibilities and time commitments are vague and the decision-making process is unclear; AND/OR</p> <p>More detail is needed to determine whether the management plan supports the scope and administrative requirements of the project.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">(0-1 points)</p> <p>The management plan is poorly described and/or appears to be inadequate to support the scope and administrative requirements of the project.</p>	
Identified each of the primary partners and described in detail the role they will serve in helping the project achieve its objectives	<p style="text-align: center;">(2-3 points)</p> <p>All primary partners are fully engaged in the project management and oversight. Activities in the implementation plan are tied to partners' missions. Strong evidence presented to justify the number of quality partners who will carry out the proposed activities. Qualifications are provided for partners and demonstrate highly aligned expertise for the particular role each will serve.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">(1-2 points)</p> <p>All primary partners are not fully engaged in project management and oversight. All primary partners are identified and appear to have satisfactory experience/expertise to successfully carry out the roles they are assigned.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">(0 points)</p> <p>Few primary partners are identified and the number appears to be inadequate for the scope of the project AND/OR those identified lack qualifications/experience/expertise to successfully carry out their roles.</p>	
Identified the fiscal agent and person responsible for overseeing the project's fiscal activities	<p style="text-align: center;">(2 points)</p> <p>The fiscal agent and the person responsible for overseeing the project's fiscal activities are clearly identified.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">(1 point)</p> <p>The fiscal agent is identified but the person overseeing the project's fiscal activities is not.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">(0 points)</p> <p>Neither the fiscal agent nor the person responsible for the project's fiscal activities is identified.</p>	
			SECTION III, Part E TOTAL POINTS	
POINT JUSTIFICATION / REVIEW COMMENTS (REQUIRED):				

NC MSP Rating Form				POINTS AWARDED
Section III, Part F: Evaluation Plan and Research Design (20 points possible)				

Named and presented credentials of those conducting evaluation of the project and their responsibilities	<p style="text-align: center;">(4 points)</p> <p>A specific person/contractor has been named external evaluator and has experience in the field of project evaluation for mathematics and/or science professional development. Responsibilities are clearly identified and described.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">(1-3 points)</p> <p>A specific external evaluator is named, but their credentials are unclear regarding expertise for evaluating mathematics and/or science professional development OR responsibilities are not clearly identified and described.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">(0 points)</p> <p>An external evaluator is not named OR is not independent of the project.</p>	
Described an overall evaluation plan that uses multiple measures to gather appropriate formative and summative data on project objectives	<p style="text-align: center;">(4-5 points)</p> <p>The evaluation plan is designed to gather appropriate information about each project objective, using both quantitative and qualitative methods. For each objective, an evaluation table clearly lists suitable data to be collected, the instruments or protocols used, and target audience for the data collection. Mechanisms are described for gathering ongoing formative feedback on project activities and participant progress, and incorporating it into project planning.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">(1-3 points)</p> <p>The evaluation plan addresses project objectives overall, but it is not clear how each objective will be measured and reported. OR the evaluation table contains incomplete information OR data to be collected are insufficient, too narrow, or inappropriate to inform progress on the objectives OR the evaluation gives insufficient attention to gathering and using formative data.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">(0 points)</p> <p>An evaluation table is not included OR the description of the evaluation plan is unclear or incomplete OR the plan focuses solely on some objectives and excludes the others.</p>	
Described a credible evaluation design and appropriate instruments and protocols to be used	<p style="text-align: center;">(4 points)</p> <p>Evaluation design includes collecting data from both the participant group and a similar comparison group (random assignment preferred but not required). Pre/post measures are collected for both groups, with statistical analysis comparing pre/post changes. Size of the participant and comparison groups is sufficient for the analysis to detect meaningful differences.</p> <p>Instruments to be used for teacher or student content assessment have a significant objective component (not just self-report) and have documented validity and reliability.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">(1-3 points)</p> <p>Evaluation design may include a comparison group. At a minimum, pre/post measures are collected from the participant group, to document changes during the project. Number of teachers is sufficient for statistical analysis.</p> <p>Instruments to be used for teacher or student content assessment have a significant objective component (not just self-report), but validity and reliability are not discussed or are not available.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">(0 points)</p> <p>Evaluation design includes only post-testing participants. Baseline data are not collected to enable changes to be measured.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Teacher or student content assessment is by self-report measures only; no objective assessment is included.</p>	
Presented a detailed timeline of the evaluation activities	<p style="text-align: center;">(2 points)</p> <p>Timeline is clear and specific about evaluation-related activities and when they will occur. Timing and scope of activities are reasonable when compared to the typical school year. Measures/instruments are clearly identified as well as the number of and classification of the participants.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">(1 point)</p> <p>Timeline is presented but does not include ALL of the required information OR is only very general.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">(0 points)</p> <p>Timeline is <u>not</u> available OR is so generic that no assessment of its quality or reasonableness can be made.</p>	

<p>Presented a research design to investigate the effects of the professional development model chosen</p>	<p>(3 points) The research component is designed to yield credible information about the p.d. approach taken by the project that can be used by others working in this domain. (Examples of such information could include: generalizing results beyond the participant group; identifying factors in the p.d. model and their contribution to the outcomes observed; examining system barriers and supports that impact implementing the p.d. model; etc.) The design is appropriate to the nature and scale of the project and is likely to produce useable knowledge.</p>	<p>(1-2 points) The proposal contains a research component, but it lacks clarity as to the nature of the information to be generated OR has design issues that make it unlikely to yield the intended information OR is unclear about who will be involved in carrying out the research.</p>	<p>(0 points) A research component is not included OR is not distinct from the project's summative evaluation.</p>	
<p>Presented a method of disseminating results of the research as a part of planned activities</p>	<p>(2 points) A method of disseminating results of the research is included as part of the planned activities that will include presentation of successful strategies and curricula and lessons learned.</p>	<p>(1 point) Disseminating results of the research is included as part of the planned activities but no details are provided as to how or when.</p>	<p>(0 points) Disseminating results of the research is not described.</p>	
			<p>SECTION III, Part F TOTAL POINTS</p>	
<p>POINT JUSTIFICATION / REVIEW COMMENTS (REQUIRED):</p>				

NC MSP Rating Form				POINTS AWARDED			
Section IV and V, Completed Budget Narrative and Budget Summary Forms (10 points possible)							
Provided budget forms for each partner as well as a Total Project Budget; Provided a Budget Narrative for each line item of expenditures	(3 points)	Budget forms for each partner are complete and correct. A Total Project Budget is provided. All budget calculations are correct. Budget narrative is included for each line item of the budget. The purpose of each line item is clear and narrative includes accurate formulas for calculating totals.	(1-2 points)	Budget forms for each partner are complete and correct. A Total Project Budget is provided. All budget calculations are correct. Budget narrative is complete but some expenditures require more detailed explanation.	(0 points)	Budget forms are not filled out correctly or some are missing. Numbers do not add up. Budget narrative is incomplete and the purpose of some line items is unclear.	
	(3 points)	The budget and budget narrative are directly tied to the implementation plan outlined in Section III, Part D and clearly shows how all aspects of the plan will be supported. No funds are budgeted for unrelated expenditures.	(1-2 points)	The budget and budget narrative are directly tied to the implementation plan but it may not be clear how all aspects of the plan will be supported.	(0 points)	The budget and budget narrative are not directly tied to the implementation plan.	
	(4 points)	The budget supports all of the project objectives and activities. Overall cost of the project clearly matches services proposed, professional development outlined and/or number of teachers served. Budget is consistent with roles of the partners. Budget is adequate and does not include excessive spending on peripheral project needs.	(1-3 points)	Most elements in the implementation plan appear adequately budgeted for. Expenditures are reasonable and focus on needs. Budget expenditures may appear higher than expected for some of the proposed activities. Budget is consistent with roles of the partners.	(0 points)	The budget does not directly support project objectives and activities. Funds are budgeted for unrelated purposes AND/OR do not focus on needs. Budget is inconsistent with the roles of partners. Excessive or inadequate spending is included for peripheral project needs.	
				SECTION IV and V TOTAL POINTS			
POINT JUSTIFICATION / REVIEW COMMENTS (REQUIRED):							

FINAL SCORING	POINTS AWARDED
Section III, Part A: Evidence of Meaningful Partnerships	
Section III, Part B: Results of Needs Assessment	
Section III, Part C: Project Objectives	
Section III, Part D: Project Implementation Plan	
Section III, Part E: Project Management Plan	
Section III, Part F: Evaluation Plan and Research Design	
Section IV and V: Budget Narrative & Summary Forms	
TOTAL SCORE	

Reviewer's Funding Recommendations
<i>Check the appropriate box and provide comments if needed</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> I would support funding for this proposal as written. Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> I would support funding this proposal with the following recommended changes. Recommendations:
<input type="checkbox"/> I do NOT recommend funding this proposal. Comments: