

# REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

*Supporting professional development for pK-12 teachers and principals  
in mathematics, science, and English language arts/literacy*

## 2016-17 Final Round Oregon University/School Partnerships

funded by  
Title II, Part A, Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund  
Improving Teacher Quality Program  
U.S. Department of Education  
[CFDA 84.367B]

*RFP Issued: May 16, 2016*  
*Intent to Apply Due: May 26, 2016 4:00 p.m.*  
*Proposal Due Date: June 21, 2016 4:00 p.m.*  
*Projects Notified: July 11-13, 2016*  
*Project Timeline: August 1, 2016 – July 31, 2017*

The Research Institute at  
Western Oregon University



Contact: Dr. Bonnie Morihara  
503-838-8413  
moriharb@wou.edu

<http://triwou.org/pages/show/universityschool-partnerships>

## CONTENTS

Page

<b>A. BACKGROUND</b>	<b>3</b>
Partnership Criteria	3
General Guidelines for the 2016-17 RFP	4
2016-17 Competition Details	5
<b>B. PROFESSIONAL LEARNING, EVALUATION, AND STANDARDS</b>	<b>5</b>
What is High-Quality Professional Learning?	5
Evaluation	6
University/School Partnership Program Standards	7
<b>C. APPLICATION PROCESS AND PROPOSAL REVIEW</b>	<b>9</b>
Application Organization and Format	9
Budget Criteria	10
Review Process	11
Proposal Rating Scale	11
Proposal Due Date and Application Checklist	13
Award Notification	13
Site Visits/Program Monitoring	13
Questions and Technical Assistance	13
<b>D. APPENDICES</b>	<b>14</b>
Sources Cited	14
2016-17 Eligible High-Need Oregon School Districts	15
Intent-to-Apply Form	20
RFP Cover Page	21
Partnership Profile Form	23
Joint Effort Document	24
USP Budget Form	26
Statement of Assurances	27

# University/School Partnerships Title II-A Improving Teacher Quality Program 2016-17 Request for Proposals

## Section A: Background

The Research Institute (TRI) at Western Oregon University is issuing this Request for Proposals to distribute Federal Fiscal Year 2017 funds allocated to the University/School Partnership Program under *No Child Left Behind, Title II-A, Subpart 3*, also known as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The primary goal of the University/School Partnership program is for partnerships to use funds to strengthen pK-12 educators' pedagogical and academic content knowledge through research based professional development activities designed to ensure students' educational achievement.

This is the final competition for the University/School Partnership Title II-A program under the transition from *No Child Left Behind* to the new *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA), December 2015. NOTE: This final USP competition is dependent upon funding from the U.S. Department of Education. TRI is not responsible for funding this program should Federal funding be reduced or withdrawn.

## Partnership Criteria

The objective of the partnership is to combine the strong disciplinary expertise of college of arts and sciences faculty and the instructional/ pedagogical expertise of college of education faculty in order to improve student achievement in high-need districts through a program of rigorous professional development. Eligibility for the University/School Partnership Title II-A sub-grants is limited to a partnership comprised at a minimum of an Oregon:

1. Division of an independent college/university or public university that prepares teachers and/or principals; and a
2. Division of arts and sciences from a public or private, two- or four-year higher education institution; and a
3. High-need local education agency (LEA), i.e., school district.

A partnership may also include another district, a public charter school, a private pK-12 school, an education service district, a non-profit cultural organization, another institution of higher education, an entity carrying out a pre-kindergarten program, a teacher organization, a principal organization, or a business.

The proposal must be submitted by the higher education entity. Either of the two required higher education partners may serve as project coordinator and fiscal agent.

All partners must be involved throughout all stages of a project. Substantial collaboration among education and arts and sciences faculty in designing, conducting and evaluating the project is required to ensure that the project integrates teaching skills with substantive content knowledge. Similarly, teachers, administrators, and other school personnel to be served by the project must be part of project planning from the outset to ensure that the project will meet their needs and those of the students they teach.

The proposed partnerships must ensure that services are offered on an equitable basis to public and private school teachers. Each partnership must contact private pK-12 schools that are high-poverty or low-performing in the districts it will serve and offer them the opportunity to participate in grant-related activities. The Title II-A program, however, does not authorize payments to private schools to be used for hiring substitute teachers while teachers are participating in professional development.

A list of 43 Oregon school districts that meet the federal definition of high-need LEA for this RFP is in the Appendix. A qualifying high-need district retains that designation throughout the duration of the project even when federal data change.

## General Guidelines for the 2016-17 RFP

The following guidelines are a combination of federal requirements for the Title II-A Improving Teacher Quality program and Oregon-specific guidelines:

- Professional development proposals for this 2016-17 competition will be accepted in the academic areas of **mathematics, science** (including STEM), and **English language arts/literacy** (including English learners). All projects must integrate content knowledge with teaching skills; projects which provide pedagogical professional development unrelated to core content cannot be funded.
- Proposed professional development activities should promote improved academic outcomes for students that are based on an analysis of student achievement data and are focused on needs identified in the district's/school's continuous improvement plans (CIP) or professional development plans.
- Professional development activities must be high quality, sustained, intensive, and designed to have a positive and lasting impact on classroom instruction and the teacher's performance in the classroom.
- Proposals must indicate how proposed grant-funded professional development activities are based upon a review of scientifically based research so that students benefit from teaching practices and methods that are drawn from what is known to work, or at a minimum, cite innovative and related theory and research on which the proposed professional development can reasonably build.
- Projects are required to submit a plan for and final reports of formative and summative evaluation results that include participant demographics, descriptions and results of professional development activities, and pK-12 student impact. (See Section B: Evaluation).

## 2016-17 Competition Details

**Available Funding.** There is approximately \$650,000 available to fund eligible partnerships that have the greatest potential to produce positive results. We expect to fund 4-5 projects ranging from \$130,000 to \$160,000 with the money received in FY 2017.

**Grant Duration.** Projects will commence August 1, 2016 and must be complete by July 31, 2017 with no carry-over funding permitted (total of 12 months).

### Key Dates

RFP issued	May 16, 2016
Intent to apply email due	May 26, 2016 4:00 p.m.
Proposal due date	<b>June 21, 2016 4:00 p.m.</b>
Review panel reads/scores proposals	June 22 – July 7, 2016
Projects notified	July 11-13, 2016
Projects may begin	August 1, 2016
1 <sup>st</sup> progress report due*	January 30, 2017
Final day to spend funding	July 31, 2017
Final report due*	September 30, 2017

\* Written progress reports are due mid-project and at the end. Project directors are expected to notify the TRI USP Project Director of changes in the schedule of activities or budget and to invite the USP Project Director to observe project professional learning or sharing sessions.

## Section B: Professional Learning, Evaluation, and Standards

### What is High Quality Professional Learning?

In the past the University/School Partnership Title II-A RFP has used standards for professional development that were based on 1) best practices from the Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Regional Consortiums Program (1965-2001), 2) a research-based publication titled *High-quality professional development for teachers: Supporting teacher training to improve student learning* (2013, DeMonte), and 3) Oregon-specific conditions. The Oregon Department of Education, on the other hand, is using the *Standards for Professional Learning* developed by Learning Forward (LF) as the benchmark for the annual Continuous Improvement Plans (CIP) required from all Oregon school districts under ESEA Title II-A.

A 2009 report published by the National Staff Development Council (now Learning Forward) concluded that effective professional development is:

- Intensive, ongoing and connected to practice
- Focused on student learning and teaching specific curriculum content
- Aligned with school improvement priorities and goals

Similarly, DeMonte's (2013, p. 6) research showed that high-quality educator professional development has the following five characteristics:

1. Aligns with school goals, state and district standards and assessments, and other professional learning activities
2. Focuses on core content and modeling of teaching strategies for the content
3. Includes opportunities for active learning of new teaching strategies
4. Provides the chance for teachers to collaborate
5. Incorporates follow-up and continuous feedback.

Moreover, professional development is most likely to result in improved teaching practices when it: is comprised of sustained and regular activities; is job embedded; incorporates coaching; includes regular collaboration among teachers about improving teaching; and uses technology wisely (DeMonte, 2013, pp. 7-8).

The Learning Forward *Standards for Professional Learning* describe seven key metrics for professional learning and defines the global focus of each. According to the Learning Forward standards (2011), "Professional learning that increases educator effectiveness and results for all students...

1. occurs within learning communities committed to continuous improvement, collective responsibility, and goal alignment. (LEARNING COMMUNITIES)
2. requires skillful leaders who develop capacity, advocate, and create support systems for professional learning (LEADERSHIP)
3. requires prioritizing, monitoring, and coordinating resources for educator learning. (RESOURCES)
4. uses a variety of sources and types of student, educator, and system data to plan, assess, and evaluate professional learning. (DATA)
5. integrates theories, research, and models of human learning to achieve its intended outcomes. (LEARNING DESIGNS)
6. applies research on change and sustains support for implementation of professional learning for long-term change. (IMPLEMENTATION)
7. aligns its outcomes with educator performance and student curriculum standards (OUTCOMES)

A comprehensive guide to ***Increasing the Effectiveness of Professional Learning***—with examples—can be found among the Planning Materials and Resources on ODE's website at <http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=2223>.

## Evaluation

There is a nationwide emphasis on being able to provide evidence that educator professional development is effective, resulting in improved teacher knowledge and instruction, and ultimately resulting in greater student achievement. Projects must be designed based on the standards for professional learning discussed above, and must also demonstrate the value of the professional development through evaluation and assessment.

The Oregon University/School Partnerships Title II-A program does not require an outside project evaluator. However, projects are required to report on qualitative or quantitative, formative or summative assessment measures of:

- changes in educator content knowledge,
- changes in educator pedagogical knowledge,
- changes in educator instructional practice, and
- improvements in student achievement

that are a result of the project (USP Standard 6 below). Each project must include a rigorous evaluation plan that measures changes in teacher knowledge and practice, as well as changes in student learning outcomes to the extent feasible given the time frame and budget of the project.

## University/School Partnership Program Standards

There are six Program Standards for the University/School Partnerships with related Performance Measures to be used as evidence that your project will meet these standards. All six standards and applicable performance measures must be clearly addressed in your proposal. You may propose additional or alternate performance measures if relevant.

**USP Program Standard 1: Professional development activities provided by USP projects are responsive to the teaching and learning needs identified in school/district continuous improvement plans (CIP) and the required reporting of Student Learning & Growth Goals (SLGGs).** (See Continuous Improvement Planning at <http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/results/?id=201> and Student Learning & Growth at <http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=3836>.)

*Relevant Learning Forward metrics: RESOURCES, DATA, OUTCOMES*

### ***Performance Measures:***

1. Projects provide evidence of alignment with district or school continuous improvement (CIP) plans by specifying:
  - a. How the professional development provided addresses school and/or district needs identified in the continuous improvement plan(s)
  - b. How the effectiveness of the professional development provided by the project will be evaluated, and project activities revised, to meet the continuing needs identified by the school/district professional development or school improvement plan(s).
2. Participants develop appropriate student learning and growth goals for their students in the target content areas.

**USP Program Standard 2: Professional development activities provided by USP projects support the development and growth of learning communities that involve novice and experienced teachers, administrators, and higher education faculty in collaborative interactions focused on improving student achievement.**

*Relevant Learning Forward metrics: LEARNING COMMUNITIES, LEADERSHIP*

***Performance Measures: (Select at least two)***

1. Professional development is embedded in everyday school life, providing opportunities for teachers and administrators to meet, observe, and study with each other around student learning needs.
2. Less experienced educators are linked with more experienced educators in providing classroom instruction or school leadership in the target content areas.
3. Higher education faculty are supported to work in school buildings.
4. Inservice educators assist in teacher/principal preparation by serving as higher education faculty in delivering coursework, and formally participating in the design of teacher/ administrator preparation curricula.

**USP Program Standard 3: Professional development activities provided by USP projects utilize the Common Core State Standards or the current Oregon content standards in the appropriate content area(s).**

*Relevant Learning Forward metrics: LEARNING COMMUNITIES, RESOURCES, DATA, OUTCOMES*

***Performance Measures:***

1. All projects demonstrate explicit connections between the professional development activities and student standards in the relevant target core area:
  - Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts & Literacy, and the English Language Proficiency Standards (both available at <http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=1613>)
  - Common Core State Standards in Mathematics (<http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=1527>)
  - Next Generation Science Standards (<http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=1577>)
  - other appropriate student standards for targeted core academic subjects.

**USP Program Standard 4: All USP professional development activities incorporate equity strategies to assist teachers, administrators, and other school staff in using practices that will provide all of their pK-12 students – regardless of population grouping or individual learning styles or needs – with the opportunity to achieve excellence**

*Relevant Learning Forward metrics: LEARNING COMMUNITIES, DATA, OUTCOMES*

***Performance Measures:***

1. Projects demonstrate that they have incorporated the principles of Oregon's Equity Lens — twelve core beliefs that fuel opportunities to bolster success for diverse student populations across the state. (See [http://education.oregon.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Final\\_Equity\\_Lens\\_Adopted.pdf](http://education.oregon.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Final_Equity_Lens_Adopted.pdf))
2. Projects provide evidence that project activities address equity issues and strategies for culturally responsive teaching and learning.
3. Projects provide examples of how project activities will address inequities of access, opportunity, interest, and attainment for underserved and underrepresented populations.



**USP Program Standard 5: All USP professional development activities provide significant opportunities for adult learning that is sustained, ongoing, and active.**

*Relevant Learning Forward metrics: LEARNING COMMUNITIES, RESOURCES, DATA, LEARNING DESIGNS, IMPLEMENTATION, OUTCOMES*

***Performance Measures:***

1. Projects provide a minimum of 60 inservice professional development contact hours for the primary cohort of inservice participants. *(The primary cohort of inservice participants is that group of teachers and/or administrators targeted by the professional development design and implementation activities described by the project in its proposal. Sixty contact hours is the USP minimum standard.)*
2. Projects demonstrate support, directly or through articulated agreements, of active learning activities. Identify which of the following activities will be used and how they will be used: a) peer observation and feedback of participant teaching; b) practice under simulated conditions with feedback; c) informal meetings with other participants to discuss classroom implementation; d) sharing/reviewing student work; e) scoring/analyzing assessments; f) planning, developing and peer reviewing curricula or lesson plans; g) opportunity to present, demonstrate, or lead discussions with peer participants; h) analyzing teaching and learning needs using disaggregated student achievement data. Add other activities as needed.

**USP Program Standard 6: All USP projects evaluate and report the impact of the project professional development activities on participants and, to the extent possible, their pK-12 students.**

*Relevant LEARNING FORWARD Metrics: DATA, IMPLEMENTATION, OUTCOMES*

***Performance Measures:***

1. Projects demonstrate change in teacher content knowledge, teacher pedagogical knowledge, and teacher instructional practices resulting from project professional development using assessments such as pre-post tests and surveys, baseline data, educator observation, and creation/usage of instructional tools and assessments.
2. To the extent possible, projects demonstrate changes in student learning resulting from the professional development through qualitative/quantitative formative or summative assessment measures.

## **Section C: Application Process & Proposal Review**

### **Application Organization and Format**

1. Complete the RFP Proposal Cover Sheet (included in the Appendix). The RFP Cover Sheet must be signed by the chief executive official for the institution (this is typically the president, provost/vice president of academic affairs, or research office head). Do not use a font smaller than 9 point on the Cover Sheet.

2. The proposal narrative and budget narrative shall use one-inch margins all around and 12-point font in Arial, Calibri or Times New Roman. The proposal narrative and budget narrative together shall not exceed 15 pages at 1.5 to 2.0 line spacing. Exceptions include: 1) text in charts or tables (e.g., the project timeline), which can be single-spaced with a minimum 10-point font, and 2) bibliography/references, which can be single-spaced with an empty line between entries.

Begin your proposal narrative with a short (1-2 paragraph) overview of the professional development project that you are proposing. Follow this with a narrative that addresses each of the major categories in the Proposal Scoring Checklist below (keep in mind the importance of the information in Sections A and B). Finally, include a budget narrative that explains the funding that you are requesting.

The RFP cover page, Joint Effort Document, Partnership Profile Form, USP Budget Forms, and Statement of Assurances must use the forms provided and are not counted in the 15-page narrative limit.

3. Complete the USP Budget Form (see Appendix). Provide an assurance on the Budget Form that no single participant in an eligible partnership will use more than 50% of the grant funds made available to the partnership. You may also provide an Excel budget spreadsheet if you wish (not counted in the narrative page limit).
4. Provide a list of your three required eligible partners on the Partnership Profile Form (see Appendix). You may add additional partners as appropriate.
5. Complete and sign the Joint Effort Document. (Given the difficulty of obtaining various district signatures on one document, you may submit multiple signature pages, or you can affix electronic signatures to one or more of the pages.)
6. A signed Statement of Assurances is required to receive federal funding. Submit this document with your proposal so that we have it on hand if your project is selected for funding.
7. In an Appendix you may include letters from up to three partners that indicate the extent to which the project has been planned and will be implemented with the full cooperation of the higher education institution, high-need district(s), and other schools/organizations in the partnership. You may also include other supportive materials (e.g., brochures, descriptions of related or leveraged projects, etc.). These optional items must not exceed five pages total.

## Budget Criteria

1. Funds made available through the USP Program may be used only to supplement, not supplant, funds from state and local sources.

2. Title II-A regulations for the University/School Partnerships state that no one of the three required partners may spend more than 50 percent of the grant award. This “special 50 percent rule” focuses not on which partner receives the funds, but on which partner directly benefits from them. In satisfying this rule, instructional costs charged to the grant may be regarded as being used by the higher education school of education or arts and sciences for salaries, etc., as well as by the local school districts for teacher support and may be distributed accordingly.
3. USP funds may be used for personnel and instructional costs such as staff/teacher and faculty release time or summer contracts; master teachers who serve a number of teachers in a defined region with one-to-one professional development assistance; stipends or tuition assistance for teachers to take relevant graduate-level coursework (including online courses if partner districts are geographically distant from campus partners); in-state travel costs; preparation and duplication of materials; workshop training-related costs; and related supplies.
4. Funds for equipment purchases will not be covered except in unusual circumstances and only where the project’s success directly hinges on the purchase of such equipment.
5. You may charge a maximum of 10% indirect on all expenses except tuition and stipends for teachers.

## Review Process

Proposals will be read by a review team selected from the following categories: higher education faculty and administrators, Oregon Department of Education, Oregon Education Association, other Oregon educational organizations, and current and retired pK-12 teachers and administrators. Proposals will receive a minimum of three reviews. Proposals will be reviewed according to the criteria listed in the rating scale below. While not part of individual proposal scoring, equitable geographic distribution of all proposals as a group is a requirement of Title II-A, and is a factor in the final selection of sub-grantees.

## Proposal Rating Scale

The following chart shows the rating scale that proposal reviewers will use in scoring proposals. It is recommended that you use this checklist as you design and review your proposal.

MEANINGFUL PARTNERSHIP – 10 points	Points =
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is evidence of active involvement of all required partners (teacher prep unit, arts/sciences unit, school district) in planning and implementation.</li> <li>• The planning process and each partner’s role and commitment are clearly described and documented.</li> </ul>	<p>_____ of 10</p>

<b>DEMONSTRATED NEED – 10 points</b>	Points =
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a description of specific needs and how they were determined.</li> <li>• There is evidence that proposed activities will address documented participant needs.</li> </ul>	_____ of 10
<b>PROJECT GOALS &amp; OBJECTIVES – 20 points</b>	Points =
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goals and objectives are clearly identified and linked to demonstrated needs.</li> <li>• Project goals and objectives have measurable outcomes aligned with the six USP Program Standards.</li> <li>• Goals and objectives reflect student achievement parameters (CCSS, CIP, SLGG) appropriate to proposed project.</li> </ul>	_____ of 20
<b>ACTIVITIES &amp; TIMELINE – 20 points</b>	Points =
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a well-developed schedule of activities, including a timeline.</li> <li>• There is evidence that proposed activities are research-based and will have a demonstrable impact on student achievement.</li> <li>• Activities are designed using recognized parameters of effective adult learning.</li> <li>• Project activities show evidence that they provide the conditions that will lead to anticipated outcomes.</li> </ul>	_____ of 20
<b>LASTING EFFECT - 10 points</b>	Points =
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional development activities are sufficiently sustained, intensive (60+ hours), and of high quality to have lasting and positive effect on teachers' instruction.</li> <li>• There is evidence of multiple follow-up sessions.</li> </ul>	_____ of 10
<b>EVALUATION – 20 points</b>	Points =
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The evaluation plan adequately measures achievement of project goals, effectiveness of activities, and USP Program Standards.</li> <li>• The evaluation plan provides for a means to assess increases in educators' content and pedagogical knowledge and practices.</li> <li>• The evaluation plan provides for a means to assess increases in student achievement related to project goals.</li> </ul>	_____ of 20
<b>CAPACITY – 5 points</b>	Points =
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The qualifications and responsibilities of key project personnel are appropriate for the project and linked to the project plan.</li> <li>• The size of the project staff and the amount of time devoted to the project is appropriate for the activities planned.</li> </ul>	_____ of 5
<b>BUDGET – 5 points</b>	Points =
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget line items are adequately explained in a budget narrative.</li> <li>• Budget costs are reasonable and adequate to the project objectives and design.</li> </ul>	_____ of 5

Total maximum points is 100.

## Proposal Due Date & Application Checklist

Include items 2 - 9 in the order given. Submit your full application as a single document via email as a Word or PDF document to [moriharb@wou.edu](mailto:moriharb@wou.edu) with a copy to [reaglec@wou.edu](mailto:reaglec@wou.edu) by **4:00 p.m., June 21, 2016**. Receipt of your proposal will be acknowledged via email.

1. Intent to Apply form – email to [moriharb@wou.edu](mailto:moriharb@wou.edu) by **4:00 p.m., May 26, 2016**.
2. Signed cover sheet – *not counted in 15-page limit*.
3. Project narrative (including timeline) and budget narrative – *15-page limit, 1.5~2.0 line spacing, 1" margins, 12 point font*
4. Bibliography/references – *not counted in 15-page limit*.
5. USP Budget Form (and Excel spreadsheet if desired) – *not counted in 15-page limit*.
6. Joint Effort Document(s) – *not counted in 15-page limit*.
7. Partnership Profile Form – *not counted in 15-page limit*.
8. Statement of Assurances – *not counted in 15-page limit*.
9. Any appendices, including signed support letters from partners – *5-page limit for Appendices, no special spacing or font size requirements*.

## Award Notification

Awards under the USP program will be announced by email to the institutions selected for funding as well as to unsuccessful applicants July 11-13, 2016. Contracts will be sent to successful applicants in July and projects may begin August 1, 2016 provided that TRI-WOU has received your signed contract. The project timeline is August 1, 2016 through July 31, 2017.

## Site Visits/Project Monitoring

During the time period covered by this award, a representative from the USP program will conduct periodic project monitoring (via phone, email or site visits) to projects receiving grants. Projects should send a schedule of professional development activities and an invitation to attend to Bonnie Morihara at [moriharb@wou.edu](mailto:moriharb@wou.edu).

## Questions

Questions concerning USP proposals should be referred to Bonnie Morihara at 503-838-8413, [moriharb@wou.edu](mailto:moriharb@wou.edu) or Christina Reagle at 503-838-8871, [reaglec@wou.edu](mailto:reaglec@wou.edu).

## Section D: Appendices

### Sources Cited

- Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R.C., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional Learning in the Learning Profession: A Status Report on Teacher Development in the United States and Abroad*. The School Redesign Network at Stanford University. Dallas, TX: National Staff Development Council.  
<http://learningforward.org/docs/pdf/nsdcstudy2009.pdf>
- DeMonte, J. (July 2013). *High-quality professional development for teachers: Supporting teacher training to improve student learning*. Washington, D.C.: Center for American Progress.  
<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/report/2013/07/15/69592/high-quality-professional-development-for-teachers/>
- Learning Forward. (2011) *Standards for professional learning*. Oxford, OH: Author.
- Learning Forward. (2011) *Standards for professional learning: Quick reference guide*. Oxford, OH: Author. <http://learningforward.org/docs/pdf/standardsreferenceguide.pdf>
- Oregon Department of Education. *Continuous Improvement Planning (CIP)*.  
<http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/results/?id=201>
- Oregon Department of Education. (July 2014). *Increasing the effectiveness of professional learning*. Salem, OR: Author. <http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=2223>
- Oregon Department of Education. *Student Learning and Growth Goals*.  
<http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=3836>.
- United States Census Bureau. (2013). *Small area income and poverty estimates (SAIPE)*. Washington, D.C.: Website. <http://www.census.gov/did/www/saipe/>
- U.S. Department of Education. (Revised October 5, 2006). *Improving teacher quality state grants, ESEA Title II, Part A. Non-regulatory guidance*. Washington, D.C.: Author.  
<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/legislation.html>

## 2016-17 Eligible High-Need Oregon School Districts

List updated 05-10-16 from latest U.S. Census data available at <http://www.census.gov/did/www/saipe/> released December 2015, and from Oregon Department of Education Highly Qualified Teachers 2014-15 (Accountability Measure) and Oregon District Report Cards.

The Title II-A Improving Teacher Quality competitive grant program (known in Oregon as University/School Partnerships), defines a high-need LEA as a school district in which 20% or more school-aged children are living in poverty according to U.S. Census figures, AND which has less than the state average of 98.0% of its classes taught by highly qualified teachers.

Although 110 Oregon districts meet the poverty requirement, **only the 43 highlighted school districts qualify as high-need district partners for the 2016-17 University/School Partnerships Title II-A SAHE grants.** The qualifying districts are in slightly more than half of Oregon's counties: Baker, Benton, Coos, Crook, Curry, Douglas, Gilliam, Grant, Jackson, Lake, Lane, Malheur, Marion, Multnomah, Polk, Umatilla, Union, Wallowa, Wheeler, and Yamhill counties.

Each University/School Partnership project must partner with at least one qualifying school district (highlighted in yellow) although other non-qualifying school districts may also participate in the partnership. Once you have partnered with at least one of the 42 eligible districts, you are encouraged to add one or more of the remaining 67 high-poverty districts listed on the following chart. Teachers and administrators at **private pK-12 schools are eligible and must be invited** to participate. However, by program rules they must be located within the physical boundaries of an eligible high-need district AND serve significant numbers of high poverty students.

<i>School District</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Children age 5-17 in poverty</i>	<i>% classes taught by HQ tchrs</i>	<i>Total Teachers 2014 - 15</i>	<i># of students in district</i>
Adel SD 21	Lake	23.1%	100%	1	8
Adrian SD 61	Malheur	25.4%	100%	16	266
<b>Alsea SD 7J</b>	Benton	20.0%	62.2%	12	172
Annex SD 29	Malheur	35.2%	100%	4	83
<b>Arlington SD 3</b>	Gilliam	30.2%	92.3%	10	136
Arock SD 81	Malheur	37.5%	100%	2	14
<b>Ashland SD 5</b>	Jackson	20.2%	89.9%	133	2,818
Ashwood SD 8	Jefferson	33.3%	100%	1	5
<b>Athena-Weston 29 RJ</b>	Umatilla	28.8%	94.1%	28	586
Baker SD 5J	Baker	27.3%	99.5%	101	2,398
<b>Bandon SD 54</b>	Coos	20.6%	94.6%	33	723
Blachly SD 9	Lane	22.0%	100%	19	234
Brookings-Harbor 17	Curry	20.0%	98.9%	63	1,575
Burnt River SD 30J	Baker	20.5%	100%	4	41
Butte Falls SD 91	Jackson	24.9%	100%	12	143
Camas Valley SD 21J	Douglas	34.6%	100%	16	203
<b>Centennial SD 28J</b>	Multnomah	24.4%	97.9%	227	6,242
Coos Bay SD 9	Coos	30.5%	99.6%	119	3,111
Coquille SD 8	Coos	26.0%	98.2%	37	874
<b>Corbett SD 39</b>	Multnomah	20.1%	88.6%	51	1,317

<i>School District</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Children age 5-17 in poverty</i>	<i>% classes taught by HQ tchrs</i>	<i>Total Teachers 2014 - 15</i>	<i># of students in district</i>
Crook County SD	Crook	22.7%	96.6%	120	3,303
Culver SD 4	Jefferson	27.7%	100%	31	695
David Douglas SD 40	Multnomah	31.3%	99.4%	416	10,988
Douglas Co SD 4 (Roseburg)	Douglas	22.1%	96.5%	233	6,059
Douglas Co SD 15 (Days Creek)	Douglas	23.1%	100%	12	165
Dayville SD 16J	Grant	37.0%	100%	7	52
Diamond SD 7, K-8	Harney	33.3%	100%	2	11
Double O SD 28	Harney	33.3%	100%	1	3
Drewsey SD 13	Harney	20.0%	100%	1	5
Dufur SD 29	Wasco	21.1%	100%	14	284
Echo SD 5	Umatilla	32.7%	95.1%	19	244
Enterprise SD 21	Wallowa	20.3%	93.0%	21	382
Falls City SD 57	Polk	21.8%	91.2%	10	143
Fossil SD 21J	Wheeler	34.9%	100%	15	264
Frenchglen SD 16, K-8	Harney	23.1%	98.1%	9	129
Gervais SD 1	Marion	21.5%	92.9%	52	1,056
Glendale SD 77	Douglas	30.8%	94.9%	17	343
Glide SD 12	Douglas	25.6%	100%	29	670
Grants Pass SD 7	Josephine	29.6%	100%	213	5,944
Greater Albany SD 8J	Linn	23.5%	98.6%	295	9,399
Harney County SD 3	Harney	24.6%	100%	37	825
Harney County SD 4, K-8	Harney	25.0%	100%	4	53
Harney County Union High SD 1J	Harney	28.0%	100%	7	54
Harper SD 66	Malheur	37.5%	93.9%	8	95
Hermiston SD 8	Umatilla	21.4%	99.0%	234	5,297
Huntington SD 16J	Baker	23.3%	88.6%	8	64
Jefferson County SD 509J	Jefferson	29.4%	99.5%	116	2,966
Jefferson SD 14J	Marion	25.1%	100%	34	869
John Day SD 3	Grant	24.2%	97.9%	32	592
Jordan Valley SD 3	Malheur	25.4%	86.2%	7	81
Joseph SD 6	Wallowa	33.8%	95.2%	18	229
Juntura SD 12	Malheur	35.0%	100%	1	9
Klamath County SD	Klamath	22.1%	99.7%	269	6,386
Klamath Falls City Schools	Klamath	32.6%	100%	145	3,257
La Grande SD 1	Union	23.0%	98.3%	87	2,181
Lake County SD 7 (Lakeview)	Lake	26.1%	88.8%	33	767
Lebanon Community SD 9	Linn	25.5%	100%	161	4,353
Lincoln County SD	Lincoln	28.6%	99.3%	207	5,237
Mapleton SD 32	Marion	26.9%	98.1%	12	149
McKenzie SD 68	Lane	26.0%	87.2%	14	223
McMinnville SD 40	Yamhill	23.3%	97.3%	270	6,620
Medford SD 549	Jackson	23.0%	100%	505	13,628
Milton-Freewater SD 7	Umatilla	37.3%	97.8%	73	1,793
Mitchell SD 55	Wheeler	30.8%	81.3%	5	64
Monroe SD 1J	Benton	22.7%	97.2%	21	439
Morrow SD 1	Morrow	20.4%	99.8%	100	2,215
Myrtle Point SD 41	Coos	28.0%	97.2%	40	617
Neah-Kah-Nie SD 56	Tillamook	25.4%	100%	37	759
North Bend SD 13	Coos	24.3%	99.6%	132	4,229
North Douglas SD 22	Douglas	22.8%	96.8%	18	310
North Lake SD 14	Lake	20.1%	93.2%	14	223
North Powder SD 8J	Union	35.6%	95.6%	18	282



<i>School District</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Children age 5-17 in poverty</i>	<i>% classes taught by HQ tchrs</i>	<i>Total Teachers 2014 - 15</i>	<i># of students in district</i>
North Wasco SD 21	Wasco	21.8%	98.9%	177	3,119
Nyssa SD 26	Malheur	29.0%	99.6%	51	1,150
Oakland SD 1	Douglas	22.4%	98.3%	35	518
Oakridge SD 76	Lane	30.6%	84.2%	23	533
Ontario SD 8C	Malheur	41.7%	97.9%	101	2,404
Paisley SD 11	Lake	29.2%	76.7%	11	215
Parkrose SD 3	Multnomah	23.2%	97.5%	111	3,345
Phoenix-Talent SD 4	Jackson	22.6%	100%	104	2,714
Pine Creek SD 5, K-8	Baker	36.4%	100%	1	4
Pine Eagle SD 61	Baker	30.3%	100%	14	184
Port Orford-Langlois SD 2J	Curry	58.9%	88.5%	15	210
Powers SD 31	Coos	41.7%	97.9%	13	133
Prairie City SD 4	Grant	25.9%	83.3%	10	148
Prospect SD 59	Jackson	23.5%	99.1%	15	243
Redmond SD 2J	Deschutes	24.0%	97.6%	297	7,329
Reedsport SD 105	Douglas	29.2%	100%	25	630
Reynolds SD 7	Multnomah	28.2%	99.0%	469	11,702
Riddle SD 70	Douglas	34.5%	85.1%	23	384
Rogue River SD 35	Jackson	32.8%	100%	46	880
Salem-Keizer SD 24J	Marion	21.0%	100%	989	40,698
Seaside SD 10	Clatsop	22.7%	100%	63	1,542
Sheridan SD 48J	Yamhill	22.0%	93.0%	54	1,035
Siuslaw SD 97J	Lane	30.3%	89.2%	59	1,391
South Harney SD 33	Harney	41.2%	100%	2	13
South Umpqua SD 19	Douglas	29.9%	98.0%	62	1,477
Spray SD 1	Wheeler	43.8%	97.6%	7	44
Suntex SD 10, K-8	Harney	27.3%	100%	2	15
Sutherlin SD 130	Douglas	23.3%	100%	63	1,321
Sweet Home SD 55	Linn	24.9%	98.3%	97	2,402
Three Rivers SD	Josephine	26.6%	99.9%	171	4,819
Tillamook SD 9	Tillamook	22.0%	99.8%	75	2,058
Ukiah SD 80	Umatilla	23.3%	100%	6	44
Vale SD 84	Malheur	33.3%	100%	43	948
Wallowa SD 12	Wallowa	20.5%	95.3%	15	233
Warrenton-Hammond SD 30	Clatsop	23.9%	100%	44	971
Winston-Dillard SD 116	Douglas	24.3%	97.4%	58	1,433
Woodburn SD 103	Marion	34.1%	100%	236	5,745
Yoncalla SD 32	Douglas	24.3%	83.3%	17	285

By federal definition, for the Title II-A NCLB grants, a high-need LEA is a district:

- (i) that serves not fewer than 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line; **or**
- (A) (ii) for which not less than 20% of the children served by the agency are from families with incomes below the poverty line; **and**
- (B) (i) for which there is a high percentage\* of teachers not teaching in the academic subjects or grade levels that the teachers were trained to teach (i.e., non-highly qualified)

\* The current definition of “high percentage” is based on the state average of district classes taught by highly qualified teachers. Oregon’s average for 2014-15 is 98.0% of all classes. Any district that is at or below the state average is considered to have a “high percentage” of non-highly qualified teachers.

## Poverty Level of 87 Oregon School Districts Not Meeting the 20% Cut Off

Most districts having 15.0% to 19.99% school-aged children living in poverty have “pockets of poverty” within these districts. Many of the medium-sized and large districts, in particular, contain individual schools where well over 50% of the students qualify for free and reduced lunch. (U.S. Census Bureau 2014 data, updated Dec 2015)

<i>Oregon County</i>	<i>School district</i>	<i>Poverty level</i>
Benton	1. Corvallis SD 509J	13.0%
	2. Philomath SD 17J	11.1%
Clackamas	3. Canby SD 86	16.2%
	4. Colton SD 53	8.9%
	5. Estacada SD 108	14.7%
	6. Gladstone SD 115	15.7%
	7. Lake Oswego SD 7J	7.4%
	8. Molalla River SD 35	11.5%
	9. North Clackamas SD 12	12.8%
	10. Oregon City SD 62	11.3%
	11. Oregon Trail SD 46	11.5%
	12. West Linn-Wilsonville SD 3J	7.2%
Clatsop	13. Astoria	17.6%
	14. Jewell SD 8	18.5%
	15. Knappa SD 4	13.3%
Columbia	16. Clatskanie SD 6J	17.2%
	17. Rainier SD 13	12.4%
	18. Scappoose SD 1J	12.8%
	19. St. Helens SD 502	14.7%
	20. Vernonia SD 47J	17.8%
Curry	21. Central Curry SD 1	15.9%
Deschutes	22. Bend-La Pine Admin SD 1	13.6%
	23. Sisters SD 6	11.8%
Douglas	24. Elkton SD 34	17.7%
Gilliam	25. Condon SD 25J	9.6%
Grant	26. Long Creek SD 17	18.0%
	27. Monument SD 8	19.4%
Harney	28. South Harney SD 33	18.8%
Hood River	29. Hood River County SD 1	17.2%
Jackson	30. Central Point SD 6	17.3%
	31. Eagle Point SD 9	19.5%
	32. Pinehurst SD 94	14.3%
Jefferson	33. Black Butte SD 41	19.2%
Lake	34. Plush SD 18	12.5%
Lane	35. Bethel SD 52	17.3%
	36. Creswell SD 40	12.1%
	37. Crow-Applegate-Lorane SD 66	19.9%
	38. Eugene SD 4J	14.7%
	39. Fern Ridge SD 28J	14.3%
	40. Junction City SD 69	14.1%
	41. Lowell SD 71	14.7%
	42. Marcola SD 79J	12.5%

<i>Oregon County</i>	<i>School district</i>	<i>Poverty level</i>
	43. Pleasant Hill SD 1	13.5%
	44. South Lane SD 45J	18.4%
	45. Springfield SD 19	18.4%
Linn	46. Central Linn SD 55	16.9%
	47. Harrisburg SD 7J	16.8%
	48. Santiam Canyon SD 129J	15.2%
	49. Scio SD 95	15.4%
Marion	50. Cascade SD 5	12.2%
	51. Mount Angel SD 91	12.4%
	52. North Marion SD 15	16.9%
	53. North Santiam SD 29J	15.4%
	54. Silver Falls SD 4J	12.9%
	55. St. Paul SD 45	11.4%
Morrow	56. Ione SD R2	8.4%
Multnomah	57. Gresham-Barlow SD 1J	18.3%
	58. Portland SD 1J (8,680 in poverty)	15.5%
	59. Riverdale SD 51J	7.0%
Polk	60. Central SD 13J	18.7%
	61. Dallas SD 2	16.7%
	62. Perrydale SD 21	13.8%
Sherman	63. Sherman County SD	19.5%
Tillamook	64. Nestucca Valley SD 101J	17.7%
Umatilla	65. Helix SD 1	16.3%
	66. Pendleton SD 16	18.2%
	67. Pilot Rock SD 2	11.3%
	68. Stanfield SD 61	11.4%
	69. Umatilla SD 6R	17.8%
Union	70. Cove SD 15	9.6%
	71. Elgin SD 23	18.0%
	72. Imbler SD 11	13.3%
	73. Union SD 5	14.2%
Wallowa	74. Troy SD 54	0.00%
Wasco	75. South Wasco County SD 1	16.4%
Washington	76. Banks SD 13	9.0%
	77. Beaverton SD 48J	13.3%
	78. Forest Grove SD 15	19.3%
	79. Gaston SD 511J	15.5%
	80. Hillsboro SD 1J	15.9%
	81. Sherwood SD 88J	8.2%
	82. Tigard-Tualatin SD 23J	15.0%
Yamhill	83. Amity SD 4J	12.3%
	84. Dayton SD 8	16.9%
	85. Newberg SD 29J	13.6%
	86. Willamina SD 30J	13.3%
	87. Yamhill-Carlton SD 1	9.4%

## Intent to Apply for University/School Partnership Grant

Due 4:00 p.m., May 26, 2016 (See Section C, p. 9 for submission directions)

<b>Fiscal agent</b>	<b>Required Partners (identify by name/institution)</b>
__yes __no	Teacher Education Unit:
__yes __no	Arts & Sciences Unit:
	Eligible High-Need LEA:

<b>High-need LEA?</b>	<b>Other Partners</b>
__yes __no	
__yes __no	
__yes __no	
__yes __no	
__yes __no	

Academic focus area of proposed project:

\_\_ mathematics; \_\_ language arts/literacy; \_\_ science (including engineering design)

Brief description of pK-12 professional development project you are planning as a partnership of a university/college teacher education department, a university/college arts/sciences department, and an eligible high-need school district. (The partnership agreement must be with the school district – generally the Superintendent – even though you may be working with only a few schools in the district.) *This description should approximate, but does not need to exactly match the final proposal submitted. Funds cannot be used for pre-service teacher training or participation although pre-service teachers may attend with other funding.*

**2016-17 Improving Teacher Quality: Oregon University/School Partnership Program**  
**[CFDA 84.367B]**

---

Page 21



## PARTNERSHIP PROFILE FORM

Provide the name of your partner(s) below each of the eligible categories listed. At least one partner in each of categories 1-3 are required in order to comprise an eligible USP partnership. Partners in category 4 are optional. Indicate whether #1 or #2 will be the fiscal agent.

### Our partnership will consist of:

<b>(1) A state or private institution of higher education and the division of the institution that prepares teachers and/or principals</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Agent                      or.....	<b>(2) A division of Arts &amp; Sciences</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Agent	<b>(3) A high-need local education agency. See eligible districts in Attachment</b> <i>If you will work with particular schools within the high-need LEA, list them and place a star (*) next to any partnering school that is "low performing"</i>	<b>(4) Another LEA, public or private school, public charter school, ESD, nonprofit cultural organization, another institution of higher education, school of arts and sciences within such an institution, division of such an institution that prepares teachers and principals, entity carrying out a preK program, teacher organization, principal organization, business.</b>

## Improving Teacher Quality: Oregon University/School Partnership Program

### Joint Effort Document

The proposal must reflect a joint effort between a department/school/college of education, a department/school/college of arts and sciences and a high-need district/local education agency (LEA). This federal requirement is intended to ensure that program activities integrate needed teaching skills with substantive content knowledge and that professional development activities are based on district and state needs and priorities.

Joint effort can take a number of forms, ranging from informal discussions and planning for the project to full sharing of administrative and instructional responsibilities. At minimum joint effort must involve #1; it may also involve #2 and #3.

1. Each unit is given an opportunity to provide comments/input while planning the project.
2. Instructional staff members are drawn from each unit.
3. Each unit plays a role in the evaluation of the project.

#### Statement of Joint Effort

This institution hereby provides assurances that this proposal reflects a joint effort and commitment between a department/school/college of education, a department/school/college of arts and sciences, and a high-need school district/local education agency (LEA).

#### Representative of Department/School/College of Education (Dean or designee)

Signature:	Printed Name:
Title:	Date:
Department:	

#### Representative of Department/School/College of Arts& Sciences (Dean or designee)

Signature:	Printed Name:
Title:	Date:
Department:	

#### Representative of High-Need Local Education Agency (LEA) (Superintendent or designee)

Signature:	Printed Name:
Title:	Date:
Department:	



**Representative of Other Partner Organization** (Superintendent, Director, or designee)

Signature:	Printed Name:
Title:	Date:
Department:	

**Representative of Other Partner Organization** (Superintendent, Director, or designee)

Signature:	Printed Name:
Title:	Date:
Department:	

**Representative of Other Partner Organization** (Superintendent, Director, or designee)

Signature:	Printed Name:
Title:	Date:
Department:	

**Representative of Other Partner Organization** (Superintendent, Director, or designee)

Signature:	Printed Name:
Title:	Date:
Department:	

### USP BUDGET FORM

The budget must be split out by partner (same partners as listed on the Partnership Profile Form) so it can be easily seen that no single partner is using more than 50% of the project budget.

	<b>Partner 1 Fiscal Agent</b>	<b>Partner 2</b>	<b>Partner 3</b>	<b>Partner 4*</b>
<b>1. Salaries &amp; Wages</b>				
<b>2. Employee Benefits</b>				
<b>3. In-State Travel</b>				
<b>4. Materials &amp; Supplies</b>				
<b>5. Other (specify)</b>				
<b>6. Total direct costs</b>				
<b>7. Indirect costs **</b>				
<b>8. Stipends; tuition (exempt from indirect)</b>				
<b>Total Requested</b>				

\* Add additional columns per partner

- ☐ Check here for assurance that no single participant in the eligible partnership will use more than 50% of the grant funds made available to the partnership.

Note: The U.S. Department of Education has imposed a very high burden of proof to show that paying for food and beverages with Federal funds is necessary to meet the goals and objectives of a Federal grant. Meetings should be planned so there is time for participants to purchase their own food, beverages and snacks, if necessary.

## **STATEMENT OF ASSURANCES**

The applicant assures and certifies compliance with the regulations, policies, guidelines, and requirements as they relate to the acceptance and use of federal funds for this federally funded program. Also, the applicant assures that:

1. Funds derived from Title II, Part A, the Teacher and Principal Quality Training and Recruiting Fund Program, will be used only for the purposes for which they are granted.
2. The applicant will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and all regulations issued by the Department of Education, pursuant to the chapter, to the end that no person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which the applicant received federal financial assistance.
3. The applicant will comply with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (P.L. 92-318) and all regulations issued by the Department of Education, pursuant to the title, to the end that no person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, be denied employment in, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.
4. The applicant will comply with OAR 581-015, 581-021-0045, and 581-021-0049, Discrimination Prohibited, issued by the State Board of Education, and ORS 326.051 and ORS 659.150, and 580-15-005, 580-15-010, and 580-15-015, issued by the State Board of Higher Education pursuant to these laws, to the end that no person in Oregon shall, on the basis of age, handicap, national origin, race, marital status, religion, or sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity administered or authorized by the State Board of Education or State Board of Higher Education.
5. The applicant will comply with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 and all regulations issued by the Department of Education, pursuant to this Act.  
(See <http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/ferpa/index.html>)
6. The applicant will use funds only to supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the level of funds from non-Federal sources that would, in the absence of funds made available for the purposes of the project, and may not use funds made available under this part to supplant funds from non-Federal sources.
7. Federal funds made available for the proposed program ensure the equitable participation of private elementary and secondary school teachers in the purposes and benefits of the USP Program.
8. The applicant will make such reports to the State Higher Education Agency or its designated representative, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the agency to perform its duties under this title, and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the state education agency may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

Signature of Chief Executive Officer \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_