

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIPS**

**Funded by the U.S. Department of Education
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001
Public Law 107-110
Title II Part B
Mathematics and Science Partnerships Program
and
Title II Part A, Subpart 3
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants
State Agency for Higher Education (SAHE) Partnerships**

Application Deadline: August 20, 2010

Contact:

Beth Larson-Steckler, Program Administrator
Telephone: (701) 328-3544 Fax: (701) 328-4770
E-mail: esteckler@nd.gov



**NORTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Dr. Wayne G. Sanstead, State Superintendent
600 E Boulevard Avenue, Dept. 201
Bismarck, ND 58505-0440**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIPS**

Table of Contents

	Page
Part I: Purpose	1
Part II: Eligibility	2
Part III: Grant Awards: Number and Amounts	2
Part IV: Evaluation	2
Part V: Proposal Requirements	2
Part VI: Proposal Procedures	5
Part VII: Award Administration.....	5
Appendix A: General Assurances	7
Appendix B: Proposal Scoring Rubric	8
Appendix C: Definitions	9
Appendix D: NDUS Negotiated Course or Program Fees	15
Appendix E: Questions & Answers	16
Appendix F: Partnership Agreement.....	20
:	

**NOTICE OF NONDISCRIMINATION
ND Department of Public Instruction**

The Department of Public Instruction does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, disability, age, sex (wages) or genetics in its programs and activities.

For inquiries regarding nondiscrimination policies, please contact:
Robert Marthaller, Assistant Superintendent,
Department of Public Instruction, 600 East Boulevard Avenue, Dept 201, Bismarck, ND 58505-0440,
701--328-2267.

I. Purpose

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 became law in January, 2002. Major components of the No Child Left Behind legislation are the Improving Teacher Quality Grant Programs (Title II Part A) and the Mathematics and Science Partnerships Program (Title II Part B). These programs encourage scientifically-based professional development as a means for improving student academic performance. As schools are responsible for improving student learning, it is essential to have highly qualified teachers leading the way. Partnerships between high-need school districts and institutions of higher education are at the core of these improvement efforts.

The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction in collaboration with the North Dakota University System is issuing this call for proposals in anticipation of approximately \$1,192,979 in federal funds combined under Title II Part A, Subpart 3 State Agency for Higher Education (SAHE) Partnership Grants and Title II Part B Mathematics and Science Partnership Grants for fiscal year 2010. The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction and the North Dakota University System will collaborate on the review and funding of grant proposals. Applications will only be accepted from institutions of higher education serving as fiscal agents; however, any application must demonstrate the active participation of LEA's in the planning and implementation of the grant.

Through this request for proposals (RFP), the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction and the North Dakota University System solicit partnership applications for funds to provide professional development opportunities for K-12 teachers of mathematics and science. The design of professional development will center on content knowledge, the principles of effective instruction and student learning, a commitment of time and resources for implementing development over an extended period of time, and the employment of professional development styles that engage teachers collaboratively rather than focusing on them as individuals. The goals consist of the following:

- To provide activities that are supported by scientifically-based research and designed to deepen mathematics and science teachers' content knowledge and knowledge of how students learn particular content;
- To improve the quality and coherence of the learning experiences for teachers through high-quality professional development;
- To link teachers' opportunity to learn with their opportunity to implement classroom instruction;
- To promote sustainable relationships between institutions of higher education and K-12 schools that strengthen reform efforts in K-12 education.
- To focus on the education of mathematics and science teachers as a process that continuously stimulates teachers' intellectual growth and upgrades teachers' knowledge and skills;
- To bring mathematics and science teachers in schools together with scientists, mathematicians, and engineers to increase the subject matter knowledge of those teachers and improve such teachers' teaching skills through the use of sophisticated tools and work space, computing facilities, libraries, and other resources that institutions of higher education are better able to provide than the K-12 schools.

Each project will be required to incorporate two-week summer institutes, or its equivalent, that include as a component, a program that provides direct interaction between students and faculty. Activities will include summer institutes and associated follow-up training sessions that enhance the ability of teachers to understand and utilize the State's Mathematics and Science Content and Achievement Standards. These partnerships should also provide opportunities for advanced and on-going professional development activities for teachers to work with scientists, mathematicians, engineers, experienced teachers and university faculty.

II. Eligibility

To be eligible for a subgrant, a “partnership” *must* include:

- a. An accredited four-year North Dakota institution of higher education,
- b. The division of the institution that prepares teachers and principals,
- c. A school of arts and sciences (see *Definitions, Appendix C*),
- d. An engineering, mathematics, or science department of an institution of higher education,

AND

- e. A high-need local educational agency (.see *Definitions, Appendix C*).

In addition to these two required partners, the partnership may also include: another engineering, mathematics, science, or teacher training department of an institution of higher education; additional LEAs, public or private elementary schools or secondary schools, or a consortium of such schools; a business; or a nonprofit or for-profit organization of demonstrated effectiveness in improving the quality of mathematics and science teachers. These requirements are designed to ensure that emphasis is placed on the improvement of content knowledge of teachers in mathematics and science through an expanded role of the disciplinary departments in higher education institutions.

III. Grant Awards: Number and Amounts

Project applicants may submit proposals for a duration of one to possibly two years, depending upon the kinds of activities a subgrant award is funding. To the extent that applicants are able to anticipate project activities in project-year two, they must describe what those activities will be. All awards beyond year one are contingent upon this program receiving funding through the U.S. Department of Education. The NDDPI will have available approximately \$1,192,979 for projects during school year 2010-2011. A comparable amount is anticipated in project years 2011-2012. Accordingly, project proposals should prepare budget requests at or about the same amount each year in multiple-year proposals. The NDDPI is not setting any minimum or maximum award amounts for proposals and is not setting a lower or upper limit to the number of possible awards.

IV. Evaluation

Each eligible partnership receiving a grant shall include the following:

- An evaluation and accountability plan for activities of the project that include rigorous objectives that measure the impact of the activities,
- Measurable objectives to increase the number of mathematics and science teachers who participate in content-based professional development activities,
- Measurable objectives for improved student academic achievement, and
- Annual reports to the NDDPI and the U.S. Department of Education regarding progress in meeting the objectives described in the accountability plan.

V. Proposal Requirements

The narrative sections (excluding appendices) of the proposal must be double-spaced and the font used must not be smaller than 12-point and shall not exceed 15 pages. Proposals must consist of the following components:

Part I is the Submission Cover Page which shall serve as the cover page of the proposal. The cover page must include 1) the project title; 2) the applicant organization’s name and address; 3)

the project director's name, title, address, telephone number, fax # and E-mail address; 4) the partnership members; 5) the number of teachers to be directly engaged in the project; and 6) the signature of authorized official.

Part 2 includes the General Assurances (Appendix A of this RFP). The general assurances must be included as part of the proposal to ensure that the grant recipient is fully aware of its obligations to adhere to all state and federal requirements in the event the grant application is approved.

Part 3 is the Abstract. The proposal must include a one-page summary that briefly describes the project's vision, goals, and activities, key features that will be addressed, and expected outcomes. An electronic submission of the abstract will need to be provided by those awarded the grants.

Part 4 is the Program Narrative, which shall contain the following elements:

- **Needs Assessment:** The project description shall indicate a clear understanding of results of a needs assessment and how the goals and activities of the program are directly related to those needs.
- **Research Summary:** The project description shall discuss and cite the current state of knowledge relevant to the project. This brief literature review should clearly indicate why the proposed activities were selected or designed. If the proposal builds on prior work, the project description should indicate what was learned from this work and how these outcomes are incorporated in the project.
- **Plan of Work:** the proposal must clearly describe the goals and objectives for the project and the responsibility for each of the partners. The project description should indicate a timeline and an estimate of the number, type, duration, and intensity of professional development activities.
- **Alignment With State Content and Achievement Standards:** The professional development activities should develop the content knowledge of teachers in the areas of mathematics and/or science that are a part of the North Dakota Content and Achievement Standards, which can be found at the following website:
<http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/standard/content.shtm>
- **Management Capability:** The project description must clearly demonstrate that the submitting team has the capability of managing the project, organizing the work and meeting deadlines. Management capability refers to the ability of the lead organization to properly manage the project (i.e., operation of project as described in the proposal, accurate and timely submission of reports, the ability to meet institutional requirements to operate the project, and financial responsibility).
- **Sustainability:** The project description should contain evidence that the project can be sustained beyond the life of the project.
- **Partnership Agreement** The project description must include documentation of accountability of all partners and their specific roles. Also included must be an agreement of each partner to be accountable for their specific roles. Appendix F-H can be utilized to document agreement and roles or IHE's can create their own document to outline the contributions and commitments.

Part 5 is the Evaluation Plan. Each application shall provide a description identifying the research and evaluation methods that the project will use, and explain why those methods are appropriate to the issues or questions that the proposal addresses. The proposal must make a compelling case for the activities of the project and describe how the activities will help build a rigorous, cumulative, reproducible, and usable body of findings. The plan must include the following:

- Measurable objectives and annual targets which describe progress towards meeting the goals and objectives established in response to the comprehensive needs assessment;

- Measurable objectives to increase the number of mathematics and science teachers who participate in content-based professional development activities; and
- Measurable objectives for improved student academic achievement in mathematics and science.

Part 6 is the Budget Justification. Describe and define the expenditures as they relate to the proposed activities. Indicate the direct costs for implementing the project, as well as in-kind contributions, indirect costs, and funding from all other sources by amount and source (use only whole dollar amounts). Indirect costs cannot exceed 8% of the awarded amount. Partnerships may use funds for the following: promotion activities, tuition and book fee waivers (applicable to higher education institutions as outlined in Appendix D), graduate credit, registration payments, travel, meals and lodging, stipends, faculty salaries, and other justifiable program administration costs. Include an itemized breakdown of the following budget categories:

Salaries

- Administrator: supervises project staff and/or directs the project. Costs included under this line item must be directly attributable to the project and documented as such.
- Instructional and professional staff: professional staff that provides direct educational/instructional services in the project and are paid a salary through the project.
- Support staff: other project staff that provide services necessary to support direct educational/instructional services in the project.

Fringe Benefits

If fringe benefits are offered to project staff, these benefits must be granted under approved plans and be consistent with the applicant agency's standards for similar costs supported with other than project funds.

Contractual Services

Services that cannot be provided by other full- or part-time staff employed by the project may be contracted for with a specified provider. Generally, these services are for a short-term period and provide a specific and identifiable product or service. All proposals shall include provision for evaluation of the activities in an annual performance report.

Travel

Travel costs may be provided for project personnel on official business incident to the project. Travel costs for project personnel are not to exceed state rates. The NDDPI will allow one out-of state trip per year directly related to the project's goals.

Participant Costs

Expenditures for participants, including tuition and fees, books and course materials, room and board, travel, stipends, etc., should be essential to the conduct of the proposed activities. Travel costs for participants are not to exceed state rates. Grant funds cannot support the purchase of full sets of classroom materials for students of participating teachers.

Other costs

- Communication: advertising, printing, telephone/telecommunications, mailing/postage costs directly related to the project.
- Rent of space/equipment.
- Supplies and materials that are necessary for project staff to conduct project activities.
- Other justifiable program administration costs.

Indirect Costs

Indirect costs for grantees (i.e., accounting, payroll, budgeting, purchasing) are not to exceed 8% of the total direct costs.

The NDDPI reserves the right to negotiate budget parameters with any potential awardee regarding budget items that the Department believes to be excessive or unreasonable.

Attachments may be provided and will not count toward the fifteen-page limitation. Attachments may include the following: evidence of partnerships and scientifically based research, needs assessment results, course syllabi, timelines, itemized budget details, vitae, and other appropriate information.

VI. Proposal Procedures

- A) Delivery of Proposals:** One (1) original and four (4) copies of the written proposal must be sent to the following address:
- ND Department of Public Instruction
 - Beth Larson-Steckler, Program Administrator
 - 600 E Blvd Ave., Dept. 201
 - Bismarck, ND 58505-0440

Incomplete proposals will not be accepted and cannot be returned for revisions. No faxed or electronic copies will be accepted. Proposals will not be accepted after the deadline.

- B) Review Process and Selection of Awards:** An expert review panel will evaluate eligible applications in light of the required application components and the established criteria in this RFP. The evaluation committee will review the proposals and score each proposal according to the following criteria: the final score assigned to each proposal by the review panel; the cost effectiveness ratio determined by the relationship between the number of teachers served, the actual amount of teacher-faculty instructional contact time, and the total cost of the program; and geographic distribution. The review panel will review each eligible application and make recommendations to the NDDPI and the NDUS. Grants will be negotiated with the applicants that have the highest points, whose proposals are most advantageous to the NDDPI and NDUS, and/or comprehensive and responsive as determined by the evaluation committee. Scoring will be based on the following criteria (see Appendix B, Proposal Scoring Rubric):

• Efficacy of Plan	30 points
• Evaluation Plan	25 points
• Demonstration of Need and Research Summary	15 points
• Commitment and Capacity of Partnership	10 points
• Budget and Cost Effectiveness	<u>20 points</u>
	100 points total

VII. Award Administration

- A) Notification of Award:** Notification of grant awards will be announced on or about September 17, 2010.
- B) Project Period:** Year 1 - October 1, 2010 to September 30, 2011, Year 2 - October 1, 2011 to September 30, 2012.
- C) Award Conditions:** Annual awards of the grant are subject to availability of federal funds, adequate progress in meeting yearly project objectives, timely completion of reporting requirements, and submission of a proposed budget and justification for the subsequent year.
- D) Requests for Funds:** Grants are awarded on a cost-reimbursable basis. Payment request forms will be supplied to the grant recipient when the awards are issued.
- E) Reporting Requirements:** Each eligible partnership receiving a grant must report annually to the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction and to the U.S. Department of Education regarding the eligible partnership's progress in meeting the objectives and annual targets described in the partnership's accountability plan. Further information regarding the reporting requirements and forms will be made available by the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction.

- F) **Special Rule:** No single partner in an eligible partnership may use more than 50 percent of the funds made available to the partnership. This provision focuses not on which partner receives the funds, but on which partner directly benefits from them.

Mathematics and Science Partnerships General Assurances

This statement of assurances must be included as Part 2 of the application to ensure that the grant recipient is fully aware of its obligations to adhere to all state and federal requirements in the event the grant application is approved.

The signature of the authorized official on the Submission Cover Page of this application certifies that the applicant:

- Complies with the requirements outlined in the publication “General Requirements for Federal Programs” compiled by the Department of Public Instruction (available on the NDDPI website @ <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/grants/require.pdf>);
- Complies with state and federal laws and regulations applicable to use of federal title funds for each program;
- Complies with Executive Order 12549 regarding debarment and suspension, which states that neither the applicant nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in any transaction by any federal department or agency;
- Supplements rather than supplants existing local, state, or federal funds;
- Will control the funds and administer the funds and any property purchased with the funds to the extent required by the authorizing statutes;
- Will adopt and use proper methods of administering each program, including the enforcement of any obligations imposed by law for carrying out each program and correcting any deficiencies in program operations that may be identified through audits, monitoring, or evaluations;
- Will keep such records and provide such information to DPI as may be reasonably required for fiscal audit and individual or consolidated program evaluation consistent with the responsibilities of DPI;
- Will cooperate in carrying out any evaluation of the programs conducted by or for the State Educational Agency, the Secretary of Education, or other federal officials;
- Will submit reports to the State Educational Agency and the Secretary of Education to enable them to perform their duties under each program and maintain records, provide information, and afford access to the records to enable them to carry out their duties.

Mathematics and Science Partnerships Proposal Scoring Rubric

Reviewer ID# _____

Proposal # _____

Evaluation of proposals will be based upon the following criteria. Maximum points for each category are indicated.

A) Efficacy of Plan _____/30 maximum pts.

- Project supports improved student achievement in the targeted discipline.
- Project provides a two-week summer institute, or its equivalent, with associated follow-up training.
- Project provides direct interaction between students and faculty.
- Project enhances the ability of teachers to understand and utilize the State's Mathematics and/or Science Content and Achievement Standards.
- Project provides opportunities for on-going professional development activities for teachers to work with scientists, mathematicians, engineers, experienced teachers, and university faculty.

B) Evaluation Plan _____/25 maximum pts.

- Project includes measurable objectives and annual targets that describe progress towards meeting the goals and objectives established.
- Project includes measurable objectives to increase the number of teachers who participate in professional development activities in the targeted discipline.
- Project includes measurable objectives for improved student academic achievement.

C) Demonstration of Need and Research Summary _____/15 maximum pts.

- Project provides scientifically-research based professional development activities.
- Project addresses the results of a comprehensive assessment of teacher quality and professional development needs.

D) Commitment and Capacity of Partnership _____/10 maximum pts.

- Submitting team has the capability of managing the project.
- Partners share goals, responsibilities, and accountability.

E) Budget and Cost Effectiveness _____/20 maximum pts.

- Budget relates to the scope and requirements of the project.
- Budget includes provision for evaluation of the activities in an annual performance report.
- Cost effectiveness ratio determined by the relationship between the number of teachers served, the actual amount of teacher faculty instructional contact time, and the total cost of the program.

Total _____/100 maximum pts.

Mathematics and Science Partnerships Definitions

The following definitions are drawn from those included in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Title IX- General Provisions, Part A-Definitions.

High-need Local Education Agency (LEA): (A)(i) An LEA that serves not fewer than 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line; or (ii) for which not less than 20 percent of children served by the agency are from families with incomes below the poverty line (see Table 1 below); and (B)(i) Fewer than 50 percent of students tested scored Proficient on the 2009-2010 North Dakota State Assessments in science (see Table 2 below); or (ii) Fewer than 50 percent of students tested scored Proficient on the 2009-2010 State Assessments in mathematics (see Table 3 below).

The U.S. Department of Education has determined that the only uniform and consistent data that reflect the number or percentage of children served by the local education agency from families with incomes below the poverty line, a term which is defined in section 9101 (33) of the ESEA, are data periodically collected and reported by the U.S. Census Bureau. In November, 2009 the U.S. Census Bureau released model-based estimates of poverty and income in 2008 for states, counties, and school districts from the Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program (available at <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/saipe/>.) Table 1 below lists the school districts in North Dakota that meet the definition of poverty in (A)(ii) above.

Table 1: 2008 U.S. CENSUS BUREAU SCHOOL DISTRICT POVERTY ESTIMATES

	School District	Estimated Poverty Count Ages 5-17 (N)	Estimated Population Count Ages 5-17 (N)	Total Poverty Percent
1	FORT TOTTEN PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 30	1905	565	29.66%
2	SOLENS PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 3	1130	299	26.46%
3	WARWICK PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 29	1058	270	25.52%
4	BELCOURT PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 7	6025	1496	24.83%
5	DUNSEITH PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 1	2974	720	24.21%
6	SURREY PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 41	1441	345	23.94%
7	MAPLETON PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 7	1011	240	23.74%
8	FORT YATES PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 4	2657	614	23.11%
9	UNITED PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 7	2977	672	22.57%
10	NEDROSE PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 4	1666	372	22.33%
11	TWINBUTTES PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 37	293	65	22.18%
12	MANDAREE PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 36	772	171	22.15%
13	EIGHTMILE PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 6	723	159	21.99%
14	SAWYER PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 16	805	177	21.99%
15	THOMPSON PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 61	2057	451	21.93%
16	WHITE SHIELD PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 85	461	101	21.91%
17	ST JOHN PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 3	1373	300	21.85%
18	SWEET BRIAR PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 17	121	26	21.49%
19	NEW TOWN PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 1	2821	605	21.45%
20	MANNING PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 45	150	32	21.33%
21	CENTRAL CASS PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 17	3828	807	21.08%
22	WYNDMERE PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 42	1334	277	20.76%
23	LONETREE PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 6	285	58	20.35%
24	KINDRED PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 2	3627	737	20.32%
25	MANVEL PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 125	1452	293	20.18%
26	GLENBURN PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT 26	1017	204	20.06%

Table 2: Schools Where 50% or Less of the Students Achieved Proficiency in Science

	District & School Name	% of Students Who Scored Proficient on Science Test
1	Warwick 29 Warwick Public School (PK06)	0.00%
2	Naughton 25 Naughton School (OK08)	0.00%
3	Menoken 33 Menoken Elem School (OK08)	0.00%
4	Montpelier 14 Montpelier Public School (OK06)	0.00%
5	Ft Totten 30 Four Winds Community High School (0912)	3.33%
6	Standing Rock Community Schools Standing Rock Community Grant High School (0912)	6.98%
7	Warwick 29 Warwick Public School (0712)	9.09%
8	Milnor 2 Sundale Colony School (OK08)	10.00%
9	Dunseith 1 Dunseith High School (0912)	11.43%
10	Mandaree 36 Mandaree Public School (OK08)	11.54%
11	Mandaree 36 Mandaree Public School (0912)	12.50%
12	Dickinson 1 Southwest Community High School (0912)	14.29%
13	Emerado 127 Emerado Elem School (PK08)	15.38%
14	Ft Yates 4 Ft Yates Middle School (0608)	16.28%
15	Selfridge 8 Selfridge Public School (0712)	16.67%
16	TGU 60 TGU Towner Public School (0912)	17.39%
17	Kidder County 1 Tappen Public School (0912)	25.00%
18	Edgeley 3 Willow Bank Colony School (OK08)	25.00%
19	Alexander 2 Alexander Public School (PK06)	25.00%
20	White Shield 85 White Shield Public School (0712)	25.00%
21	Solen 3 Solen High School (0912)	25.00%
22	Belcourt 7 Turtle Mt Community Middle School (0608)	27.45%
23	New Town 1 New Town High School (0608)	28.85%
24	White Shield 85 White Shield Public School (OK06)	30.00%
25	Minnewaukan 5 Minnewaukan Public School (PK08)	30.30%
26	Linton 36 Linton Public School (0912)	33.33%
27	Little Heart 4 Little Heart Elem School (OK08)	33.33%
28	Marmarth 12 Marmarth Elem School (OK08)	33.33%
29	Kensal 19 Kensal Public School (PK08)	33.33%
30	Lewis and Clark 161 North Shore Elem School (PK06)	33.33%
31	Parshall 3 Parshall High School (0712)	35.14%

32	Standing Rock Community Schools Standing Rock Community Elem School (0K05)	35.85%
33	Belcourt 7 Turtle Mt Community High School (0912)	36.00%
34	New Town 1 New Town High School (0912)	36.84%
35	St John 3 St John Public School (0912)	37.04%
36	Minto 20 Minto Public School (0912)	38.89%
37	Maddock 9 Maddock Public School (0912)	40.00%
38	Sterling 35 Sterling Elem School (0K08)	40.00%
39	Sterling 35 Halliday Public School (0912)	40.00%
40	Dunseith 1 Dunseith Elem School (0K08)	40.00%
41	McClusky 19 McClusky Elem School (0K06)	40.00%
42	McClusky 19 McClusky High School (0712)	40.00%
43	Barnes County North 7 Barnes Co N-Wimbledon/Court Public School (PK06)	42.86%
44	Oberon 16 Oberon Elem School (0K08)	42.86%
45	Newburg-United 54 Newburg-United Public School (0712)	42.86%
46	Twin Buttes 37 Twin Buttes Elem School (0K08)	42.86%
47	Finley-Sharon 19 Finley-Sharon Public School (0712)	42.86%
48	North Border 100 North Border-Walhalla Public School (0912)	43.75%
49	Eight Mile 6 Eight Mile Public School (0912)	43.75%
50	Eight Mile 6 Eight Mile Public School (0K08)	43.75%
51	LaMoure 8 LaMoure Colony School (0K08)	44.44%
52	Leeds 6 Leeds Public School (0912)	45.45%
53	St Thomas 43 St Thomas Public School (0712)	45.45%
54	New Salem 49 Prairie View Elem School (0K06)	45.83%
55	Edmore 2 Edmore High School (0712)	46.67%
56	Drayton 19 Drayton Public School (0712)	47.06%
57	Beach 3 Beach High School (0712)	47.17%
58	Devils Lake 1 Central Middle School (0508)	48.41%
59	Dakota Prairie 1 Dakota Prairie High School (0712)	48.65%
60	Minnewaukan 5 Minnewaukan Public School (0912)	50.00%
61	Minnewaukan 5 Minnewaukan Public School (0912)	50.00%
62	Bowbells 14 Bowbells Public School (0712)	50.00%
63	Kidder County 1 Tappen Public School (0K08)	50.00%
64	Flasher 39 Flasher Public School (0K06)	50.00%
65	Goodrich 16 Goodrich Public School (0K06)	50.00%

66	Solen 3 Cannon Ball Elem School (0K08)	50.00%
67	Selfridge 8 Selfridge Public School (0K06)	50.00%
68	Pingree-Buchanan 10 Pingree-Buchanan Elem School (PK07)	50.00%
69	Hatton 7 Hatton Public School (0712)	50.00%
70	Kenmare 28 Kenmare High School (0712)	50.00%
71	Pleasant Valley 35 Pleasant Valley Elem School (0K08)	50.00%
72	Grenora 99 Grenora Public School (0712)	50.00%

Table 3: Schools Where 50% or Less of the Students Scored Proficient in Mathematics

School District & School Name		% of Students Who Scored Proficient on Math Test
1	Standing Rock Community Schools Standing Rock Community Grant High School (0912)	0.00%
4	Ft Totten 30 Four Winds Community High School (0912)	6.67%
	Selfridge 8 Selfridge Public School (0712)	8.33%
	Mandaree 36 Mandaree Public School (0912)	12.50%
	White Shield 85 White Shield Public School (0712)	14.81%
	Warwick 29 Warwick Public School (0712)	15.22%
	Solen 3 Solen High School (0912)	15.38%
	Ft Yates 4 Ft Yates Middle School (0608)	16.56%
	Halliday 19 Halliday Public School (0912)	20.00%
	Dunseith 1 Dunseith High School (0912)	25.71%
	Mandaree 36 Mandaree Public School (0K08)	26.14%
	TGU 60 TGU Towner Public School (0912)	30.43%
	Cavalier 6 Cavalier Public School (0912)	31.03%
	Belcourt 7 Turtle Mt Community High School (0912)	31.20%
	New Town 1 New Town High School (0912)	31.58%
	Naughton 25 Naughton School (0K08)	33.33%
	Little Heart 4 Little Heart Elem School (0K08)	33.33%
	Minto 20 Minto Public School (0912)	33.33%
	Selfridge 8 Selfridge Public School (0K06)	36.00%
	New 8 Garden Valley Elem School (0708)	36.00%
	New Town 1 New Town High School (0608)	36.97%
	St John 3 St John Public School (0912)	37.04%
	Warwick 29 Warwick Public School (PK06)	37.50%
	Kidder County 1 Tappen Public School (0912)	37.50%

North Border 100 North Border-Walhalla Public School (0912)	37.50%
McClusky 19 McClusky High School (0712)	38.89%
Goodrich 16 Goodrich Public School (0712)	40.00%
Parshall 3 Parshall High School (0712)	41.67%
Solen 3 Cannon Ball Elem School (0K08)	41.67%
White Shield 85 White Shield Public School (0K06)	42.11%
Mott-Regent 1 Mott-Regent Public School (0912)	42.86%
Goodrich 16 Goodrich Public School (0K06)	42.86%
Lewis and Clark 161 Berthold Public School (0912)	45.00%
Griggs County Central 18 Griggs County Central Public School (0912)	45.83%
TGU 60 TGU Granville Public School (0912)	46.15%
West Fargo 6 West Fargo High School (1012)	46.93%
Eight Mile 6 Eight Mile Public School (0912)	47.06%
Oberon 16 Oberon Elem School (0K08)	48.15%
Valley City 2 Valley City Jr-Sr High School (0912)	48.96%
Standing Rock Community Schools Standing Rock Community Elementary School (0K05)	49.07%
Central Cass 17 Central Cass Public School (0912)	49.12%
Wahpeton 37 Wahpeton High School (0912)	49.40%
St Thomas 43 St Thomas Public School (0712)	50.00%
St Thomas 43 St Thomas Public School (0K06)	50.00%
Rolette 29 Rolette Public School (0912)	50.00%
Fordville-Lankin 5 Fordville-Lankin Public School (0712)	50.00%
Harvey 38 Harvey High School (0912)	50.00%

High Quality Professional Development: Instructional activities that:

- are based on scientifically-based research and state academic content standards, student academic achievement standards and assessment;
- improve and increase teacher's content knowledge of the academic subjects they teach;
- enable teachers to become highly qualified; and
- are sustained, intensive and classroom-focused in order to have a positive and lasting impact on classroom instruction and the teacher's performance in the classroom.

Scientifically-based research: means research that involves the application of rigorous, systemic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs. Also includes research that:

- employs systematic, empirical methods that draw on observation or experiment;
- involves rigorous data analyses that are adequate to test the state hypotheses and justify the general conclusions drawn;

- relies on measurements or observational methods that provide reliable valid data across evaluators and observers, across the 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.

Summer Workshop or Institute: means a workshop or institute conducted during the summer that:

- Is conducted for a period of not less than two weeks or sixty hours;
- Includes, as a component, a program that provides direct interaction between classroom teachers and university faculty; and
- Provides for follow-up training during the academic year that is conducted in the classroom for a period of not less than four consecutive or nonconsecutive days, except that if the follow-up training is for teachers in rural school districts, the follow-up training may be conducted through distance learning.

School of Arts and Sciences:

- Applies to the organizational unit of the Institution of Higher Education; and
- An organizational unit of an institution of higher education is any academic unit that offers one or more academic majors in disciplines or content areas corresponding to the academic subjects in which teachers teach; and
- Where math and science degrees are awarded by both the College of Arts and Sciences and by the College of Engineering; or
- Where economic degrees are awarded by both the College of Arts and Sciences and by the Agricultural College, the College of Engineering or the Agricultural College.

**NORTH DAKOTA STATE BOARD OF
HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY MANUAL**

SUBJECT: FINANCIAL AFFAIRS

EFFECTIVE: October 28, 1999

Section: 805.1.4 Negotiated Course or Program Fees

The Board recognizes that postsecondary institutions require the flexibility to price courses or programs offered directly to business and industry and other non-traditional customers based on market demand in order to deliver the training contemplated by NDCC chapter 52-08 and respond to the need for other programs in non-traditional markets. Accordingly, university system institutions may negotiate a flat rate charge, not less than the residence tuition rate, to be paid in full or in part by a third party for the delivery of courses or programs to a defined group of students. The Chancellor may, upon application of an institution and documentation of special circumstances, approve a charge less than the resident tuition rate.

Reference: NDUS Procedure 805.1.4

HISTORY: New Policy. SBHE Minutes, October 28, 1999.

**Department of Public Instruction
600 E Boulevard Avenue
Bismarck ND 58505-0440**

Questions and Answers Mathematics and Science Partnerships

Question 1: *Would you be able to give more clarification on the special rule on page 6 of the RFP?*

“Special Rule: No single partner in an eligible partnership may use more than 50 percent of the funds made available to the partnership. This provision focuses not on which partner receives the funds, but on which partner directly benefits from them.”

(1) This is referring to all partners within the project, not just the 2 required (Higher Ed and High Need LEA), correct? So for example in our current 05B project, the consortium would be considered one partner and we would not be in compliance with this rule if it were in effect for this grant project, because more than 50% of funds are benefiting the consortium schools, correct?

Response: The question implies that a consortium, consisting of several school districts, constitutes a single partner. This is incorrect. According to historical practice, including Title IIA guidance, which provides clarity to this special rule but is not understood as the guidance for this project’s RFP (reference <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/titleII/partA.shtm>), this issue is addressed accordingly: “Section 2132(c) of the law (No Child Left Behind Act of 2001) requires that no single participant in an eligible partnership, (i.e., no single high-need LEA, no single IHE and its division that prepares teachers and principals, no single school of arts and sciences, and no other single partner), may “use” more than 50 percent of the subgrant. The provision focuses not on which partner receives the funds, but on which partner directly benefits from them.”

For the purposes of this RFP, the Department of Public Instruction considers each respective, individual school institution (i.e., LEA or IHE) as an individual partner. The Department does not consider a consortium to be a partner; instead, each individual school institution within the consortium is considered to be an individual partner of the subgrant or project.

(2) Is it implying that we should be spending more funding on the high need LEA?

Response: As stated in Section 2132(c) of federal guidance referenced earlier, no single partner may receive more than 50 percent benefit from the subgrant. Guidance makes no further reference to the status of any partner or the proportion of their benefit. There exists no implication that a high need LEA should receive any proportional benefit from the subgrant.

(3) Since projects are centered around professional development, does this rule imply that some of the funds should be used for professional development opportunities for the higher ed faculty to attend, not just for them to facilitate?

Response: The purpose of this subgrant project is for Higher Education content specialists to provide instruction to LEA teachers for the advancement of mathematics and science knowledge. The Department believes that every effort should be made to secure high quality professional development for LEA teachers as a high priority within any proposal. The Department is mindful that a modest, proportional level of professional development may be provided to Higher Education content specialists in the provision of such instruction; however, any such professional development for IHE faculty must be modest in nature, proportional in scope, and limited in the allocation of resources.

(4) Is this rule implying that we want to make sure that the project is a “many” way street, where K-12 is learning from higher ed and higher ed is learning from K-12, and both are learning from the workforce of scientists, mathematicians, and engineers?

Response: The Department references its response to Question 1(3) above for clarification on this matter.

(5) Does this rule imply that all partners, including business and nonprofit or for-profit organizations should benefit from the professional development offered as well? Or can they still facilitate only?

Response: The Department references its response to Question 1(3) above for clarification on this matter.

(6) I guess my main question is, if the words “directly benefits from” implies receive professional development training?

Response: The Department encourages any proposals to define the nature of the benefit that will be offered or received during the course of this subgrant project. This RFP provides sufficient guidance to allow bidders to put forth their best interpretation of any benefits to be offered or received. The Department believes that the RFP provides sufficient guidance to aid bidders in determining any benefits.

Question 2: *The language in the RFP notes: “Partnerships between high-need school districts and the engineering, mathematics or science department faculty in institutions of higher education are at the core of these improvement efforts.” Mathematics, science, or engineering faculty will be involved in the proposals, but might other entities also provide professional development opportunities as faculty also are committed to teaching full time during the school year?*

Response: The Department believes that the RFP is clear in its intent to emphasize the critical role of mathematics, science, or engineering content specialists in this subgrant proposal. The Department encourages any proposals to adhere to this principle. If any other entity might contribute to this subgrant proposal by providing appropriate content specialists, then a bidder must provide sufficient project activity narrative to ensure that these other entities will work in close collaboration with any IHE faculty.

Question 3: *The RFP specifically defines the professional development as “summer institute.” Does this mean that the institute can only be held in the summer? What is the length as noted by “two weeks in length”—does that mean 5 full days each week?*

Also, we are finding that many teachers/schools are preferring to have the professional development to be held during the school year. Might the institutes be held during the school year?

Response: The RFP (page 1) requires each project to incorporate two-week summer institutes, or its equivalent, into any subgrant project to provide direct interaction between Higher Education content specialists and LEA teachers. This requirement meets the intent of Section 2201 of the No Child Left Behind Act which defines summer workshops or institutes as the primary means of providing professional development. The Department understands a week to mean five full days of instruction. The RFP clearly allows proposals to put forth an equivalent manner of providing instruction that is meaningful, equivalent in duration and intensity, and adheres to a two-week *minimum* contact time. The Department does not limit the scheduling of summer institutes to any specific time period. It is the responsibility of any bidder to propose a meaningful equivalent means of delivering any professional development that meets this intent. The Department encourages bidders to adhere to the intent of the Act's requirements for the rigor, duration, and intensity of professional development.

Question 4: *I am interested in getting some additional information on the Math and Science Partnership Program. Specifically, during the last grant cycle for which data is available, how many applications were received, and of those received, how many were funded? Also, if there have been any significant changes in the budget allocation from last year to this year?*

Response: This RFP marks the first time that the Department of Public Instruction and the North Dakota University System have combined the Title IIA and Title IIB funds provided under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act into a single, unified subgrant project. The Department of Public Instruction respectfully observes that any reference to the number of previous applications and awards of previous competitions based on separate funding requirements is irrelevant and will not contribute to any meaningful insight into the possible level of competition anticipated in this subgrant project.

The Department has stated in the RFP the anticipated allocation available under both Title IIA and Title IIB for the purposes of this subgrant project. The RFP also references the number and range of possible awards that might be granted during this competition. The Department does not wish to characterize further the scope of any awards resulting from this current subgrant project competition.

Question 5:

(1) Page 1 of the RFP states: "Each project will be required to incorporate two-week summer institutes, or its equivalent..." What do you consider a two-week equivalent? Can the institute be more than two weeks? The summer courses in our master's program, funded by the previous grant, are 3-6 weeks in length with additional 2-4 day workshops. Can these courses be used to satisfy the two-week requirement or are the 3-6 week courses too long? Our program is content-based and we know that teaching content too fast can be trying for students. Thus, we are concerned about teaching content too fast without the necessary time to "digest" the material and give students feedback about their work. If content is taught too fast, retention of the content decreases and their understanding of how to use the content in the classroom may not be complete.

Response: The Department references its response to Question 3 above for clarification on this matter.

(2) The RFP requires partnerships with a high-need local educational agency (LEA). In the past there was a form used to document this partnership/commitment. Will there be a similar form for this grant or should a signed letter be used to document the partnership/commitment?

Response: Page 1, paragraph 2 of the RFP clearly identifies the need for a bidder to demonstrate the active participation of LEAs in the planning and implementation of the grant; however, the RFP neither provides nor requires a specific form to document this partnership. The Department encourages bidders to provide an appropriate manner of documenting any partnerships, including but not limited to letters of support or participation. Note that the RFP, on page 3 under "Plan of Work", also states that bidders must clearly describe the goals and objectives for the project and the responsibility of each of the partners.

(3) Part VII of the RFP states: "Special Rule: No single partner in an eligible partnership may use more than 50 percent of the funds made available to the partnership. This provision focuses not on which partner receives the funds, but on which partner directly benefits from them." Please clarify this statement. What do you mean by "directly benefits from them?" Are you referring to who receives the most instruction and training instead of the most funding?"

Response: The Department references its response to Question 1, which addresses various aspects of this issue. The fundamental principle of the 50 percent rule is to ensure the fair, equitable exposure of all partners to the receipt of instructional services and the expenditure of funding. No single partner should receive an inordinately large (i.e., greater than 50%) level of benefit from the project that is not available to the other partners. Equitable participation is a guiding principle of this subgrant project. It is the understanding of the Department that any instructional service carries a commensurate cost, either in the service received or payment for service. If any partner were to receive an inordinate or *restrictive* or *dedicated* level of benefit (i.e., instructional services or funding exceeding 50 percent) not made available to other partners, then that partner would receive an inequitable benefit. However, if several partners were to participate in a generally available instructional service or funding, then no single partner would receive a restrictive benefit.

The Department cannot anticipate all possible scenarios or service models proposed by bidders. Bidders should describe how the allocation of resources and benefits will ensure equity among all partners according to the 50 percent rule.

(4) The RFP requires the project to include measurable objectives for improved student academic achievement. What are you expecting here? Do you want standardized tests, like CTBS test scores, before, during, and after teachers participate in the project? Can we create our own instrument to measure student academic achievement? We need more input on how you would like this done.

Response: The Department does not provide any specific definition of measurable objectives or require the use of any specific assessment model. The Department encourages any bidder to define its own measurable objectives and means of measuring the achievement of these measurable objectives.

