

Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Grants 2009-2010

Based on progress made during the 2008-2009 grant cycle, fourteen projects are recommended for continued funding for the 2009-2010 fiscal year at the amount indicated. (Project Name and Fiscal agents are in bold print.) Four new projects are recommended for first-year funding during 2009-2010.

MSP Projects Recommended for Continued Funding in 2009-2010

Project Name/Year of Funding	Partners		With this SBE Action	Upon release of 09-10 funds from USED	TOTAL Recommended Funding
	LEA (SBE District)	IHE			
Mountain Valley Partnership (supplement to original funding) Year 3 of 3 (Cohort IV)	Ashe County Schools (7) , Alleghany County Schools (7), Catawba County Schools (7), Elkin City Schools (7), Hickory City Schools (7), Watauga County Schools (7), Wilkes County Schools (7), Yadkin County Schools (7)	Appalachian State University Department of Mathematical Sciences and the Mathematics and Science Education Center, Catawba Valley Community College, Surry Community College	\$300,000.00	\$206,179.00	\$506,179.00
Quality Teaching and Learning Equal High Levels of Mathematics and Science Instruction (QTL=^MS) Year 3 of 3 (Cohort IV)	Cleveland County Schools (6) , McDowell County Schools (8), Rutherford County Schools (8)	Appalachian State University Department of Mathematical Sciences and the Mathematics and Science Education Center	\$300,000.00	\$ 69,819.00	\$369,819.00
Partnerships for Improving Mathematics Understanding of Students and Teachers (PIMUST) Year 3 of 3 (Cohort IV)	Columbus County Schools (4)	University of North Carolina at Wilmington Science and Mathematics Education Center	\$300,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$400,000.00
Physics Project Year 3 of 3 (Cohort IV)	Winston Salem Forsyth (5) , Guilford (5), Robeson (4), plus additional districts as space is available	University of North Carolina at Greensboro, University of North Carolina at Pembroke, American Association of Physics Teachers	\$205,236.00	\$ 22,797.00	\$ 228,033.00

Project Name/Year of Funding	Partners		With this SBE Action	Upon release of 09-10 funds from USED	TOTAL Recommended Funding
	LEA (SBE District)	IHE			
Partners for Mathematics Learning: Disseminating North Carolina's 2008 Mathematics Curriculum Standards Year 3 of 3 (Cohort IV)	Roanoke Rapids (3) , Buncombe(8), Charlotte-Mecklenburg (6), Columbus (4), Durham (3), Winston Salem Forsyth (5), Guilford (5), Harnett (4), McDowell(8), Union (6), STATEWIDE PROJECT	Meredith College	\$500,000.00	\$288,478.00	\$788,478.00
Teacher Algebra Network Year 3 of 3 (Cohort IV)	Avery (7) , Alleghany County Schools (7), Ashe County Schools (7)	Appalachian State University Department of Mathematical Sciences	\$ 80,245.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 80,245.00
Project MATH (Making Algebraic Thinking Happen) Year 3 of 3 (Cohort IV)	Person (5)	UNC Chapel Hill Department of Mathematics; UNC Chapel Hill Center for Mathematics and Science Education	\$ 83,640.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 83,640.00
Trajectory of Science Scholars Year 3 of 3 (Cohort IV)	Durham (3)	NC State University Department of Mathematics, Science, and Technology Education, NC State University Department of Zoology	\$100,000.00	\$ 73,245.00	\$ 173,245.00
Empowering Teachers and Students through Problem Based Mathematics Year 3 of 3 (Cohort IV)	Buncombe (8), Asheville City (8)	Department of Mathematics, University of North Carolina at Asheville	\$200,000.00	\$223,254.00	\$ 423,254.00
NCIM Year 3 of 3 (Cohort IV)	Weldon City Schools (3) , Warren(3), Duplin (2), Bertie (1), Durham (3), Winston Salem Forsyth (5), Wayne (2), Northampton (3), Hoke (4), Cumberland (4), Scotland (4), plus additional districts as	North Carolina State University, North Carolina New Schools Project	\$300,000.00	\$165,087.00	\$465,087.00

Project Name/Year of Funding	Partners		With this SBE Action	Upon release of 09-10 funds from USED	TOTAL Recommended Funding
	LEA (SBE District)	IHE			
	space is available				
TEAMS Partnership (K-8 Math/Sci) Year 2 of 3 (Cohort V)	Alamance Burlington School System (5), Orange (5), Vance (3)	Elon College, Vance Community College	\$251,119.00	\$0.00	\$251,119.00
CSI Teams Project (K-12 Math) Year 2 of 3 (Cohort V)	Polk County Public Schools (8), Cherokee (8), Henderson (8), Madison (8), Swain (8), Transylvania (8), Yancey (8)	Appalachian State University Department of Mathematical Sciences and the Mathematics and Science Education Center	\$192,468.00	\$0.00	\$192,468.00
Modeling Instruction in Physics, Physical Science, and Chemistry Year 2 of 3 (Cohort V)	Watauga County Schools (7), Buncombe (8), Durham (3), Caldwell (7), Martin (1), STATE-WIDE project	North Carolina State University, Science House	\$555,491.00	\$162,991.00	\$718,482.00
Collaborative and Sustainable Ventures in Implementing the NC SCS (Mathematics 9-12) Year 2 of 3 (Cohort V)	Winston Salem Forsyth County Schools (5), Ashe (7), Burke (7), Caldwell (7), Cherokee (8), Elkin (7), Henderson (8), Hickory (7), Madison (8), Orange (5), Wilkes (7) STATE-WIDE project	Appalachian State University Department of Mathematical Sciences and the Mathematics and Science Education Center	\$250,000.00	\$ 65,695.00	\$315,695.00
			With this SBE Action	Upon release of 09-10 funds from USED	TOTAL Recommended Funding
Total for Continuing Projects			\$3,618,199.00	\$1,377,545.00	\$4,995,744.00

MSP Projects Recommended for New Funding in 2009-2010

Project Name/Year of Funding	Partners		With this SBE Action	Upon release of 09-10 funds from USED	TOTAL Recommended Funding
	LEA (SBE District)	IHE			
Mathematics Achievement Success Today (MAST) (9-12 Math) Year 1 of 3 (Cohort VI)	Brunswick County Schools (2)	University of North Carolina at Wilmington (UNC-W), Science Math Education Center at UNC-W	\$ 99,972.00	\$0.00	\$ 99,972.00
Partnering to Reinforce Integration of Mathematics and Science (PRISM) (K-8 Math and Science) Year 1 of 3 (Cohort VI)	Cumberland County Schools (4)	North Carolina State University (NSCU), NCSU Science House	\$209,750.00	\$0.00	\$209,750.00
BRIDGES (K-5 Math & Science) Year 1 of 3 (Cohort VI)	Onslow County Schools (2), Carteret County Schools (2)	University of North Carolina at Wilmington (UNC-W), NCSU Science House, The Jason Project	\$333,777.00	\$0.00	\$333,777.00
Developing Standards-Based Mathematics Teachers Year 1 of 3 (Cohort VI)	Kannapolis City Schools (6), Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools (6)	University of North Carolina at Charlotte (UNC-C), UNC-C Center for Mathematics and Science Education	\$332,650.00	\$0.00	\$332,650.00
			With this SBE Action	Upon release of 09-10 funds from USED	TOTAL Recommended Funding
Total for New Projects			\$976,149.00	\$0.00	\$976,149.00

MSP 2009-2010 Funding Summary

	With this SBE Action	Upon release of 09-10 funds from USED	TOTAL Recommended Funding
Total for Continuing Projects	\$3,618,199.00	\$1,377,545.00	\$4,995,744.00
Total for New Projects	\$976,149.00	\$0.00	\$976,149.00
Total	\$4,594,348.00	\$1,377,545.00	\$5,971,893.00

**Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Grants
Review Process
February 2009**

The table below indicates all proposals submitted for new funding in the 2009-2010 NC Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Program. All projects were reviewed using a rubric¹. The table below indicates the quality band rating for each proposal that met the technical specifications in the Request for Proposals (RFP). Four projects are recommended for new funding in 09-10: Brunswick, Cumberland, Onslow, and Kannapolis. NCSBE Policy #EEO-O-001 was followed without deviation.

Project	SBE District	Met RFP Requirements	Review Team Rating	Final Selection/Rank
Brunswick	2	Y	strong	1
Cumberland	4	Y	average	2
Onslow	2	Y	average	3
Kannapolis City	6	Y	average	4
Lee	4	Y	average	5
Davidson	5	Y	average	6
Cabarrus	6	Y	average	7
Scotland	4	Y	average	8
Charlotte Mecklenburg	6	Y	average	9
Lincoln	6	Y	weak	10

¹A copy of the **MSP Rating Form** is attached to this memo.

NC MSP RATING FORM

2009-2010 Proposal Reviews

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

LEA/Fiscal Agent: _____

Are any required components missing? (see RFP, page 13-14) No Yes If yes, which one(s)? _____

Focus Area of the RFP (Mark all that apply)

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics K-5 | <input type="checkbox"/> Physical Science Strand K-8 | <input type="checkbox"/> Jason Project (K-8) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> High School Biology | <input type="checkbox"/> High School Geometry | <input type="checkbox"/> High School Integrated Math |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Graduate Level University Courses | | |

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

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

Reference LEA forms in Appendix E and choose one:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NC MSP Rating Form				POINTS AWARDED
Section III, Part F: Evaluation Plan and Research Design (20 points possible)				
Named and presented credentials of those conducting evaluation of the project and their responsibilities	(4 points) A specific person/contractor has been named external evaluator and has experience in the field of project evaluation for mathematics and/or science professional development. Responsibilities are clearly identified and described.	(1-3 points) A specific external evaluator is named, but their credentials are unclear regarding expertise for evaluating mathematics and/or science professional development OR responsibilities are not clearly identified and described.	(0 points) An external evaluator is not named OR is not independent of the project.	
Described an overall evaluation plan that uses multiple measures to gather appropriate formative and summative data on project objectives	(4-5 points) The evaluation plan is designed to gather appropriate information about each project objective, using both quantitative and qualitative methods. For each objective, an evaluation table clearly lists suitable data to be collected, the instruments or protocols used, and target audience for the data collection. Mechanisms are described for gathering ongoing formative feedback on project activities and participant progress, and incorporating it into project planning.	(1-3 points) The evaluation plan addresses project objectives overall, but it is not clear how each objective will be measured and reported. OR the evaluation table contains incomplete information OR data to be collected are insufficient, too narrow, or inappropriate to inform progress on the objectives OR the evaluation gives insufficient attention to gathering and using formative data.	(0 points) An evaluation table is not included OR the description of the evaluation plan is unclear or incomplete OR the plan focuses solely on some objectives and excludes the others.	
Described a credible evaluation design and appropriate instruments and protocols to be used	(4 points) Evaluation design includes collecting data from both the participant group and a similar comparison group (random assignment preferred but not required). Pre/post measures are collected for both groups, with statistical analysis comparing pre/post changes. Size of the participant and comparison groups is sufficient for the analysis to detect meaningful differences. Instruments to be used for teacher or student content assessment have a significant objective component (not just self-report) and have documented validity and reliability.	(1-3 points) Evaluation design may include a comparison group. At a minimum, pre/post measures are collected from the participant group, to document changes during the project. Number of teachers is sufficient for statistical analysis. Instruments to be used for teacher or student content assessment have a significant objective component (not just self-report), but validity and reliability are not discussed or are not available.	(0 points) Evaluation design includes only post-testing participants. Baseline data are not collected to enable changes to be measured. OR Teacher or student content assessment is by self-report measures only; no objective assessment is included.	

<p>Presented a detailed timeline of the evaluation activities</p>	<p>(2 points) Timeline is clear and specific about evaluation-related activities and when they will occur. Timing and scope of activities are reasonable when compared to the typical school year. Measures/instruments are clearly identified as well as the number of and classification of the participants.</p>	<p>(1 point) Timeline is presented but does not include ALL of the required information OR is only very general.</p>	<p>(0 points) Timeline is <u>not</u> available OR is so generic that no assessment of its quality or reasonableness can be made.</p>	
<p>Presented a research design to investigate the effects of the professional development model chosen</p>	<p>(3 points) The research component is designed to yield credible information about the p.d. approach taken by the project that can be used by others working in this domain. (Examples of such information could include: generalizing results beyond the participant group; identifying factors in the p.d. model and their contribution to the outcomes observed; examining system barriers and supports that impact implementing the p.d. model; etc.) The design is appropriate to the nature and scale of the project and is likely to produce useable knowledge.</p>	<p>(1-2 points) The proposal contains a research component, but it lacks clarity as to the nature of the information to be generated OR has design issues that make it unlikely to yield the intended information OR is unclear about who will be involved in carrying out the research.</p>	<p>(0 points) A research component is not included OR is not distinct from the project's summative evaluation.</p>	
<p>Presented a method of disseminating results of the research as a part of planned activities</p>	<p>(2 points) A method of disseminating results of the research is included as part of the planned activities that will include presentation of successful strategies and curricula and lessons learned.</p>	<p>(1 point) Disseminating results of the research is included as part of the planned activities but no details are provided as to how or when.</p>	<p>(0 points) Disseminating results of the research is not described.</p>	
			<p>SECTION III, Part F TOTAL POINTS</p>	
<p>POINT JUSTIFICATION / REVIEW COMMENTS (REQUIRED):</p>				

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

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

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

**NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Policy Manual**

Policy Identification

Priority: Effective and Efficient Operations

Category: Contracts and Grants

Policy ID Number: EEO-O-001

Policy Title: Policy establishing competitive/discretionary grant proposal review process

Current Policy Date: 04/02/1998

Other Historical Information: Previous board dates: 09/04/1992, 12/04/1992

Statutory Reference:

Administrative Procedures Act (APA) Reference Number and Category:

This policy was developed to assure the Board that all project proposals have been evaluated fairly and on merit without bias or favoritism and all approval criteria for selection have been followed. The DPI will follow the policy when considering federal, state, or other funds available for use.

Definition: Competitive projects are those projects for which the DPI or SBE solicits proposals from eligible applicants and which are evaluated against a set of approved criteria to determine the recommendations for funding.

All funding sources are covered by this definition.

Criteria for Competitive/Discretionary Projects. All projects will be evaluated on the applicant's written response addressing the items outlined in Section I. All proposals will go through the review process outlined in Section II. Some projects may be subject to federal or state funding priorities, in which case review procedures will be altered accordingly.

Eligibility. All applicants must be eligible according to requirements of law, regulations, policy and other directions provided by the funding source. Only eligible applicants should respond to the RFP. Applicants should clearly establish eligibility according to guidelines in the RFP.

SECTION I: Applicant's Response to a Request for Proposals (RFP)

All eligible applicants will include the eight items outlined below in each proposal.

A. A. Objectives and Intended Outcome. All objectives of the project must be

stated in measurable terms that clearly establish time frames and expected outcomes.

Describe how outcomes will benefit both students and teachers.

- B. **Narrative Description.** Prepare a narrative description of the project. Include all preliminary steps to implementation such as special training, designation of personnel and purchases. Provide a schedule of activities and the dates when each will be accomplished. Include background research information used to formulate the proposal. Also elaborate on ways in which the proposal is linked to the school system's total plan, as well as state priorities. Conclude the narrative by stating ways the project can be continued or replicated after the funding period.
- C. **Proposed Budget.** Present annotated budget information according to requirements in the RFP. All locally prepared budgets must conform to the DPI chart of accounts.
- D. **Community Involvement.** Describe how the project will involve the local community beyond the local school system. Detail any anticipated participation of parents, citizens, or business.
- E. **Statement of Need.** Cite data that supports need statement. Also, use evidence of socioeconomic status of area, demographic data, and population statistics to support needs.
- F. **Dissemination.** Describe how project information will be shared with other school systems throughout the state. Include the methods that will be used to share best practices among school personnel.
- G. **Local Evaluation and Procedures.** Describe local evaluation procedures and methods of evaluation for the project. Time frames for completing local evaluations must be included.

SECTION II. Application Review Process

Each application will be reviewed and compared to others through the process outlined below.

A. INITIAL LOG-IN AND SCREENING

Applicant's eligibility is determined. Information is recorded on a cover sheet to reflect the presence of basic components: proposal sections, applicant and partner signatures, and other essentials outlined in the RFP.

B. LEVEL I EVALUATION

1. The DPI appoints a review team of at least 3 persons who meet the following qualifications.
 - All familiar with subject areas
 - All impartial
 - RFP requirements will determine if team members are internal or external to DPI
2. Each review team is assigned a specific number of applications to evaluate. Each team member must use professional judgment in examining the proposals. Division directors should specify components which are especially vital to consider in the review process, and may direct the review team to rate the proposal on its merit within each individual category.
3. After all proposals are evaluated by individual team members, the entire review team discusses each proposal as a group and comes to a consensus on the final rating. Each proposal shall be included in one of the five following quality bands.
 - Excellent
 - Strong
 - Average
 - Weak
 - Unacceptable
4. After consensus, each review team shall prepare comments on each proposal to be used in the approval/rejection letters sent to the applicants.
5. Each review team Chairperson will present findings to the division director.

C. LEVEL II EVALUATION

Applications recommended for funding by the review team will be reviewed by a smaller team of reviewers (which may include the division director and review team chairpersons). These reviewers will use the following criteria and will align applications with specific funding priorities.

1. SBE/DPI Priorities. The applicant's attention to agency priorities will be taken into consideration.
2. Geographic Area Needs. Needs will be considered in the various geographical areas of the state. Attention will be given to appropriate statewide distribution of funds.

3. Socioeconomic Needs. The socioeconomic standing of each applicant will be taken into consideration.
3. Number of Projects and Total Funding Received. All projects and total amounts funded to each applicant during the current year and prior years will be compared with other applicants to insure reasonable distribution of funds.
4. Applicant's Prior Performance. The applicant's prior and current performance in related areas will be examined to ensure a high probability of success.

D. LEVEL III EVALUATION

Using evaluation forms from the review teams, the division director, the appropriate associate superintendent, chief technology officer and the state superintendent/deputy jointly determine final selections.

E. NOTICE PROCEDURE

The division director will oversee the distribution of approval/rejection letters, create and maintain a file, and prepare materials to be presented to the State Board of Education. Upon approval by the State Board of Education, approval/rejection letters will be prepared using comments listed during review team sessions.

SECTION III. Evaluation/Review Results

A. RECORD KEEPING

The division director (or program director) is responsible for ensuring that a file is available and maintained which contains information applicable to all sections of this policy. Files will be open to public inspection. All proposals submitted for consideration must be listed in alphabetical order in the file. An asterisk should be placed on the left side of the folder of each project to be funded. Ratings must be shown for each proposal by showing evaluation information and/or by grouping projects into quality bands such as excellent, strong, average, weak, and unacceptable.

B. MATERIALS TO BE PRESENTED TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

- A list of all project proposals submitted
- The corresponding quality band for each acceptable proposal

- Any information regarding weighting of categories
- The list of recommended projects for funding
- An assurance that the process has been followed without deviation

SECTION IV. Assurances

The appropriate assistant superintendent will insure that all proposals have been evaluated fairly and on merit without bias or favoritism and that all approved criteria for selection has been followed.

SECTION V. Exceptions

Any additional criteria, amended process, or further changes made to the above procedures must be approved by the deputy state superintendent.