Educators for the 21st Century 2016-17 Professional Development Grant Program Pre-proposal Video Presentation Script 2/29/16

Slide 1 Cover Slide
Hi everybody, this is Mark Bergeson, the RFP Coordinator for the Washington Student Achievement Council's Educators for the 21st Century 2016-17 Professional Development Grant program. Welcome to the pre-proposal video. This video will focus on helping potential applicants understand our professional development grant program and competitive award process.

Slide 2 Housekeeping
But first some housekeeping. You will probably find it useful to have a copy of the request for proposals in front of you as you watch the video, so you can write down questions related to various slides. Also, there are a couple of important dates coming up: There will be a pre-proposal question and answer session on March 2 at 1:00 p.m., and there is a required notice of intent due on March 9 by 5:00 pm.

Slide 3 Presentation Learning Goals
The webinar is designed to help you understand the program and the award process. In doing so, it will highlight key features outlined in the Request for Proposals and also point out potential pitfalls. In short, I will give you the why, who, what, how, when and where of the RFP. To help you understand the "why," we will start out with the federal priorities for the program.

Slide 4 Intent – Federal Priorities
The program is authorized under Title II Part A Subpart 3 of the No Child Left Behind Act and has been around since 2002. Since the No Child Left Behind Act is about to be replaced by the Every Student Succeeds Act, we think that this is the last request for proposals we will issue for this program. The program pays for professional development that helps enhance educators ability to use state standards and assessments to improve instruction and student achievement; helps improve educator subject matter knowledge; and helps improve principals' instructional leadership skills. Those are the federally allowable uses of funds that are explicitly spelled out in section 2134 of the No Child Left Behind Act.

One of the reasons that the program is a partnership grant program is that Congress intended for the higher education partners to learn from the experience in a way that would help them strengthen teacher and principal preparation programs and their relationships with other departments on campus. We will cover the partnership structure in more depth later. Basically, Congress wanted K-12 and higher education to learn from each other, and for higher education to work more collaboratively across departmental lines.

Now we'll move from federal priorities to state priorities.

Slide 5 Intent – State Priorities
Each time we issue an RFP under this program, we consult with OSPI to determine state priorities. Current state priorities include helping teachers get endorsements, implementing the Since Time Immemorial Curriculum, and implementing the formative assessment process and instructional resources in the Smarter Balanced Digital Library.

Slide 6 State Priorities - Endorsements
The first of the 3 state priorities is to help teachers teaching outside of their endorsement to get an appropriate endorsement. Because of the way the federal law governing allowable uses of grant funds is worded, projects must focus on endorsements in core academic subject areas and grade levels, rather than other types of endorsements. For example, a track 1 project could focus on helping teachers make meaningful progress towards obtaining Mathematics 5-12, English/Language Arts 5-12, History 5-12, Reading, Elementary Education K-8, or similar endorsement; but not a Bilingual education or Special Education endorsement. This slide has links to lists of endorsement competencies and pathways that you may find useful.

Slide 7 State Priorities – Implementing Since Time Immemorial
The second state priority is to help schools implement the state's Since Time Immemorial curriculum. The curriculum is split into an elementary school curriculum, a middle school curriculum, and a high school curriculum. The Since Time Immemorial website houses resources, materials, lessons, and entire units to support the teaching of tribal sovereignty, tribal history, and current tribal issues within the context of OSPI recommended units for Washington and US history in the elementary and middle school levels and US history and Contemporary World Issues in the high school level. Each unit is aligned with Washington State K-12 Learning Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.

Slide 8 State Priorities – Implementing the Digital Library
The third state priority is to help schools implement the Smarter Balanced Digital Library, which is a key component of the Smarter Balanced Assessment System. Projects responding to this state priority may wish to include use of interim or summative assessments in conjunction with formative assessment in some way. For example, you could use spring 2016 summative assessment data as a starting point and interim assessments to measure progress as part of your evaluation plan.

Slide 9 State Priorities – Implementing the Digital Library (Continued)
The digital library is designed to help educators implement a four-step formative assessment process to improve instruction and learning. It includes several different kinds of resources, including professional development resources and instructional resources. Projects responding to the third state priority must provide professional development in use of the four-step formative assessment process to inform instruction and also the instructional resources; and projects may use the professional development resources. The links on this slide are very useful. The first two are quick reads, and the third leads to an excellent presentation that will give you a good feel for the four-step formative assessment process and the instructional resources in the Digital Library. Your total time in doing all three (including viewing the first 30 minutes of the September 29, 2015 webinar) would probably be an hour or less.

Slide 10 State Priorities – Why These Three?
Why are we prioritizing these three areas?
First, they are three different ways of closing the opportunity gap. Priority one closes it by helping ensure that students of color, English Language Learners, students receiving special education, and students in poverty are not taught at higher rates than other students by out-of-endorsement teachers. Priority 2 closes it by increasing the cultural competence of teachers. Priority 3 closes it by helping teachers use an assessment process that can inform their instruction to better serve these groups of students. Also, the formative assessment process in priority 3 will help teachers ensure that their students are college and career ready when they graduate. Hopefully the presentation so far has helped you understand the underlying state and federal priorities that shaped the RFP. Now we will move on to a description of the mechanics of the program.

Slide 11 Program Mechanics - Summary
To understand the mechanics of the program, we'll look at the bolded elements of this slide's text in subsequent slides. As we go over these elements, I'll speak in terms of who, what, how, where, and when. We've already discussed the "why" when we covered the priorities. Next we will move on to the "who."

Slide 12 Program Mechanics – Who?
These are partnership grants, and partnership issues are one of the most common pitfalls that projects run into. In fact, one of the main reasons we require that applicants file a Notice of Intent is to allow us to identify and troubleshoot partnership issues early in the process. The next slide shows the required partners in detail.

Slide 13 Who? – Required Partners

This slide shows three required partners that every project must have, at a minimum, to be eligible for funding.

- The first partner is a two part partner in that the institution and its division that prepares teachers and/or principals count as a single partner. The division that prepares teachers and/or principals would be a college of education or similar academic unit. This academic unit must be approved by the Professional Educator Standards Board to prepare licensed teachers and/or principals in Washington.
- The second partner is a college or university school of arts and sciences that offers an appropriate major. Please note the words "offers one or more academic majors" on the slide. This can trip people up. In putting together your partnership, you need to be careful of majors offered by required partner 2. You need to do some homework to ensure that the school of arts and sciences partner or partners offers or offer an appropriate academic major. For example, a math department would work if a project was focused on helping out-of-endorsement math teachers get endorsed in math or on implementing the Digital Library in math. An English department would work if a project was focused on implementing the Digital Library in English Language Arts. A history department would work if a project was focused on Since Time Immemorial. These examples are not meant to be an exhaustive list. Other departments might work too, but check with us first.
- The third required partner is a high-need local educational agency. These are school districts, tribal schools, and charter schools that meet the federal criteria outlined in the definition of high-need local educational agency on page 11 of the RFP. You can find a list of high-need school districts that meet these criteria in Exhibit F on pages 43-45 of the RFP. The list was generated using OSPI statewide report card and state Equity Plan data in conjunction with federal poverty data. Projects providing service within multiple target regions must serve at least one high-need school district (or other LEA) from each target region.

You may ask "Why these partners?" First, to encourage two-way learning, so that higher education programs can be informed by what their faculty learn during their service in the project. Second, Congress wanted to encourage communication across departments in universities. When the legislation was written, Congress perceived that the level of interaction between colleges of education and other academic units wasn't high.

Slide 14 Who? – Optional Partners

As long as the partnership has all of the required partners, it may include as many optional partners from the list on pages 7 and 8 of the RFP as it wants to. The list of optional partners is long. It includes higher education partners, such as community and technical colleges.

Slide 15 Who? – Optional Partners (Continued)
The list of optional partners also includes various K-12, nonprofit organization, and business partners. For example, Educational Service Districts have expressed interest in this RFP. They are welcome to be part of a project and even to lead one, but they are optional partners and need to ensure that any partnership they put together includes and has meaningful roles for higher education partners. Nonprofit private schools have a special status in that they need to be offered equitable participation in compliance with No Child Left Behind Act section 9501. What that boils down to is that you need to contact nonprofit private schools located in the districts your project will serve and offer them meaningful and timely opportunities for participation in the design and implementation of the project, equivalent to the opportunities given to public schools. For track 2 projects, tribes also have a special role in that track 2 projects must work in collaboration with them even though they are not on the list of required or optional partners. The list is a federal list, and it is unclear why tribes are not included.

Now let's talk about roles in the partnership.

- The default model that Congress had in mind was a partnership where higher education provides professional development for K-12. The idea is that the teacher/principal prep partner would provide expertise related to instruction and the school of arts and sciences partner would provide subject matter expertise.
- In Washington, we are allowing variations. For example, personnel from an Educational Service district or other optional partner can provide professional development via instructional coaches or in other ways.
- But higher education has to have a significant instructional role. The project director or at least one co-director must be a tenured or tenure-track faculty member of a required higher education partner. This faculty has to provide effort comparable to or greater than the effort of other key personnel in the project. This is to ensure that the project impacts the college of education partner. Congress intended these projects to result in two-way learning that strengthens teacher and principal preparation programs.
- One key role that a partner will play is that of fiscal agent.

Slide 16 Who? – Fiscal Agent Partner
This slide outlines the duties of the fiscal agent partner. The fiscal agent partner is the one that will interact with WSAC. In short, it serves as the lead partner in a partnership. Not every partner can serve as the lead partner—it has to be a higher education partner or an educational service district partner. Now let's shift from the structure of the

partnership to the target audience that the professional development is aimed at helping.

Slide 17 Who? – Target Audience of K-12 Educators
The target audience is in-service K-12 educators. All projects must serve teachers as well as principals and/or assistant principals, but serving highly qualified paraprofessionals is optional. Teachers need to be actual or planned 2016-17 teachers of record of core academic subjects. Principals and assistant principals must be responsible for instructional leadership in core academic subjects in their schools. A Highly Qualified Paraprofessional has not less than 2 years of experience in a classroom; and post-secondary education or demonstrated competence in a field or academic subject for which there is a significant shortage of qualified teachers. If you decide to serve Highly Qualified Paraprofessionals, you will need to obtain certification that they meet this definition of highly qualified. Now let's move from who projects serve to what projects are supposed to do.

Slide 18 Program Mechanics – What?
Projects must focus on at least one of the professional development tracks outlined in the RFP and may focus on two or all three. Projects must design and offer professional development activities that will meet the required project goals for the track or tracks they choose to offer to participants. Since projects are required to serve teachers as well as principals and/or assistant principals, each track has both a teacher goal and a principal/assistant principal goal. Regardless of how many tracks they offer, each project only submits one proposal.

There are commonalities across all three professional development tracks:

- First, though the teacher goals vary across tracks, all involve improving teacher subject matter knowledge and standards-based teaching skills. This is because of the way the underlying federal law is written. You may find it useful to read that law. With respect to teachers, it is No Child Left Behind sections 2134(a)(1)(A) and 2134(a)(2)(A). With respect to principals and assistant principals, it is No Child Left Behind section 2134(a)(1)(B).
- Second, the principal/assistant principal goals for each track involve instructional leadership skills to help them support teachers served by the project, with the ultimate goal of helping all students master core academic subjects.
- Third, the term "all students" is common across the teacher goals for tracks 2 and 3, and the principal/assistant principal goals for all tracks. The term includes students in the Opportunity Gap, which means that we expect cultural competence training to be integrated into the professional development that the project provides. We are using the term culture broadly to include not only

different racial or ethnic groups of students, but also English Language Learners, students receiving special education, and students in poverty.

Slide 19 What? – Professional Development Track 1

We will look the teacher and principal/assistant principal goals for track 1 first. The teacher goal is designed to help out-of-endorsement teachers make progress along an endorsement pathway by giving them the necessary subject matter knowledge and standards-based teaching skills. They don't actually have to get an endorsement by the end of the project, but they do have to make meaningful progress. That term is not defined in the RFP because it depends on which core academic subject areas and grade levels the project is focusing on, and also how far along the pathway the teachers already are. But regardless of all that, meaningful progress will involve improving teachers' subject matter knowledge and standards-based teaching skills. The principal/assistant principal goal involves enhancing principals' instructional leadership skills. This is a common theme across tracks, though the other tracks add some specificity in terms of instructional leadership focus. To help you know which districts need the most help, high-need school districts with relatively high percentages of out-of-endorsement teaching are asterisked in appendix F of the RFP.

Slide 20 What? – Professional Development Track 2

For track 2, the teacher goal is designed to help teachers implement the state's Since Time Immemorial curriculum. Similarly, the principal/assistant principal goal is designed to help principals and assistant principals provide the instructional leadership their teachers will need to implement the curriculum. This instructional leadership will be especially important if a project takes a schoolwide approach to providing professional development. This is something that track 2 is especially well suited for, because Since Time Immemorial touches on a number of core academic content areas. It is worth noting that the curriculum is aligned to the Common Core State Standards, and the Since Time Immemorial web page for each unit includes a link to a page that explicitly shows the alignment.

Slide 21 What? – Professional Development Track 3

For track 3, the teacher goal is designed to help teachers implement the Digital Library. Similarly, the principal/assistant principal goal is designed to help principals and assistant principals provide the instructional leadership to help teachers do that. As with Track 2, Track 3 may also lend itself well to a schoolwide professional development approach, because of the breadth of the Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts.

The last few slides we've been looking at tell you what projects must focus on accomplishing. The next slide gives some examples of what kinds of professional development activities projects can use to accomplish those required goals. In other words, we are moving from the "what" to the "how."

Slide 22 Program Mechanics – How?
This list is not intended to be exhaustive. In the past, our projects have typically offered summer institutes of some sort, followed up on during the academic year by one or more other activities on the list. Whatever type of activities you choose, you must offer at least 48 contact hours per person of professional development to teachers and at least 12 contact hours per person to principals and assistant principals over the life of the project. The minimum number of hours for highly qualified paraprofessionals, if served by the project, is also 12. Contact hours can be either in person or online. Now we will move from "how" to "when."

Slide 23 Program Mechanics – When?
Professional Development activities may start mid May 2016 and must finish by June 30, 2017. Final reports are due July 31, 2017. Report templates will be available in the next week or so. Let us know if you would like to receive a copy. Our initial plan for what we mean by "mid-May" is May 16, but there is a chance that complaints or protests could slow the process down. Now we will move from "when" to "where."

Slide 24 Program Mechanics – Where?
Funding is available to serve school districts within each of the state's nine Educational Service Districts, which we will refer to as target regions. Projects may request up to $100,000 per track per target region served and may serve multiple regions. The more tracks and regions you serve, the more funding you can request, up to $900k. The school district partners within each region served must include at least 1 high-need school district in that region. If you propose a multi-track or multi-region project, you need to be prepared to scale it down if necessary, because there is a chance that the review process may result in funding a different project for one or more of the tracks and/or regions you've proposed to serve. On the other hand, if we don't get enough proposals, we may increase funding per track and/or per region. And everything I said about school districts also applies to other local educational agencies, such as certain tribal schools and charter schools.

So far, I've been trying to help you understand the mechanics of the grant program by telling you about the who, what, where, when, how, and why of it. Now we'll move from focusing on the grant program to focusing on the competitive process. We'll start with a timeline.

Slide 25 Competitive Process - Timeline

As you can see, the clock is ticking. There is a mandatory Notice of Intent to Apply due by 5:00 pm Wednesday, March 9. There is no form—just make sure you answer all of the questions listed in Exhibit E on page 42 of the RFP. The Notice of Intent is mandatory, but it is also easy to complete and nonbinding. Its purpose is to help us communicate with you and to identify potential problems early so we can address them proactively. It also helps us let reviewers know how much work they are in for. If you submit a Notice of Intent and something changes after submission, it is to your advantage to let us know so that we can work issues out early.

One thing to notice about the timeline is that you have complaint and protest procedures available to you. The difference between a complaint and a protest is that a complaint deals with flaws you perceive related to the RFP and a protest deals with flaws you perceive in the outcome of the process. The RFP outlines allowable grounds for complaint and protest.

Finally, please note that proposals are due by 5:00 pm on Wednesday, April 6.

Next we will cover what components the proposals need to include.

Slide 26 Competitive Process – Proposal Components

There are three types of proposal components: Forms, narrative, and attachments. Some components are subject to formatting restrictions. Pay attention to order, formatting requirements, and internal consistency. Ensure your proposal has all of the components listed and that they appear in the required order, as outlined on page 20 of the RFP, which is where the instructions for preparing the proposal start. Next we'll take a more detailed look at each type of proposal component, starting with forms.

Slide 27 Competitive Process - Forms

Form 1 gives us a quick understanding of what the project is about. Form 2 allows us to determine whether partnership and geographic distribution requirements are met. Form 3 gives us a quick sense for the nature and timing of project's professional development activities. You will need to make sure that the numbers on forms 1, 2, and 3 are consistent with each other. For example, if you add up the numbers of participants listed on forms 2 and 3, they should be consistent with each other and the number of participants listed on form 1. If you add up the hours listed for each type of activity on form 3, they should sum to the totals reported on form 1. Probably the most difficult form to fill out will be the budget form, form 4. So we will look at that one in detail.

Slide 28 Forms – Budget Form and Budget Narrative
If you'll turn to Form 4 on page 40 of the RFP, you'll see that the budget form is split into rows and columns. The rows identify the types of goods and services that the project will charge the grant for, and the columns identify which partner is using the money. So for example, total salaries paid to college of education faculty would appear in row 1 column 1 of the form. Stipends paid to participating teachers from high-need school districts would be entered in row 5 column 3 of the form, and so on. The columns are designed to ensure that required partners 1 and 2 get at least 10 percent of the project budget and also to ensure compliance with a federal rule that no partner in the project may use more than 50% of the funds made available to the project. This is referred to as "the 50% rule."

For detailed guidance on what the grant can and can't pay for, see pages 23-25 of the RFP. I won't go over every item, but would like to highlight a few:

- To begin with, there is a general federal rule that costs must be reasonable and necessary.
- Generally, the grant can pay for the items listed as eligible on page 23 and the top part of page 24 of the RFP. This includes:
    - Salaries, wages, & benefits for project personnel at their regular pay rates. Course releases for faculty are generally not a problem, but if you are using faculty overload pay, make sure that you are following the university's faculty overload policy and Section 200.430(h) of the Uniform Guidance, which is cited in the RFP.
    - Independent contractor and/or subcontractor fees, but only if approved in advance by the Student Achievement Council. Generally, we will approve reasonable fees for independent evaluators, for tribes working with the project, and for community-based organizations consulting with regard to cultural competency. Generally we will not approve other contractor fees. Please note that track 2 projects are *required* to consult with a tribe.
    - Supplies and materials for professional development activities. The grant can pay for what is necessary for professional development purposes, but cannot pay for general classroom use purposes.
    - Stipends for participating educators, but only for time outside of their normal work hours. We can't pay more than the normal rate for participating in professional development activities in the districts you are serving. Stipends for public school educators may be paid through the school, but stipends for private school educators must be paid directly to the individual.
- These are just a few examples. If you have a cost that is difficult to pigeonhole as allowable or not, ask us for help.

For detailed guidance on what the grant cannot generally pay for, see pages 24-25 of the RFP. This includes things like:

- Proposal development costs
- Faculty overload compensation that does not conform to institutional policy or Section 200.430(h) of the Uniform Guidance, which is cited in the RFP.
- Payments to private school participants made through their schools rather than directly to themselves
- Classroom sets of materials
- Space rental; parking fees; research costs; equipment purchases; third party conferences or trainings; tuition (except as outlined in the RFP); clock hour fees; and food and beverages, with the possible exception of working lunches. Food is a very touchy issue with the federal government right now, and you have to work really hard to justify serving a working lunch and document that it is really necessary.

Please avoid the temptation to include questionable items in your budget. It is risky on two levels. First, it may cost you some reviewer points, and second, our contract will contain a clause saying that disallowed costs are your responsibility. So it is to your advantage to err on the side of being conservative in charging costs.

In addition to filling out the budget form, you will need to attach a budget narrative that explains how the numbers on the budget form were calculated. There is no specified format for the narrative, but it must be sufficiently detailed that readers will understand how each budget amount was calculated and be able to judge whether a budgeted expenditure is reasonable and necessary.

Now we will move from forms to the proposal narrative components.

Slide 29 Proposal Components – Proposal Narrative
The proposal narrative includes 4 components: a professional development plan, an evaluation plan, a management plan, and an impact section.

The Professional Development Plan describes your objectives and activities for accomplishing the required project goals. It also describes the research base that gives us reason to believe that the approach is sound.

The Evaluation Plan describes how you will include formative components and also summative components that evaluate your success in accomplishing the required goals.

The plan will assess changes in educator knowledge and practice. In other words, what do educators know and do differently as a result of the project.

The Management Plan describes who will do what and outlines project personnel qualifications.

The project impact section is your chance to convince reviewers that the project will have a significant impact. We are looking for a compelling case built along several dimensions, including:

- a compelling rationale for how the project will impact student outcomes,
- how the project will help close the opportunity gap at the classroom and school levels,
- integration of the project with school or district plans, and synergy with other professional development initiatives; and
- impact on the teacher/principal preparation at the teacher/principal preparation partner. This kind of impact on higher education is one of the outcomes that the federal government intends for the program.

Now we will leave the narrative and move on to the attachments.

Slide 30 Proposal Components - Attachments
There are five different kinds of attachments.

- The first is a One-Page Logic Model that represents the project's theory of action.
- The second is a list of References cited in the Proposal Narrative – You should include only scientifically based research (there is a definition for that on page 13 of the RFP). Please don't include references you don't actually cite in your narrative.
- The third is a School Support Certification. There is a template in Exhibit B on RFP page 35. Try to get one of these completed and signed by the principal of each school to be served by the project, up to 18 schools. You will need at least one from each target region served.
- The fourth is Key Personnel Curriculum Vitas. These should be one pagers outlining qualifications. Don't include home address, phone numbers, or email addresses. Do include academic qualifications, relevant employment, relevant courses taught, relevant research, and involvement with similar projects.
- The last is a Certifications and Assurances document. There is a template in Exhibit A on RFP page 34. This must be signed and dated by an official authorized to legally bind the Bidder (that's you!) to a contractual relationship. This form provides you with an opportunity to request contract exceptions if you wish. If

you do, attach them as an attachment to Exhibit A when you submit the proposal.

That wraps it up for proposal contents. Next we will consider the evaluation of proposals.

Slide 31 Competitive Process – Proposal Evaluation

The proposal evaluation process has several steps, and the exact form they take will be a function of how many proposals we receive. Regardless of number, WSAC staff will screen proposals for compliance with RFP guidelines before forwarding them to reviewers. For example, we will make sure that formatting rules are followed, such as the page and margin limits. We will also check to see that the numbers reported on Forms 1-3 are consistent with each other, and that no partner is using more than 50% of the budget. If we find anything wrong, we may ask you to make changes, and if we do, you have 24 hours to make them. The reason for the short turnaround time is that we need to maximize the time available to reviewers. Typically, the nature of the changes we request has been such that projects have not had trouble complying with the 24 hour turnaround time.

Slide 32 Proposal Evaluation – Scoring Rubric

Next we'll discuss the scoring rubric that proposal reviewers will use. There are 100 points possible, regardless of number of tracks. There are 5 criteria, and within each criteria, proposals will be scored on one or more attributes that we think are important for projects to be successful. Reviewers will be asked to assess each attribute through the lens of whether or not the proposal exhibits the attribute to a superior, adequate, or inadequate degree.

Slide 33 Ongoing Technical Assistance

We would like to offer ongoing technical assistance as you prepare your proposal. As time goes on, we will post RFP updates and a Q&A document on the Educators for the 21st Century webpage. Also, I will be available by email, phone, or in person to help.

As we become aware of needs for clarification or corrections, we will revise the RFP. The first revision happened on Monday (that's today). It incorporates several minor corrections and clarifications that arose as we read the RFP closely while developing this presentation. There is a list on the next slide.

Slide 34 RFP Updates

As you can see, these are minor items. The revised RFP incorporating them is posted on the Educators for the 21st Century webpage at http://wsac.wa.gov/21-educators.

When we post items to the webpage, we will alert you if you let us know you are interested.

I will close with a reminder that Notices of Intent are due next Wednesday. In case you need help finding partners, one of the questions asks if we can share contact information for purposes of encouraging collaboration.

This concludes the presentation.

Thank you for interest!