



UWW ORSP DEADLINE - PRE-PROPOSAL [REQUIRED]: 26 AUGUST 2011
UWW ORSP DEADLINE - FULL PROPOSAL: 9 SEPTEMBER 2011

WISCONSIN IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PROGRAM

INTRAMURAL GRANT APPLICATION PACKAGE

X

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater Office of Research and Sponsored Programs Intramural Transmittal Form. ONE original, complete ORSP Transmittal Form including all relevant funding competition information, proposal information, required clearances, and required signatures must accompany each proposal submitted to ORSP.

X

Proposal Development and Submission Instructions. Each University of Wisconsin grant program has varying proposal development and submission requirements. Principal Investigators must review this application package carefully and adhere to specific program requirements to be competitive.

X

Grant Program Forms. Each University of Wisconsin grant program requires the submission of different forms. All relevant forms are included in this application package. Electronic versions of all forms can be accessed on the ORSP Funding Page (<http://www.uwworsp.org/media/funding.htm>).

X

Additional Proposal Development and Submission Resources. University of Wisconsin grant application packages may include additional resource information including evaluation/review criteria, description of proposal review processes and deadlines, and other pertinent appendices.

The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs can provide additional information, proposal development assistance, and copies of funded proposals. ALL proposals must be submitted to ORSP. Grants submitted directly to System or Extension may not be reviewed.

DENISE EHLEN, Director, 262-472-5212, ehlend@uww.edu
RON FLEISCHMANN, Associate Research Administrator, 262-472-5212, fleischr@uww.edu





UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
WHITewater

RSP APPROVAL & CERTIFICATION
TRANSMITTAL



DO NOT COMPLETE SHADED SECTIONS WITH DOUBLED BORDER – FOR UWW RSP USE ONLY

FUNDING COMPETITION INFORMATION Deadline:		RSP USE ONLY		ID:
1. Sponsor & Program:		Date Submitted:		
2. Address:		Number of Copies to Sponsor (original +)		
3. Telephone:	Fax:	Binding of Original: <input type="checkbox"/> Clip <input type="checkbox"/> Staple <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		
4. Web:	Notes:	GT Proposal Entry:		GT Award:
PROPOSAL INFORMATION				
5. Principal Investigator:		5a. Department/Division/Institution:		
5b. Address:		Phone:	Fax:	Email:
6. Co-Investigator:		6a. Department/Division/Institution:		
6b. Address:		Phone:	Fax:	Email:
7. Co-Investigator:		7a. Department/Division/Institution:		
7b. Address:		Phone:	Fax:	Email:
8. Co-Investigator:		8a. Department/Division/Institution:		
8b. Address:		Phone:	Fax:	Email:
9. Project Title:				
10. Funding Type <input type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Renewal/Continuation		AWARD INFORMATION – RSP USE ONLY <input type="checkbox"/> GRANT <input type="checkbox"/> CONTRACT		
11. Total Request \$		New Account <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Federal <input type="checkbox"/> Federal (CFDA#)		
12. Match Information \$		Org Information <input type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Add To		
13. Begin Date End Date		Total Award Begin Date End Date		
REQUIRED CLEARANCES – Does the project involve:				
14. toxic, infectious or carcinogenic/mutagenic material? Use recombinant DNA technology?				Approved? (choose one)
15. use of human subjects, human tissue or vertebrate animals?				<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Pending
16. action involving space, remodeling, or construction?				<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Pending
17. hiring non-UWW personnel?				<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Pending
18. requires release time by PI (and/or Co-Is) in support of project activities?				<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Pending
19. creation of new degree programs or services?				<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Pending
20. potential environmental impacts, which require review under the Wisconsin Environmental Policy Act?				<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Pending
REQUIRED SIGNATURES				
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR/PROJECT DIRECTOR		SIGNATURE		DATE
I certify that the plan detailed in the proposal/contract complies with all campus, state, and federal regulations and policies and reflects University, College/Division, and Department/Unit goals. This project is achievable as described, including the limitations of time, resources, and personnel expertise. All required clearances have been satisfied. I have disclosed any possible conflicts of interest during the proposal development process. If awarded, I agree to conduct the proposed project in compliance with (1) the conditions of the grant and (2) with all policies of UWW, UWS, and the State of Wisconsin.				
I authorize the use of my name and grant information for university publication. <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES (initial)				
DEPARTMENT CHAIR/UNIT DIRECTOR		SIGNATURE		DATE
I certify that I have reviewed the proposal/contract and found it to be complete, including required clearances, budget, and commitments involving space, faculty/staff time, and matching funds. In addition, I certify that all resources and other provisions of any award will be fulfilled. A match (check one) <input type="checkbox"/> has OR <input type="checkbox"/> has NOT been pledged. Cash match will be satisfied by a transfer of funds from org code _____-_____ in the amount of \$_____ or via in-kind contributions as described in the budget (narrative).				
COLLEGE DEAN/DIVISION DIRECTOR(S)		SIGNATURE		DATE
I certify that I have reviewed the proposal/contract and found it to be complete, including required clearances, budget, and commitments involving space, faculty/staff time, and matching funds. In addition, I certify that all resources and other provisions of any award will be fulfilled. A match (check one) <input type="checkbox"/> has OR <input type="checkbox"/> has NOT been pledged. Cash match will be satisfied by a transfer of funds from org code _____-_____ in the amount of \$_____ or via in-kind contributions as described in the budget (narrative).				
<i>Applicants submitting proposals including an international component must secure the signature of the Director of the Center for Global Education in this cell.</i>				
RESEARCH AND SPONSORED PROGRAMS CERTIFICATION		SIGNATURE		DATE
By signing this transmittal, I certify that this proposal/contract is consistent with campus, state, and federal regulations; is within the campus' research/service mission; and is approved for submission to the funding agency.				
INITIAL HERE TO APPROVE GRANT/CONTRACT ACCEPTANCE:		DATE:		TYPED NAME: DENISE EHLEN

WISCONSIN IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PROGRAM

SPECIAL NOTE

The University of Wisconsin-Whitewater Office of Research and Sponsored Programs' pre-proposal and full proposal deadlines are **FIRM**.

Applicants must first submit the proposal to the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs for internal review and required institutional signatures.

Contact Denise Ehlen (ehlend@uww.edu, x5212) with additional questions.

WISCONSIN

IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY

PROGRAM

(Authorized under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001,
Title IIA: Preparing, Training, and Recruiting High Quality Teachers and Principals)

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
AND
APPLICATION GUIDELINES

Grant Competition for Institutions of Higher Education in Wisconsin

Intent to Submit **REQUIRED** by August 27, 2011
Proposal Deadline September 23, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW

Introduction & Background.....3
Wisconsin Priorities.....3

APPLICATION INFORMATION

Partnerships.....4
Needs Assessment.....4
Activities.....4
Duration.....4
Scientifically Based Research.....5
Evaluation.....5
Project Period.....5
Budget.....5
Other Requirements.....6
Special Notes.....7
Important Deadlines.....7

PROPOSAL PREPARATION

Details.....8

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Proposal Submission.....8
Proposal Reviewers.....9
Evaluation Criteria.....9
Appendix - Acronyms, Abbreviations, and Definitions.....9
Appendix - Additional Resources.....13

Introduction:

Under Part A of Title II, funds are made available for state agencies for higher education (University of Wisconsin System) to support partnerships intended to increase the academic achievement of students in core subjects by enhancing the content knowledge and teaching skills of classroom teachers. Project participants may consist of teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals. The University of Wisconsin System, working in conjunction with the Wisconsin DPI, shall use the funds to make subgrants, on a competitive basis to eligible partnerships.

The amount available for higher education projects in Wisconsin is expected to be approximately \$1,126,000. It is anticipated that about \$600,000 will be available for new project awards.

Funds are awarded partnerships between higher education faculty in teacher education, higher education faculty in arts and sciences, and one or more local school districts. One of the school districts in an eligible partnership must be a High-need LEA.

Every proposal must indicate willingness to work with Wisconsin's high-need LEAs. Proposals may be *submitted* with non-high-need LEAs so long as the applicant agrees to this condition. When the review panel recommends a proposal for funding, the University of Wisconsin System will contact appropriate high-need LEAs and the prospective project director to work out how a high-need LEA will be added to the project as the statutory required high-need LEA. UW-System will work with the applicant to make any appropriate proposal or budget adjustments (such as tuition costs, travel for participants or staff, etc.). Other partners may include additional LEAs, charter schools, businesses, and nonprofit organizations.

In Wisconsin, the subjects of English language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, social studies, art and design, dance, music, and theatre are treated as ESEA core subjects.

Any partnership receiving both a WITQ subgrant and a Section 203 of Title II of the Higher Education Act award under the Partnership Program for improving teacher preparation must coordinate activities of the two awards.

This document, along with the application template, can be found on the Wisconsin ESEA Improving Teacher Quality web site, <http://www.uwsa.edu/acss/esea/>.

A Program Similar to This Program - Math & Science Partnerships

Under Title II Part B, approximately \$2,200,000 is available for Math & Science Partnerships. These funds are administered and awarded by Wisconsin DPI. Additional information may be obtained at by visiting the website at <http://dpi.wi.gov/tepd/t2bgrant.html>.

Wisconsin Priorities

Priority 1: All students will reach proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics as described by the Common Core Standards adopted by Wisconsin on June 2, 2010.

Priority 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics as described by the Common Core Standards adopted by Wisconsin on June 2, 2010.

Priority 3: All students will graduate from high school.

Priority 4: All teacher licensure programs will have a collaborative relationship between core content area faculty and teacher education faculty.

Wisconsin ESEA Improving Teacher Quality Proposal 2011 Priorities

Priority 1: Proposals that will help teachers understand the content of the Common Core Standards for mathematics and reading/language arts and increase teacher's pedagogical skills to implement the Common Core Standards for mathematics and reading/language arts.

Priority 2: Proposals that increase the quality of teaching in all core subjects for ALL students.

Priority 3: Proposals that improve the collaboration between higher education arts and sciences, and teacher education faculties.

APPLICATION INFORMATION

Key Program Elements

I. Partnerships

Projects are designed and implemented by partnerships that include K-12 administrators, faculty, teachers, and guidance counselors in participating K-12 schools, higher education faculty and administrators from teacher education and the arts and sciences. Other partners are encouraged and may include businesses, nonprofit organizations, other K-12 schools, and other institutions of higher education. The program must demonstrate substantial collaboration between arts and sciences and teacher preparation departments in Wisconsin's public and private IHEs, LEAs, and other education entities. Every proposal submitted must verify this collaboration on the required forms.

Every funded project must include a qualified High-need LEA. Submitted proposals only need to show true collaboration with at least one LEA in their planning of the proposed project, and indicate a willingness to work with additional High-need district(s). A list of Wisconsin High-need LEAs may be found in the Appendix.

II. Needs Assessment

The project must address the results of a comprehensive assessment of the teacher quality and professional development needs with respect to the teaching and learning of core subjects at any schools and LEAs that comprise the partnership. Possible sources include WINSS and local student achievement data, local teacher needs assessments, WASDI Math and Science Teachers needs assessments. Student achievement data and teacher quality data must be used in preparing a proposal.

III. Activities

Grant activities must be clearly focused on the Common Core Standards adopted by Wisconsin on June 2, 2010, Wisconsin Model Academic Standards and Wisconsin Teacher Standards. Activities must be related to the needs of teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals. The project should have attainable goals that will be accomplished, and will demonstrate an improvement in student achievement and/or increase the number of highly qualified teachers. Proposals must include evidence that the project will provide professional development activities in the specific discipline(s) as well as in the related pedagogy. See the Appendix for definition of Professional Development activities that may be supported by this program.

IV. Duration

Formats for projects include, but are not limited to, institutes, seminars, intense summer

and yearlong courses, or combinations thereof. The most effective projects have been summer programs of at least two weeks with 80 or more contact hours, using a hands-on, inquiry based, problem-solving approach, and incorporating follow-up activities during the school year. One, two, and three-year projects are supported.

V. Scientifically Based Research

The activities to be carried out by the partnership must be based on a review of scientifically based research. An explanation of how the activities will lead to improvement in student academic achievement and quality of instruction must be included.

VI. Evaluation

Each partnership receiving a subgrant shall develop an evaluation and accountability plan for activities of the project that include rigorous objectives that measure the impact of the activities. Measurable objectives for improved student academic achievement are required. Additionally, measurable objectives that increase the number of highly qualified teachers may be included.

Each project must have a comprehensive evaluation plan. Proposals must include reliable and valid measurable objectives. The proposal must provide a description and timeline of how data will be gathered and used to evaluate the project's impact with respect to the objectives. The evaluation plan must examine whether the project functioned as the proposal stated it would, how the project activities contribute to teaching/learning outcomes, and how teachers' and/or students' performance have been affected by participation in the project. An outside evaluator should conduct the evaluation.

Proposed projects are expected to include professional development that is sustained over a period of time.

VI. Project Period

Proposed projects may last 17 to 41 months. Proposals for two or three-year projects are encouraged. Multi-year projects are expected to provide a coordinated plan of activities for participants over two or three years rather than repeating an annual project two or three times. Funding for second and third year activities of multi-year projects will be dependent on successful completion of the project's initial activities as well as on the continued availability of grant money to UW System for the program. For the second or third year of a funded project, rather than submitting a complete application packet, project directors will be expected to submit a progress report, an annual budget, and a description of the activities planned for the next year.

- One-year Projects will have activities and budgets from **March 1, 2012 through July 31, 2013.**
- For two-year Projects: **Year one activities and budget will run from March 1, 2012 July 31, 2013. Year two activities and budget will run from August 1, 2013 to July 31, 2014.**
- For three-year Projects **Year one activities and budget will run from March 1, 2012 July 31, 2013. Year two activities and budget will run from August 1, 2013 to July 31, 2014. Year three of funding will cover activities from August 1, 2014 to July 31, 2015.**

VII. Budget

A. Tuition

A grant may pay either for participant tuition or for the direct instructional costs of program delivery. It cannot pay for both. Direct costs may include summer or released time salaries and fringe benefits for faculty and staff, participant stipends, required institutional fees (not including tuition), participants' living costs, travel, supplies, and consultants' fees. Any institution may elect to charge tuition and required fees instead of direct costs. For UW institutions, UW System policy permits the payment of direct costs for a credit-producing course in lieu of tuition only when direct costs exceed projected tuition revenue. If the grant pays the direct costs of instruction, then participants may not be charged tuition.

B. Staff remuneration

If K-12 teachers are hired as part of the teaching staff, their remuneration should be commensurate with their contribution, based on considerations similar to those used for faculty salaries.

C. Supplies

Equipment, supplies, and text materials may be purchased through the grant, provided it is used for professional development activities that are part of the funded project. A budget summary using Form B and a budget narrative explaining each item is required. Each item must be justified for its contribution to the program.

D. Stipends

The suggested maximum for stipends to full time participants is \$250 per week. Stipends for participants in a program that is less than full-time shall be adjusted proportionally. Participants shall not receive stipends in addition to their regular salary for activities during weekdays of the academic year. If credit is granted at no cost to the participants, then the awarding of participant stipends is not allowed.

E. Teacher Substitutes

Substitutes may be paid at the local rate up to a maximum of \$105 per day. Additional costs for substitutes must be paid by other sources. Federal funds shall not be used to pay for teacher substitutes in private schools. These substitutes must be paid with funds from another source. **Requests for substitutes must include the approving school administrator's name and contact information in the budget explanation.**

F. Consultant Costs

Use of program consultants must be justified and their pay should be a reflection of time commitment. Consultants' pay cannot exceed a rate of \$550 for a full day of project work. Preparation time for consultants may not be paid by the grant.

G. Travel Costs

Only in-state travel at the state rate may be paid from grant funds. Out-of-state travel may not be paid by grant funds.

H. Indirect Costs

Indirect costs are limited to eight percent (8%) of the Title II Higher Education funds for the project.

VIII. Other Requirements

A. Geographical Distribution *"Grants must be equitably distributed by geographic area within the state."* (NCLB Title II, Part A, Subpart 3, Section 2132) This rule is satisfied as a part of the final review process.

B. 50% Rule: Use of Funds “No single participant in an eligible partnership may use more than fifty percent of the funds made available to the partnership.” (NCLB Title II, Part A, Subpart 3, Section 2132) This rule is satisfied by completion of the SR 50 budget information forms.

Special Notes

1. Credit

While it is not required, projects may offer university undergraduate or graduate credit for participants. In determining the amount of credit to offer for a given project, all institutions should adhere to the University of Wisconsin policy on the awarding of credit as stated in *UW System Policy on Academic Year and Assorted Derivatives*, 1984. "... It is assumed that study leading to one semester credit represents an investment of time by the average student of not fewer than 48 hours for class contact in lectures, for laboratories, examinations, tutorials and recitations, and for preparation and study; or a demonstration by the student of learning equivalent to that established as the expected product of such a period of study. Study leading to one quarter of credit represents two-thirds of that set as the standard for one semester credit."

2. Required Reports

A financial report is required within thirty days of the end of each one-year project period. A project report including participant data and describing funded activities is required by September 30th each year. Forms, for the two reports, are available online at <http://www.uwsa.edu/acss/esea/forms/index.htm>.

3. Required Meetings

Attendance at the annual Spring Reporting and Monitoring meeting is required and funds for attendance should be included in the budget.

4. Previous Project Directors: To be eligible to submit a proposal, project directors of previous ESEA grants must have all required reports on file with the Wisconsin ESEA Improving Teacher Quality Higher Education Program Coordinator.

5. Assistance: General and/or specific questions may be submitted to makuratp@uww.edu and they will be answered as soon as possible.

Important Deadlines

REQUIRED Intent to Submit Proposal Email

In order to prepare for the review process, please send a email to makuratp@uww.edu identifying the (1.) Applying institution or organization, (2.) Project Director, (3) Core subject area(s), and (4) targeted grade level(s) on or before August 27, 2011.

Proposal Deadline

Proposals are due by 4:30 PM on September 23, 2011. Successful applicants will be notified before January 15, 2012 that their proposals have been selected for funding. Unsuccessful applicants will be notified at the same time.

PROPOSAL PREPARATION

Proposals must be a MS Word document or a searchable pdf document using the 2011 Proposal Pages.doc document as a starting template.

ALL PROPOSALS PAGES 1-27

Page 1 - Cover Page

Page 2 - Abstract

Page 3 – 17 Proposal Narrative

Page 18 Summary Table

Page 19 Budget Summary for March 1, 2012 - July 31, 2013

Page 20-22 Budget Explanation

Page 23 SR-50 Estimates

Page 24-25 Collaboration Documentation

Page 26 Statement of Assurances

Page 27 Eligible Partnership Documentation

For ONE-YEAR PROJECTS THE FOLLOWING IS ADDED

Page 28 -... One Page vita for each of the key Personnel

For TWO-YEAR PROJECTS THE FOLLOWING IS ADDED

Page 28 Estimated Budget Summary for August 1, 2013 - July 31, 2014

Page 29 Description of indicators of progress that would be available by September 1, 2012

Page 30 -... One Page vita for each of the key Personnel

For THREE-YEAR PROJECTS THE FOLLOWING IS ADDED

Page 28 Estimated Budget Summary for August 1, 2013 - July 31, 2014

Page 29 Estimated Budget Summary for August 1, 2014 - July 31, 2015

Page 30 Description of indicators of progress that would be available by September 1, 2012

Page 31 -... One Page vita for each of the key Personnel

The parts of the template (2011 Proposal Pages.doc) in [red text] should be removed before submitting the proposal.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Proposal Submission

The proposal should be sent as an e-mail attachment to makuratp@uww.edu.

Proposal Reviewers

The Wisconsin ESEA Improving Teacher Quality Grants Proposal Review Committee will evaluate proposals. This committee will consist of members, selected by the program coordinator from the following.

- University of Wisconsin institutions
- Independent colleges and universities
- University of Wisconsin System Administration
- Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
- Wisconsin elementary teachers

- Wisconsin middle school teachers
- Wisconsin secondary teachers
- CESA districts
- Non-profit organizations

Volunteer to Review

Any individual may volunteer to be considered as a reviewer by e-mailing makuratp@uww.edu. Reviewers are each assigned 4-6 proposals to read. The review committee will meet a Thursday afternoon and Friday morning in October or November. Reviewer travel and lodging expenses for the review meeting are paid by WITQ Higher Education Grant Program administrative funds. Ethnic, gender, geographic, teaching level, and subject matter diversity will be sought when selecting the committee.

Evaluation Criteria

The reviewer's evaluation form is one of the tools used to determine which proposals receive funding. This evaluation form is available online at <http://www.uwsa.edu/acss/esea/forms/index.htm>.

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance CFDA #84.367

Appendix

Acronyms, Abbreviations, and Definitions

ARTS AND SCIENCES: When referring to an organization unit of an institution of higher education, any academic unit that offers one or more academic majors in disciplines or content areas corresponding to the academic subjects in which teachers teach; an when referring to a specific academic subject, the disciplines or content areas in which an academic major is offered by an organizational unit (Title II, Part A, section 2102).

CESA Cooperative Educational Service Agency. There are twelve such agencies, or districts, in Wisconsin.

Core subjects For this program the core subjects are defined to be "English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography" (NCLB Title IX, Part A, section 911).

DPI Department of Public Instruction.

Eligible Partnership An Eligible Partnership is an entity that includes (i.) a private or state institution of higher education and the division of the institution that prepares teachers and principals **AND** (ii.) a school of arts and sciences **AND** (iii.) a high-need LEA." The Eligible Partnership may include another education related entity. (NCLB Title II, Part A, Subpart 3, Section 2132)

ESEA Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

HIGH-NEED LEA: An LEA that serves not fewer than 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line; or for which not less than 20 percent of the children served by the agency are from families with incomes below the poverty line; and for which there is a high percentage of teachers not teaching in the academic subjects or grade levels that the teachers were trained to teach; or for which there is a high percentage of teachers with emergency, provisional, or temporary certification of licensing (Title II, Part A, section 2102).

HIGHLY-QUALIFIED TEACHER:

- A. When the term “highly-qualified teacher” is used with respect to any public elementary school or secondary school teacher teaching in a State, it means that:
- The teacher has obtained full State certification as a teacher (including certification obtained through alternative routes to certification) or passed the State teacher licensing examination, and holds a license to teach in such State, except that when the term is used with respect to any teacher teaching in a public charter school, the term means that the teacher meets the certification or licensing requirements set forth in the State’s public charter school law; and
 - The teacher has not had certification or licensure requirements waived on an emergency, temporary, or provisional basis.
- B. When the term “highly-qualified teacher” is used with respect to:
1. An elementary school teacher who is new to the profession, it means that the teacher has met the requirements of paragraph (A) above, and:
 - Holds at least a bachelor’s degree; and
 - Has demonstrated, by passing a rigorous State test, subject knowledge and teaching skills in reading, writing, mathematics, and other areas of the basic elementary school curriculum (which may consist of passing a State-required certification or licensing test or tests in reading, writing, mathematics, and other areas of basic elementary school curriculum); or
 2. A middle school or secondary teacher who is new to the profession, it means that the teacher has met the requirements of paragraph (A) above, holds at least a bachelor’s degree, and has demonstrated a high level of competency in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches by:
 - Passing a rigorous State academic subject test in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches (which may consist of a passing level of performance on a State-required certification or licensing test or tests in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches); or
 - Successful completion, in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches, of an academic major, a graduate degree, coursework equivalent to an undergraduate academic major, or advanced certification or credentialing.
- C. When the term “highly-qualified teacher” is used with respect to an elementary, middle, or secondary school teacher who is not new to the profession, it means that the teacher has met the requirements of paragraph (A) above and:
- holds at least a bachelor’s degree,
 - Has met the applicable standard in the clauses of sub-paragraph (B), which includes an option for a test; or

- Demonstrates competence in all the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches based on a high objective uniform State standard of evaluation that-
 - a. Is set by the State for both grade appropriate academic subject matter knowledge and teaching skills;
 - b. Is aligned with challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and developed in consultation with core content specialists, teachers, principals, and school administrators;
 - c. Provides objective, coherent information about the teacher's attainment of core content knowledge in the academic subjects in which a teachers teaches;
 - d. Is applied uniformly to all teachers in the same academic subject and the same grade level throughout the State;
 - e. Takes into consideration, but not be based primarily on, the time the teacher has been teaching in the academic subject;
 - f. Is made available to the public upon request; and
 - g. May involve multiple, objective measures of teacher competency. [Title IX, Part A, section 9101 (23)]

IHE Institution of higher education. This includes both private and public institutions. It includes both two-year and four-year institutions.

LEA A Local education agency. This may be a single public school, a public school district, or a consortium of public schools or districts. For example, one of the CESA districts could serve as the LEA for purposes of this program. Note: While teachers of private schools are eligible to participate in WITQ projects, private schools may not serve as the LEA.

NCLB No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Partnership Partnership means an agreement between two or more high need local educational agencies and the science, technology, engineering, or mathematics departments of the higher education institutes that have agreed to work together in the pursuit of common goals in an attempt to improve K-12 instructional quality and student performance in relative isolation from each other. It is expected that each partner normally contributes resources, exchange ideas, and assumes responsibility.

Conditions for success

- * Create relationships between institutes not between individuals only
- * Create a bond of trust and demonstrate openness
- * Work as a team, for consensus and consultation
- * Respect the organizational mission of each partner
- * Respect the expectations and limits of each partner
- * Share power, risks and responsibilities
- * Invest jointly in resources
- * Encourage commitment and permanency from the stakeholders
- * Evaluate the impact of the project on each partner regularly

Professional Development Activities means activities that –

- 1) improve and increase teachers' knowledge of the academic subject they teach;

- 2) are an integral part of broad school-wide and district-wide educational improvement plans;
- 3) give teachers, principals, and administrators the knowledge and skills to provide students with the opportunity to meet challenging state content standards;
- 4) improve classroom management skills;
- 5) are high quality, sustained, intensive, and classroom focused;
- 6) are not 1-day or short-term workshops or conferences;
- 7) advance teacher understanding of effective instructional strategies that are scientifically based and improve student academic achievement;
- 8) are aligned with state content standards and curricula tied to these standards;
- 9) are developed with extensive participation of teachers, principals, parents, and administrators;
- 10) are regularly evaluated for their impact on increased teacher effectiveness and improved student achievement.” (NCLB Title IX, Section 9101)

SAE State Agency for Education. This is the state agency that is responsible for K-12 education. In Wisconsin the SAE is DPI

SAHE State Agency for Higher Education. In Wisconsin the SAHE is UW System

Scientifically Based Research

(A) means research that involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs; **and**

(B) includes research that –

- i. employs systematic, empirical methods that draw on observation or experiment;
- ii. involves rigorous data analyses that are adequate to test the stated hypotheses and justify the general conclusions drawn;
- iii. relies on measurements or observational methods that provide reliable and valid data across evaluators and observers, across multiple measurements and observations, and across studies by the same or different investigators;
- iv. is evaluated using experimental or quasi-experimental designs in which individuals, entities, programs, or activities are assigned to different conditions and with appropriate controls to evaluate the effects of the condition of interest, with a preference for random-assignment experiments, or other designs to the extent that those designs contain within-condition or across-condition controls;
- v. ensures that experimental studies are presented in sufficient detail and clarity to allow for replication or, at a minimum, offer the opportunity to build systematically on their findings; and
- vi. has been accepted by a peer-reviewed journal or approved by a panel of independent experts through a comparably rigorous, objective, and scientific review.” (NCLB Title IX, Part A, Section 9101)

UW System University of Wisconsin System

WINSS Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools

Wisconsin High-need LEAs based upon most recent Census and teacher qualification data:

- Adams-Friendship Area School District
- Ashland School District
- Augusta School District
- Bayfield School District
- Belmont Community School District
- Beloit School District
- Birchwood School District
- Blair-Taylor School District
- Bowler School District
- Bruce School District
- Cashton School District
- Cassville School District
- Chequamegon School District
- Clayton School District
- Crandon School District
- Crivitz School District
- Drummond Area School District
- Fennimore Community School District
- Flambeau School District
- Geneva Joint No. 4 School District
- Gilman School District
- Granton Area School District
- Greenwood School District
- Hayward Community School District
- Hillsboro School District
- Kickapoo Area School District
- La Farge School District
- Lac du Flambeau No. 1 School District
- Ladysmith-Hawkins School District
- Lake Holcombe School District
- Loyal School District
- Markesan School District
- Menominee Indian School District
- Mercer School District
- Milwaukee School District
- New Auburn School District
- New Lisbon School District
- North Crawford School District
- Northwood School District
- Norwalk-Ontario-Wilton School District
- Owen-Withee School District
- Phelps School District

Prentice School District
Racine School District
Royall School District
Seneca School District
Siren School District
Solon Springs School District
South Shore School District
Spooner Area School District
Viroqua Area School District
Washington School District
Wausaukee School District
Wautoma Area School District
Westby Area School District
Westfield School District
Weston School District
Weyerhaeuser Area School District
Whitehall School District
Wild Rose School District
Winter School District

Additional Resources

US Department of Education Resources

No Child Left Behind website: <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/>

Bringing Evidence-Driven Progress to Education: A Recommended Strategy for the U.S. Department of Education. Report of the Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy. November 2002, at <http://www.excelgov.org/usermedia/images/uploads/PDFs/coalitionFinRpt.pdf>

What Works Clearinghouse <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/> established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, and the public with a central independent, and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education.

Wisconsin Resources

DPI Educator Licensing and Program Approval website: <http://dpi.wi.gov/tepd/>

DPI Content and Learning Team Division for Academic Excellence Team Directory website: <http://dpi.wi.gov/dae/>

Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS)

The WINSS, an Internet-based school improvement resource, it is an excellent tool to help not only schools identified for improvement, but any school wishing to improve performance in one or more of the accountability areas. WINSS has four sections:

1. *Standards and Assessment* describes the Wisconsin model academic content standards and state and local assessment tools available to educators to evaluate student progress in attaining proficiency in reading, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.
2. *Data Analysis* makes available all data about student performance on state assessments.
3. *Continuous School Improvement* describes the research base supporting characteristics of successful schools, and provides surveys that can be used to evaluate how a school is meeting its standards.
4. *Best Practices* contains resources for designing improvements to meet local goals.
See <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/sig/index.html>.

[All text, like this, within square brackets should be removed before submitting the proposal.]

PROPOSAL COVER PAGE WISCONSIN ESEA IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PROPOSAL

Project Title: _____

Applying Institution or Organization: _____

Project Director: Name _____ Phone _____

Mailing Address _____ Email _____

City _____, WI Zip _____

Level(s) of Project Participants (check all that apply):

Preservice K-4 5-6 7-8 9-12 Other _____

Core Subject Area(s): _____

Expected number of project participants each year: (do not include project staff)

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
Paraprofessional/Preservice			
PreK-12 Teachers			
School Administrators			
Others			

Dates of Project Activities: _____

Proposed Sources of Funding. (Complete the second and third year(s) for multi-year proposals only.)

	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
WEITQ Grant	\$.00	\$.00	\$.00
Applying IHE	\$.00	\$.00	\$.00
Other	\$.00	\$.00	\$.00
TOTAL	\$.00	\$.00	\$.00

Title, name, and address of Higher Education Institution that should receive notification of award:

Title _____ Name _____

Mailing Address _____

Email Address _____

For projects with more than one fiscal agent (such as IHE and CESA), please provide the title, name, and address of chief administrator of institution that should receive notification of award:

Title _____ Name _____

Mailing Address _____

Email Address _____

B. Abstract *[This page may be single-spaced – No Tables]*

IHE:

Title:

Teaching Grade Level of Participants:

Project Director and Email:

LEAs the project is designed to serve:

Activities:

Benefits:

Dates of project activities:

Number of participants:

[The next 15 pages must be double-spaced with a font size of at least 12 points (maximum of three lines per inch), and margins must be at least one inch. are for the Project Description. These pages use the order of the five major topics below.

1. Needs assessment (typically 2 pages):

Describe the needs being addressed, how they were identified and documented, and who was involved in this process.

2. Goals and objectives (typically 1 page):

Describe the specific objectives and how their achievement will increase student achievement/teacher quality

3. Program design (typically 9 pages):

Describe the program activities. Identify the alignment between the needs, objectives, activities, and evaluation. Identify the alignment of the activities with the Wisconsin Model Academic Standards and Wisconsin Teacher Standards. Provide details regarding: number of participants, participant selection, university credit, specific dates and times, responsible person assigned to each part of each activity, best practices model being used, and the related scientifically-based research.

4. Sustainability and follow-up (typically 1 page):

Describe the follow-up activities planned, and how the changes will be sustained after the project ends.

5. Evaluation (typically 2 pages):

Describe how the project will be evaluated. Include methods used to measure increased student achievement and enhanced teacher quality. For multiyear projects enumerate the specific documentation that will be provided in September 2011 to justify continuation.

Other Projects: *State whether a similar project has received funds from the Wisconsin ESEA Improving Teacher Quality Higher Education Program in prior years. If so:*

- When was it?*
- Who was the project director?*
- How does the proposed project differ from any previous project?*
- Why is Wisconsin ESEA Improving Teacher Quality support required for the proposed project?*
- Provide a summary of the evaluation of the previous project.*
- Provide evidence that the need still exists and that the previous project has helped to meet that need.*

Identify if the proposal is similar to or related to any funded Math Science Partnership project.

If more than one previous project has received WITQ funding then only describe the most recently completed project.]

Project Objective	Related Activities	Name(s) of Responsible Person(s)	Indicator of Success

[FOR THIS PAGE ONLY – Please use reduced font size to keep it within the one page limit.]

**WISCONSIN ESEA IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY
BUDGET SUMMARY FOR 2012 - 2013**

INSTITUTION:	SOURCE OF FUNDS	
	WITQ Funds	Other Funds
PERSONNEL COSTS (List names Separately)		
A. Key Personnel (Faculty & Administrators) Salaries		
B. Key Personnel Fringe Benefits		
C. Support Personnel (Clerical, Assistants, etc) Salaries		
D. Support Personnel Fringe Benefits		
E. Contracted (e.g. Consultants, Evaluators, others)		
1. TOTAL PERSONNEL COSTS		
PARTICIPANT RELATED COSTS		
TUITION & FEES		
A. Tuition		
B. Fees		
TOTAL TUITION & FEES		
PARTICIPANT SUPPORT COSTS		
A. Stipends		
B. Travel		
C. Lodging		
D. Meals		
E. Teacher Substitutes		
F, Other (Identify)		
TOTAL PARTICIPANT SUPPORT COSTS		
INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS		
A. Books, Materials, Supplies		
B. Other (Identify)		
TOTAL INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS		
2. TOTAL PARTICIPANT RELATED COSTS		
OTHER SUPPLIES AND EXPENSES		
A. Materials and Supplies		
B. Staff travel		
C. Other (Identify)		
3. TOTAL OTHER SUPPLIES AND EXPENSES		
SUBTOTAL		
INDIRECT COSTS (Max. 8% of subtotal costs)		
TOTAL COSTS		

Budget Explanation – Pages 20, 21, 22

[In this section provide an explanation for every line of the Budget Summary on the previous page.]

Notes:

The salary for faculty/staff should be based on the actual costs for a replacement buyout.

Funds listed in the WITQ column must be explained in detail.

Other funds should be listed, but detailed explanations are NOT required.

The external evaluator's cost should be listed under Personnel Costs.]

Form SR - 50% Special Rule Single Partner Use of Funds

Name of Higher Education Core Content Area Partner : _____

Category	Amount
1. PERSONNEL	
2. TUITION & FEES	
3. PARTICIPANT COSTS	
4. INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS	
5. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS	
6. CONTRACTUAL	
7. OTHER (indirect)	
Total Funding to this Partner Organization from Grant	

Name of Higher Education Teacher Education Area Partner : _____

Category	Amount
1. PERSONNEL	
2. TUITION & FEES	
3. PARTICIPANT COSTS	
4. INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS	
5. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS	
6. CONTRACTUAL	
7. OTHER	
Total Funding to this Partner Organization from Grant	

Name of Local Education Area Partner: _____

Category	Amount
1. PERSONNEL	
2. TUITION & FEES	
3. PARTICIPANT COSTS	
4. INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS	
5. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS	
6. CONTRACTUAL	
7. OTHER	
Total Funding to this Partner Organization from Grant	

All other partners combined

Category	Amount
1. PERSONNEL	
2. TUITION & FEES	
3. PARTICIPANT COSTS	
4. INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS	
5. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS	
6. CONTRACTUAL	
7. OTHER	
Total Funding to this Partner Organization from Grant	

COLLABORATION DOCUMENTATION Pages 24 and 25

Describe the cooperative planning that took place by the IHE arts and science faculty, teacher education faculty, LEA(s), and any other entities, in the preparation of this proposal. Include the date, location, topics of discussion, names of meeting participants, and any other pertinent information.

Date

Location

Agenda topic(s)

Meeting participants and their school affiliations:

Date

Location

Agenda topic(s)

Meeting participants and their school affiliations:

[Repeat the above format as needed.]

STATEMENT OF ASSURANCES

The applicant hereby assures that the project will comply with all of the following:

1. The applicant will comply with the regulations, policies, guidelines and requirements, including 45 CFR Part 74 and OMB Circulars No. A-102, A-133, and applicable costs principles Circulars: A-21, "Educational Institutions"; A-87, "Cost Principles for State and Local Governments"; and A-122, "Nonprofit Organizations") as they relate to the application, acceptance, and use of federal funds for this federally assisted project.
2. The applicant will comply with the administrative procedures and fiscal guidelines of the University of Wisconsin System and the United States Department of Education, including submission of all final reports.
3. The applicant will comply with Title II of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P. L. 88-352) and in accordance with Title VI of that Act, no person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which the applicant received federal financial assistance and will immediately take any measures to effectuate this agreement.
4. The applicant will comply with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, 29 U.S.C. 794, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicap in programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance.
5. The applicant will coordinate activities of a WITQ award and a Section 203 of Title II of the Higher Education Act award under the Partnership Program for improving teacher preparation.
6. The applicant will ensure that the use of grant funds are to supplement, and not supplant, funds from non-federal sources.
7. The applicant will ensure equitable participation of teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals in both public and private schools.
8. The applicant will conduct the professional development activities as described in this proposal.

Name of the individual with fiscal authority for the grant:

Name _____ Address _____

PROJECT DIRECTOR:

TYPED NAME AND TITLE

SIGNATURE / DATE

INSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY:

TYPED NAME AND TITLE

SIGNATURE / DATE

ELIGIBLE PARTNERSHIP DOCUMENTATION

Activities funded under ESEA Title II Higher Education subgrants are required to involve the joint effort of the institution's school or department of education, the school(s) or department(s) in the specific discipline(s) in which the professional development will be provided. The Project Director may not sign as representing an eligible partner. A complete proposal must have a signature from one of the LEAs involved in the planning of the proposal. Additional LEAs, schools, businesses, or other educational entities, may be added later.

1. The following Dean or Department Chair of the core subject area at the proposing IHE concurs with the information in this proposal regarding the partnership for this project.

Please Print Title, Name, Discipline

Signature

Date

2. The following Dean or Department Chair of a department or school of education at the proposing IHE concurs with the information in this proposal regarding the partnership for this project.

Please Print Title, Name

Signature

Date

3. The following representative (Superintendent, Principal, or appropriate administrator) of an LEA concurs with the information in this proposal regarding the partnership for this project.

Please Print Title, Name, School District

Signature

Date

[*This page is to be completed by two and three year projects ONLY.*]

**WISCONSIN ESEA IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY
ESTIMATED BUDGET SUMMARY FOR 2013 - 2014**

INSTITUTION:	SOURCE OF FUNDS	
	WITQ Funds	Other Funds
PERSONNEL COSTS (List names Separately)		
A. Key Personnel (Faculty & Administrators) Salaries		
B. Key Personnel Fringe Benefits		
C. Support Personnel (Clerical, Assistants, etc) Salaries		
D. Support Personnel Fringe Benefits		
E. Contracted (Consultants, evaluators, others)		
1. TOTAL PERSONNEL COSTS		
PARTICIPANT RELATED COSTS		
TUITION & FEES		
A. Tuition		
B. Fees		
TOTAL TUITION & FEES		
PARTICIPANT SUPPORT COSTS		
A. Stipends		
B. Travel		
C. Lodging		
D. Meals		
E. Teacher Substitutes		
F, Other (Identify)		
TOTAL PARTICIPANT SUPPORT COSTS		
INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS		
A. Books, Materials, Supplies		
B. Other (Identify)		
TOTAL INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS		
2. TOTAL PARTICIPANT RELATED COSTS		
OTHER SUPPLIES AND EXPENSES		
A. Materials and Supplies		
B. Postage		
C. Staff travel		
D. Other (Identify)		
3. TOTAL OTHER SUPPLIES AND EXPENSES		
SUBTOTAL		
INDIRECT COSTS (Max. 8% of subtotal costs)		
TOTAL COSTS		

[This page is to be completed by three year projects ONLY.]
WISCONSIN ESEA IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY
ESTIMATED BUDGET SUMMARY FOR 2014 - 2015

INSTITUTION:	SOURCE OF FUNDS	
	WITQ Funds	Other Funds
PERSONNEL COSTS (List names Separately)		
A. Key Personnel (Faculty & Administrators) Salaries		
B. Key Personnel Fringe Benefits		
C. Support Personnel (Clerical, Assistants, etc) Salaries		
D. Support Personnel Fringe Benefits		
E. Contracted (Consultants, evaluators, others)		
1. TOTAL PERSONNEL COSTS		
PARTICIPANT RELATED COSTS		
TUITION & FEES		
A. Tuition		
B. Fees		
TOTAL TUITION & FEES		
PARTICIPANT SUPPORT COSTS		
A. Stipends		
B. Travel		
C. Lodging		
D. Meals		
E. Teacher Substitutes		
F, Other (Identify)		
TOTAL PARTICIPANT SUPPORT COSTS		
INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS		
A. Books, Materials, Supplies		
B. Other (Identify)		
TOTAL INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS		
2. TOTAL PARTICIPANT RELATED COSTS		
OTHER SUPPLIES AND EXPENSES		
A. Materials and Supplies		
B. Postage		
C. Staff travel		
D. Other (Identify)		
3. TOTAL OTHER SUPPLIES AND EXPENSES		
SUBTOTAL		
INDIRECT COSTS (Max. 8% of subtotal costs)		
TOTAL COSTS		

[ONE-page vita for each person identified in the proposal and listed in the budget as Key Personnel on additional pages as needed.]

WISCONSIN IMPROVING TEACHER
QUALITY PROGRAM

APPENDIX I

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS



ACADEMIC AFFAIRS



[UW System Home](#) > [Academic Affairs](#)

Academic Affairs

Wisconsin ESEA Title II Improving Teacher Quality Program

[Home](#) | [Request for Proposals](#) | [Forms](#) | [FAQs](#) | [Projects](#) | [Related Links](#) | [Acronyms](#)

Grant Competition for Institutions of Higher Education in Wisconsin

Frequently Asked Questions

The following questions and answers are intended to provide additional information regarding the Wisconsin ESEA Improving Teacher Quality Grants.

1. What is the purpose of the ESEA Title II Higher Education Grants program?

In Wisconsin, the University of Wisconsin System administers a portion of the Title II, Part A funds to make competitive subgrants to eligible partnerships comprised of at least institutions of higher education and high-need LEAs. The partnerships use the funds to conduct professional development activities in core academic subjects in order to ensure that highly qualified teachers, paraprofessionals, and (if appropriate) principals have subject matter knowledge in the academic subjects they teach, or in computer-related technology to enhance instruction. The University of Wisconsin System works in conjunction with the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

2. Who is eligible to receive a competitive award under this program?

Eligibility is limited to partnerships comprised at a minimum of (1) a private or State Institution of Higher Education (IHE) and the division of the institution that prepares teachers and principals; (2) a school of arts and sciences; and (3) a high need LEA (see below).

An eligible partnership also may include additional LEAs, a public charter school, an elementary school or secondary school, an educational service agency, a nonprofit educational organization, another IHE, a nonprofit cultural organization, a teacher or principal organization, or a business.

A high-need LEA is defined as an LEA:

(A)(i) 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 the children served by the agency are from families with incomes below the poverty line; and

(B)(i) for which there is a high percentage of teachers not teaching in the academic subjects or grade levels that the teachers were trained to teach; or
(ii) for which there is a high percentage of teachers with emergency, provisional, or temporary certification or licensing. [section 2102]

3. What activities may the UWS fund with its share of Improving Teacher Quality State Grants funds?

Consistent with the priorities and criteria it has announced for selection of grant recipients, the UWS must make awards of Improving Teacher Quality State Grants funds to support the following types of partnership activities to enhance student achievement in participating high-need LEAs:

1. Professional development activities in core academic subjects to ensure that:

- a. Teachers and highly qualified paraprofessionals (and, when appropriate, principals) have subject matter knowledge in the academic subjects that the teachers teach (including knowledge of how to use computers and other technology to enhance student learning); and
 - b. Principals have the instructional leadership skills to help them work more effectively with teachers to help students master core academic subjects.
2. Development and provision of assistance to LEAs and to their teachers, highly qualified paraprofessionals, or school principals, in providing sustained, high-quality professional development activities that:
 - a. Ensure that those individuals can use challenging State academic content standards, student academic achievement standards, and State assessments to improve instructional practices and student academic achievement;
 - b. May include intensive programs designed to prepare individuals to provide instruction related to the professional development described in the preceding paragraph to others in their schools; and
 - c. May include activities of partnerships between one or more LEAs, one or more of the LEAs' schools, and one or more IHEs for the purpose of improving teaching and learning at low performing schools.

Note: The law requires any partnership receiving both a subgrant from a SAHE and an award under the Partnership Program for Improving Teacher Preparation in section 203 of Title 11 of the Higher Education Act (HEA) to coordinate activities conducted under the two awards.

4. Are there state of Wisconsin DPI resources available for prospective proposers?

Yes, the Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS) website (<http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/sig/index.html>) is a tool to help proposers work with schools to improve student achievement.

5. When will project activities take place?

Funding will be for participant related activities that take place March 1, 2012 through July 31, 2013, except for the initial year(s) of multi-year projects. Multi-year projects are for two or three years and the first year's activities end March 1, 2013. Project funding and activities for the second year begin March 1, 2013.

6. How will the selection be made for which proposals to fund?

Grants will be awarded on a competitive basis. All proposals will be reviewed by a widely based Proposal Review Committee of Wisconsin educators representing public and private higher education institutions, K-12 schools, University of Wisconsin System, Wisconsin Technical College System, the Department of Public Instruction, and non-profit organizations. Reviewers use a proposal evaluation form for assigning a score to each proposal. The program coordinator and the University of Wisconsin System's Office of Academic Affairs will make the final selection.

7. How much money will be available for the ESEA Title II Higher Education Grant Program in Wisconsin?

The amount available for higher education projects in Wisconsin is approximately \$1,126,000. Approximately \$600,000 of this will be used for continuing the existing multi-year projects.

8. Are there any other requirements regarding the statewide distribution of these subgrants?

Yes. The UWS must ensure either that subgrants are equitably distributed by geographic area within a State or that subgrants serve eligible partnerships in all geographic areas within the State [Section 2132(b)].

9. Must members of the partnership receiving a subgrant use a "restricted indirect cost rate" in calculating the maximum amount of indirect costs that may be charged to their awards?

No. The Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program does not require these partnerships to use program funds only to supplement and not supplant non-Federal funds that otherwise would be used for funded activities. Because the restricted indirect cost rate (see section 76.563 of EDGAR) applies only where a "supplement not supplant" requirement is in effect, partnership members may apply a larger, unrestricted indirect cost rate.

10. In establishing application selection criteria or funding priorities, may the UWS preclude members of the partnership from charging any indirect costs to the subgrant?

No. EDGAR and applicable Office of Management and Budget (OMB) cost principles permit grant recipients to charge indirect costs to their grants. However, indirect costs are limited to 8 % of the subgrant.

11. Is the amount of administrative costs considered when awarding subgrants? May the UWS establish, as a selection criterion to be used in reviewing subgrant applications, the willingness of the partnership members to limit the amount of their administrative costs?

Yes. Preference is given to applicants that agree to charge lower levels of administrative costs. The program director will negotiate budgets with applicants selected for awards to ensure that all administrative costs are reasonable and necessary for the proper implementation of the grant.

12. Will proposals for funding the first year of multi-year projects be considered this year?

Yes. Proposals for two or three year projects are encouraged. Funding for second year and third year activities will be dependent on:

1. Continued grant money to UWS for a professional development program;
2. Sufficient first year enrollment to warrant continued funding;
3. Successful completion of the project's first year activities;
4. Ensuring that there is effective management of the day-to-day operations of subgrant-supported activities;
5. Ensuring compliance with program requirements and that performance goals are being achieved; and
6. Ensuring that there is fiscal control and fund accountability over all subgrant funds.

If the program director determines that a partnership's Title 11, Part A-supported activities are not complying either with the Title 11 program requirements or the IHE's approved application action will be taken either to (1) bring the project into compliance, or (2) terminate the project rather than issue a continuation award.

13. Who may participate in funded Wisconsin ESEA Improving Teacher Quality Program activities?

Teams of teachers
 Teachers
 Pupil services personnel
 Administrators
 Preservice/Paraprofessionals

14. Do the ESEA Title IX requirements on services to private school teachers apply to activities that IHE-LEA partnerships conduct under competitive awards they receive from the SAHE?

Yes. The IHE-LEA partnerships need to ensure that services are offered on an equitable basis to public and private school teachers since the requirements

apply to grants of "financial assistance" provided to an LEA "or another entity" [Section 9501(b)(1)].

15. When are proposals due?

All proposals must be emailed by 4:30 p.m. September 23, 2011.

16. What is the allowable amount for a proposal?

There is no stated maximum. Grants awarded in the past ranged from \$18,000 to \$98,000.

17. When will proposers be notified if they are to receive a grant?

Approximately January 15th of the year after they were submitted.

18. What are the reporting requirements for funded projects?

Each IHE that receives a subgrant must complete a financial report within 30 days of the project completion date. Project directors must submit a project report by September 30, 2006. The reporting forms will be available online. Each project must attend a reporting conference in Spring after they have conducted a summer and fall program.

19. May a partner (i.e., IHE faculty in teacher education, IHE faculty in arts and sciences, LEA, or other educational entity) be a partner in more than one proposal?

Yes. There is nothing that prevents any partner from working with more than one proposal or funded project.

20. According to the proposal guidelines, each project must include "IHE faculty from the division of the institution that prepares teachers." Our proposed project will focus on professional development for K-12 teachers. Are we still required to include IHE faculty from Teacher Ed in our project?

It is an absolute requirement that every proposal must have "IHE faculty from the division of the institution that prepares teachers." However, two IHEs may work together, with one supplying the IHE faculty members from the Arts and Sciences, and the other one supplying the IHE faculty members from the Teacher Education program.

21. We feel we have a good, comprehensive, collaborative project, with opportunities for K-12 faculty and IHE faculty. However, the budget is over \$100,000. How should we proceed?

In a case like this, I would advise you to budget what you believe is appropriate. If the review committee recommends the project, they may recommend a lower award either by directing project changes, or recommend a specific amount asking the proposer to negotiate changes with me. In all cases, the proposer has the final word on what changes are made.

22. Are projects restricted to one LEA partner? And must all LEA participants be from Schools In Need of Improvement (SIFI)?

Multiple LEAs may be a part of a proposal, and participants may come from any schools, not only Schools In Need of Improvement (SIFI).

23. I'm really quite confused about the 50% rule. I may be missing some obvious thing about this new 50% rule so would really appreciate any advice you can offer which may clarify it for us.

The 50% Special Rule provision does not focus on which partner receives the funds, but which partner benefits from the funds. In completing Form SR, enter an estimate that apportions the proposed amount according to how it would benefit each partner. Salaries of IHE faculty may reasonably be attributed to the LEA partner that employs the participant as a teacher. At this time, details and explanations of this division are not required. Generally, the indirect costs are attributed to the partner that is the fiscal agent.

© 2010 Board of Regents - University of Wisconsin System. All Rights Reserved
[A-Z Index](#) | [Accessibility Policy](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Contact Webmaster](#)
XHTML | CSS

WISCONSIN IMPROVING TEACHER
QUALITY PROGRAM

APPENDIX II

PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Wisconsin ESEA Improving Teacher Quality Grant Proposal Evaluation Form

Project Director: _____ Amount Requested: _____

Points Awarded

1. Significance & Documentation of needs (10 points) _____

- How have K-12 teachers and staff been significantly involved in the selection of problem(s)?
- How have K-12 teachers and staff been significantly involved in the formulation of the solutions(s)?
- Is the nature and extent of partnership(s) clearly explained?
- Are needs documented?
- Are specific student/learner needs identified?

Comments

2. Project Goals and Objectives (30 points) _____

- Are the goals attainable?
- Are objectives specific, clearly stated, and measurable?
- How is this program expected to increase student achievement/learning?
- What difference would it make in classroom instruction?

Comments

3. Design of Proposed Project Activities (30 points) _____

- Are the activities aligned with goals and objectives?
- Are the activities aligned with Wisconsin Model Academic Standards and Wisconsin Teacher Standards?
- Is a timeline included?
- Is this an innovative or experimental approach to accomplish the goals?
- Are the proposed project and activities based in scientific research?
- Are appropriate best practice models being used?
- Is each activity and its objective clearly defined?

Comments

4. Sustainability and follow-up (5 points) _____

Are there provisions for insuring that changes are sustained after project funding?

Are there plans for disseminating the content knowledge and methodology of the project to other audiences?

Comments

5. Evaluation (15 points) _____

Is there a detailed plan for assessing outcomes and overall success?

Is there a detailed plan to measure increased student achievement?

Is there a detailed plan to determine enhanced teacher quality?

Are the both formative and summative methods being used?

Is there an outside evaluator?

Comments

6. Activity Summary (5 points)

Does the activity table contain all rows and columns described in the RFP?

Is the person(s) responsible for each activity appropriately qualified?

Are the Indicators of Success tangible?

General Comments

7. Personnel, Budget, and Budget Narrative (5 points) _____

Are the personnel appropriately qualified to carry out the proposed activities?

Are the expenditures clearly defined?

Is there a clear explanation of all personnel costs, and how they were determined?

Comments

Total Points _____

Recommended YES MAYBE NO

Amount Recommended _____

Note: Members of the Proposal Review Committee use this form as they evaluate proposals. Selection of proposals for funding is in part based on the composite results of these evaluations.