REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Supporting professional development for pK-12 teachers and principals in mathematics, science, language arts and foreign language

2010 OREGON UNIVERSITY/SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS

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

RFP Issued:	***February 17, 2010***
Intent-to-Apply Form Due:	***March 12, 2010, 3:00 p.m.***
Proposal Due Date:	***April 8, 2010, 3:00 p.m.***
Projects Notified:	***April 21, 2010***
Projects May Begin:	***May 1, 2010***
Projects Must Finish By:	***June 30, 2012***

The Teaching Research Institute
Western Oregon University
Oregon University System

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

http://www.tr.wou.edu/usp/

CONTENTS

I. RFP SPECIFICATIONS

A. BACKGROUND

Federal Legislation. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) became law January 8, 2002. The Act substantially revised the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) in a manner designed to provide all of America's school children with the opportunity and means to achieve academic success. It embodies four key principles of President Bush's education reform plan: 1) accountability for results; 2) expanded state and local flexibility and reduced "red tape;" 3) expanded choices for parents; and 4) focusing resources on proven educational methods, particularly in reading instruction.

The Act provides officials and educators at the school, district, and state level flexibility to plan/implement school programs that will help close the achievement gap between disadvantaged and minority students and their peers. At the same time, the reauthorized Act holds school officials accountable to parents, students, and the public for achieving results. The full text of this law is available online at http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html.

NCLB authorizes the funding of higher education/school partnerships in each state through Title II, Part A, Teacher and Principal Quality Training and Recruiting Fund. The purpose of Title II, Part A, is to increase the academic achievement of all students by helping schools and school districts improve teacher and principal quality and ensure that all teachers are highly qualified. Title II, Part A, provides for pK-12 teacher and principal recruitment, induction, and professional development support through K-16 partnerships. NCLB specifies that a partnership may use the funds for professional development of teachers and principals in core academic subjects, assistance to local education agencies in providing professional development for teachers, paraprofessionals or principals that will improve teaching and learning, and leadership skills for principals. States are given discretion in deciding the focus of their Title IIA spending.

NCLB in Oregon. This RFP describes the Oregon Higher Education Title II, Part A, Competitive Grant Program, part of the NCLB legislation. Each state is charged with developing its NCLB programs. Funds under the NCLB program are allocated to states via statutory formulas, based on the number of children aged 5-17 in each state. The Oregon Department of Education is responsible for the administration and supervision of the NCLB programs in Oregon. The Teaching Research Institute has responsibility for the administration and supervision of the NCLB Title II, Part A, University/School Partnership (USP) program, the section of Title IIA funding administered by a State agency of higher education (SAHE). The 2009-2010 allocation for University/School Partnership grants was $708,931 and is expected to be a similar amount for 2010-2011, provided funding through the U.S. Department of Education remains level. Nearly all of this amount will be available to fund new projects under this RFP.

The average amount of an annual grant award is anticipated to be $70,000 - $100,000, depending upon the size of the university/school partnership and the extent of proposed project activities and participants. About 7-10 two-year projects can be funded through this RFP, or

more if projects request one year funding only. The University/School Partnerships are now on a two-year cycle and the next RFP will not be issued until late 2011 or early 2012.

The SAHE administers its portion of *Title II, Part A* funds by working in conjunction with the SEA to identify priorities and criteria for funding competitive applications. The SAHE's priorities are guided by the "State plan," developed under Section 2112 of the ESEA, which identifies statewide professional development needs and priorities for developing, supporting, and retaining a high-quality teaching force. The focus for 2010 grant competition will be on professional development of teachers and principals in three academic core areas: **language arts, mathematics,** and **science**. In addition, one project will be funded in **foreign language**.

The State has a current focus on improving instruction in mathematics at all levels because of increased graduation requirements, so with a hypothetical number of eight funded projects, we would ideally fund three in mathematics, two in science, two in language arts, and one in foreign language. If proposals are otherwise relatively equal, we will strive to meet this proportion.

B. HIGH-NEED LEAs

An important requirement of the NCLB programs is a focus on high-need school districts – local education agencies (LEAs). By federal definition, a high-need LEA is a district:

(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% 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. (* 2.5%+ beginning 2006)

[NCLB, Section 2102(3)]

A list of 48 eligible LEAs (districts) and their high-need schools (those with 40%+ children eligible for free/reduced lunch) is in the Attachment section. The eligibility list includes 14 new districts for this year. At the end of the chart is a list of 12 school districts that were on the previous list but are no longer eligible along with the reason(s) why they lost eligibility. Projects are urged to consider adding one or more of these high poverty LEAs as partners once they have secured an eligible high-need LEA partner. Projects are allowed to have non high-need LEA partners and to serve non high-need schools within an LEA, but the focus should be on high-need LEAs and high-poverty and low-performing schools.

C. SCIENTIFICALLY-BASED RESEARCH DEFINITION

NCLB requires grant-funded professional development activities to be based upon a review of scientifically based research. The following is a synopsis of the definition of "scientifically-based research" as stated in NCLB, Section 9101(37):

- Research that involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs.
- Includes research that: employs systematic, empirical methods; involves rigorous data analysis; relies on measurements that provide reliable and valid data; is evaluated using experimental or quasi-experimental designs; can be replicated; and has been accepted by a peer-review journal.

D. OREGON HIGHER EDUCATION GRANTS

1. General Guidelines of the USP Program

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) and The Teaching Research Institute (TRI) have collaborated to identify the selection criteria and priority areas for the 2010 Oregon USP grants. The following guidelines have been established for this competitive grant program:

- Professional development must focus on the needs of teachers and/or principals in high-need schools, although other schools may participate in the university/school partnerships.
- Professional development activities must be high quality, sustained, intensive, and focus on a classroom, school, and/or district in order to have a positive and lasting impact on classroom instruction and the teacher's performance in the classroom. One-time, short-term workshops or conferences are not considered to be effective professional development activities.
- Priority in funding grants will be given to partnerships that include low-performing schools.
- Selection criteria will include geographical location to maximize the inclusion of all portions of the state in partnership projects.
- Selection criteria and priorities will promote improved academic achievement based on an analysis of high-need LEA student achievement data (based on gap analysis between student achievement and student learning expectations related to Oregon state academic content standards) in addition to identified needs of teachers and principals related to the teaching and learning of students.
- USP grants will be required to demonstrate how grant-funded professional development activities are based upon a review of scientifically based research.

- Participation of teachers (and principals, if included) with college/university teacher and administrator preparation programs AND arts/sciences content experts is required in the development of a professional development proposal.

2. Applications for Grants

Oregon colleges and universities with teacher and administrator preparation programs approved by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, in partnership with college/university divisions or colleges of Arts & Science, school districts and other eligible partners are invited to submit proposals for USP grants. Colleges and universities may submit multiple proposals. High-need LEAs, ESDs, community colleges, and other eligible partners (see Section E: 2) may also submit proposals, but the fiscal agent must be either the teacher education division or the arts & science division of a college/university with an approved teacher preparation program.

3. Priorities for Funding in the 2010 Competition

State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Susan Castillo, has priorities for Oregon schools in the areas of closing the achievement gap, preparing for the new diploma requirements, and success for all students. There is also an emphasis on leadership development in these areas. These desired outcomes should also be considered in developing proposals.

pK-12 Professional Development Projects

- Projects are sought to upgrade the content and pedagogical knowledge/skills of current pK-12 teachers, particularly to improve their competencies in the core academic subject areas of literacy/language arts, mathematics, science, and foreign language, and especially teachers who are not "highly qualified" as required by NCLB and Title I definitions.

- Projects may address professional development needs of early childhood, elementary, middle school and high school teachers and principals in the following core academic subject areas: English, reading, or language arts; mathematics; science; and foreign language.

- Professional development projects must support Oregon's standards-based school reforms (e.g., content standards appropriate for grade levels, assessment).

- Projects are encouraged to include school principals and vice principals in professional development around the core academic areas of literacy/Language Arts, mathematics, science, or foreign language. Principals with a thorough understanding of the content and processes of core academic subjects are better able to provide school leadership grounded in faculty and student learning outcomes.

E. GENERAL FUNDING CRITERIA AND ELIGIBILITY

1. All regionally accredited Oregon colleges and universities that are approved by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission to prepare licensed educators are eligible to apply for USP grants and may submit any number of proposals. Other eligible partners (see E.2 below) may submit a proposal, but the teacher education division or the arts and sciences division of a college or university with an approved teacher preparation program must be the fiscal agent (lead partner in the budget).

2. An eligible USP grant partnership **must** include three partners:

   a) a state institution of higher education or an independent (private) institution of higher education and the division of the institution that prepares teachers and/or school principals;

   b) a school/department of arts and sciences in an institution of higher education, and

   c) an eligible high-need LEA (see Section B and Attachment).

   An eligible partnership **may** also include another district, a public charter school, an education service agency, a non-profit cultural organization, another institution of higher education (2- or 4-year), a school/department of arts and sciences within such an institution, the division of such an institution that prepares teachers and principals, an entity carrying out a pre-kindergarten program, a teacher organization, a principal organization, or a business.

3. A variety of professional development formats are encouraged to facilitate the widest possible access to professional development opportunities for teachers and/or principals. These could include: courses in mathematics, science, or literacy (particularly content area reading/writing) that are focused on classroom results, are aligned with state standards, and that meet identified needs of districts and ESDs; intensive institutes offered in the summer; shorter workshops offered over time during the school year (e.g., 1-2 days per month over a period of months); telecommunicated opportunities offered during the summer and/or school-year; training opportunities delivered onsite at schools, ESDs, or other nearby sites; one-on-one technical assistance; or a mix of these or other formats. *Note*: NCLB Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, Non-Regulatory Guidance for Title II, Part A (10/05/06, Section E-12) recommends distance learning for professional development delivery to teachers/ principals in remote or rural areas.

4. Projects must avoid "one-shot" training approaches and instead provide intensive training programs with appropriate follow-through provisions. Training programs of fewer than 10 days total are not likely to be funded.

   Follow-up component(s) that encourage teachers to continually apply new knowledge and skills in the classroom are required. Examples of follow-up components include: teacher assignments during the school year; visiting other teachers' classrooms and hosting teacher

visits; working with educator teams on special projects (e.g., curriculum development); projects with business and industry, Internet networking; etc.

Projects funded through this program should take into account findings from a 1991 SRI International study that professional development activities are most effective when they:

- are related to long-term improvement goals;
- are of sufficient intensity to allow for integration into understanding and implementation;
- are related to classroom assignments;
- include professional teams (rather than individuals) that can work with each other over time;
- have follow-up activities or reinforcement activities, or both;
- have the administrative and policy support of the school or local education agency.

5. Funds made available through the USP Program may be used only to supplement, not supplant, funds from non-federal sources.

6. Priority will be given to projects that propose to serve the professional development needs of teachers and/or principals from low-performing, high-need schools.

7. Projects should incorporate equity strategies to assist teachers, administrators, and other school staff in using practices that will provide all of their pK-12 students – regardless of population grouping or individual learning styles or needs – with the opportunity to achieve excellence.

8. Grantees must demonstrate the capacity to meet the accounting and reporting components required of the USP program, to include submission of cost reimbursement invoices on a regular basis (monthly or quarterly), and completion of abstracts, evaluation reports, final financial report, and final written reports in a timely manner.

9. NCLB requires that no single partner in an eligible partnership use more than 50% of the grant funds made available to the partnership. The term "use of funds" applies to the cost of running or administering the grant program. "Use of funds" can also be determined by who gets the ultimate benefit.

F. PERFORMANCE STANDARDS, MEASURES, INDICATORS

The following set of standards and performance measures will be used to evaluate successful performance for the 2010 Oregon USP higher education projects as a group (all projects considered together), for reporting purposes to the federal NCLB program. Individual projects are not required to meet all of these standards. Projects should select which of the standards they will meet, and indicate these in the proposal.

Individual projects supported by USP funds will be required to submit a Performance Report at the conclusion of the project (or annually for two-year projects), providing evidence of which of

these performance standards were met by the project and providing documentation of the relevant performance measures.

Standard 1: The professional development provided by the Oregon USP projects is intensive, sustained, and ongoing.

Performance Measure:

1. Projects provide a minimum of 60 inservice professional development contact hours for the primary cohort of inservice participants. *(The primary cohort of inservice participants is that group of teachers and/or administrators targeted by the professional development design and implementation activities described by the project in its proposal.*)

Standard 2: Professional development activities provided by Oregon USP projects serve teachers and principals in Oregon's highest need districts and schools.

Performance Measure:

1. Projects serving districts and schools provide evidence of efforts and progress in serving teachers and principals in schools that meet Oregon's highest need classification.

Standard 3: Professional development activities provided by USP projects are responsive to the teaching and learning needs identified in school and/or district professional development plans.

Performance Measures:

1. Projects provide evidence of alignment with school and/or district professional development plans through articulated service agreements such as Memoranda of Agreement, that specify:
   a. How the professional development provided addresses school and/or district needs identified in the professional development plan(s); and
   b. How the effectiveness of the professional development provided by the project will be evaluated, and project activities revised, to meet the continuing needs identified by the school/district professional development plan(s).

Standard 4: All USP professional development activities provide significant opportunities for active learning.

*Performance Measure*s:

1. Projects demonstrate support, directly or through articulated agreements, of active learning activities such as: a) peer observation and feedback of participant teaching; b) practice under simulated conditions with feedback; c) informal meetings with other participants to discuss classroom implementation; d) sharing/reviewing student work; e) scoring/analyzing assessments; f) planning, developing and peer reviewing curricula or lesson plans; g) opportunity to present, demonstrate, or lead discussions with peer participants; h) analyzing teaching and learning needs using disaggregated student achievement data.

Standard 5: All USP professional development activities incorporate equity strategies to assist teachers, administrators, and other school staff in using practices that will provide all of their pK-12 students – regardless of population grouping or individual learning styles or needs with the opportunity to achieve excellence. (Note: This is a state priority.)

Performance Measures:

1. All USP projects provide evidence that project activities address equity issues in teaching and learning.

Standard 6: Professional development content activities provided by USP projects utilize the Oregon Content Standards in the appropriate content area(s).

*Performance Measure*s:

1. All projects providing subject area content offerings can demonstrate explicit connections between these professional development activities and the Oregon standards-based (content) standards. (See http://www.ode.state.or.us/teachlearn/real/newspaper/)

Standard 7: Professional development activities provided by USP projects support the development and growth of learning communities that involve prospective, novice and experienced teachers, administrators, and higher education faculty in collaborative interactions focused on improving student achievement.

Performance Measures:

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

G. AMOUNT OF FUNDING

The amount of grant funds available for all competitive grants in the 2010 competition is $708,931. Projects ending no later than June 30, 2012 are permissible in this RFP, although the availability of grant funds after June 30, 2011 is contingent on expected future funding of NCLB (or its replacement) by Congress.

The average amount of an annual grant award is anticipated to be $70,000 - $100,000, depending upon the size of the university/school partnership and the extent of proposed project activities and participants. About 7-10 projects total can be funded in this competition.

It is expected that no project will receive a grant award that does not meet a minimum 85% average score through the competitive review process. It should be noted that additional

consideration in the review process will be given to partnership projects which will impact teachers and/or principals in low-performing, high-need schools; partnerships proposed in geographic locations underrepresented by current and new USP projects; and projects that propose to work with a significant number of high-need LEAs (see Section I).

H. USE OF FUNDS

USP funds may be used for personnel and instructional costs such as staff/teacher and faculty release time or summer contracts; master teachers who serve a number of teachers in a defined region with one-to-one professional development assistance; stipends or tuition assistance for teachers to take relevant graduate-level coursework (including online courses if partner LEAs are geographically distant from campus partners); in-state travel costs; preparation and duplication of materials; workshop training-related costs; and related supplies.

A maximum of 8% indirect may be added to most budget items, but may not be added to teacher stipends for tuition. Funds for equipment purchases will not be covered except in unusual circumstances and only where the project's success directly hinges on the purchase of such equipment. No single partner in an eligible partnership may use more than 50% of the grant funds made available to the partnership.

I. REVIEW PROCESS

Proposals will be read by a review team composed of ODE staff and TRI-identified readers selected from the following categories: higher education faculty and administrators, Oregon Education Association, Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, and pK-12 teachers and administrators. Proposals will receive a minimum of three reviews. Proposals will be reviewed according to the following criteria:

Category	*Criteria*	*Points*
Priorities and Performance Standards	Extent to which the project addresses the USP priorities, including the USP performance standards and relevant measures/indicators, and proposes relevant evaluation measures.	30
Strength of eligible partnership	Extent to which the project has been planned and will be implemented with the full cooperation of the higher education institution, high-need district(s), and other schools/organizations in an eligible partnership.	20
Activities & Timeline	Extent to which project activities show evidence they can provide the conditions that will lead to the anticipated outcomes and can be accomplished within the stated time frame. Project activities are based on a review of scientifically based research.	20
Budget	Extent to which activities and outcomes are appropriate to the requested budget (reasonable per participant cost; numbers of participants served).	15

Key Personnel	Extent to which the qualifications and responsibilities of the key project personnel are appropriate for the project, including the capability to effectively manage the project.	15
	Total Available Points:	100

	Special Criteria
Low performing schools	Additional consideration will be given to partnership projects that will impact teachers and/or principals in low performing, high-need schools.
Geographic location	Additional consideration will be given to partnerships proposed in geographic locations underrepresented by proposals and current USP projects.
High-need LEAs	Additional consideration will be given to partnerships that propose to work with a significant number of high-need LEAs (e.g., 3 or more).

TRI may also arrange for email queries or telephone interviews with the Principal Investigator of proposed projects for further clarification of various sections of submitted proposals.

J. STATEMENT OF ASSURANCES

Applicants are required to sign a Statement of Assurances before receiving federal funds. Although the Statement of Assurances is required only of projects receiving grant awards, it is expedient to collect and submit all signature documents with the proposal.

K. TIMELINE

Key Dates	
RFP announcement issued	February 17, 2010
Intent-to-Apply Form due	March 12, 2010, 3:00 p.m.
Proposal due date	April 8, 2010, 3:00 p.m.
Proposals reviewed and selected	April 9 – 20, 2010
Projects notified	April 21, 2010
Contracts sent to lead partner (fiscal agent)	April 22 – 27, 2010
Projects may begin work	May 1, 2010 (if TRI has received signed contract)
Year One report due (for 2-year projects)	April 1, 2011
Final reports due	60 days after project end

II. APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

A. INTENT-TO-APPLY FORM

The Intent-to-Apply Form helps us pre-screen partner eligibility and plan for appropriate proposal reviewers. Submit the Intent-to-Apply Form by mail, fax or email to arrive at our office no later than 3:00 p.m., March 12, 2010. This form carries the weight of a pre-proposal; no final proposal will be considered without timely submission of the Intent-to-Apply Form.

- Fax to 503-838-8150, Attn: Bonnie Morihara
- Email to moriharb@wou.edu and glaseng@wou.edu
- Mail to address provided in following section. Form must be received in our office by 3/12/10, 3:00 p.m.

B. PROPOSAL DUE DATE & MAILING

The deadline for receipt of proposals under the University/School Partnership competitive grant program is 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, April 8, 2010. You must submit one original proposal with signatures and an electronic version of the proposal and budget in Word or Word/Excel by 3:00 p.m. on April 8, 2010. Both the hard copy and electronic copy of your proposal must be received by 3:00 p.m. on 04/08/10.

The page limit for proposal, budget, signed documents, and appendices is 25 pages. Letters of support and other supplementary materials may be included in an appendix, but the 25-page limit means that reviewers will judge your proposal based on the first 25 pages if you exceed the limit.

- Proposals and budgets must be emailed as a Word or Word/Excel attachment. Email proposals and budgets to: moriharb@wou.edu with copies to mafitc@wou.edu and glaseng@wou.edu.

- Mail or deliver one original proposal, budget, and signature pages (cover page, joint effort document, and statement of assurances) to TRI by 3:00 p.m., April 8, 2010. Confirmation of receipt will be e-mailed to the Project Director.

  University/School Partnerships
  The Teaching Research Institute
  Western Oregon University - Todd Hall
  345 N. Monmouth Avenue
  Monmouth, OR 97361

C. ORGANIZATION AND FORMAT (Checklist for proposal submission)

1. Complete the RFP Proposal Cover Sheet (enclosed with the RFP Guidelines). The RFP Cover Sheet must be signed by the chief executive official for the institution (this is

typically the president, provost/vice president of academic affairs, or research office head). Do not use a font smaller than 9 point on the Cover Sheet.

2. Describe in no more than ten pages how you propose to address the project priority areas following the work specifications. Proposals may be single-spaced, and should have 1-inch margins on all sides with no less than 12-point font size (quotation of USP standards, if used, references, and tables may be in 10 or 11-point font). Projects are encouraged to use the Narrative Proposal Form provided in the attachment to prepare your narrative proposal. The sections which must be included, whether you use this format or another, include:
    a. Project objectives.
    b. Key activities proposed.
    c. Scientifically-based research related to approaches/strategies.
    d. Projected timeline for project activities.
    e. Which performance standards you will be addressing and how you propose to measure them.
    f. Who the key personnel for the project will be and examples of relevant, successful involvement in these types of activities.

3. Provide a list of your required eligible partners including your own institution on the Partnership Profile Form (see Attachment).

4. Complete and sign the Joint Effort Document. (This document counts as one page even though you are allowed to submit multiple signature pages.)

5. Complete the USP Budget Form (see Attachment). Provide an assurance on the Budget Form that no single participant in an eligible partnership will use more than 50% of the grant funds made available to the partnership. You may also provide an Excel budget spreadsheet if it is more suitable to explain your budget.

6. A signed Statement of Assurances is required to receive federal funding. Submit this document with your proposal so that we have it on hand if your project is selected for funding.

7. Include in an Appendix letters from partners that indicate the extent to which the project has been planned and will be implemented with the full cooperation of the higher education institution, high-need district(s), and other schools/organizations in the partnership. You may also include other supportive materials (e.g., brochures, descriptions of related or leveraged projects, etc.).

D. AWARD NOTIFICATION

Awards under the USP program will be announced by email to the institutions selected for funding as well as to unsuccessful applicants by April 21, 2010. Continuation of the contract for Year 2 of two year projects is dependent on successful completion of Year 1 activities, timely billing, submission of an annual performance report, and continued funding from the U.S.

Department of Education. Extensions and carryover requests will not be automatic, but are available upon written approval for two-year projects.

E. SITE VISITS

During the time period covered by this award, a representative from The Teaching Research Institute will make annual site visits to projects receiving grants. When projects are established, the Project Director should submit to TRI a participant roster including name, school of employment, email address, dates/location/duration of meetings or professional development scheduled, and the nature of the professional development (including the name and position of the provider). This list should be updated to indicate attendance and be available for site visits and performance reports.

F. QUESTIONS AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Questions concerning USP proposals should be referred to Bonnie Morihara, USP Program Coordinator, at 503-838-8413 or by e-mail at moriharb@wou.edu.

Intent to Apply for University/School Partnership Grant

Due March 12, 2010 (See Section A, p. 12 for submission directions)

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

High-need LEA?	***Other Partners***
__yes __no	
__yes __no	
__yes __no	
__yes __no	
__yes __no	

Core academic focus area of proposed project:
___ mathematics; ___ science; ___ literacy/language arts; ___ foreign language

Brief description of pK-12 professional development project you are planning as a partnership of a university/college teacher education department, a university/college arts/sciences department, and an eligible high-need school district. *This description does not need to exactly match the final proposal submitted. Funds cannot be used for pre-service teacher training or participation.*

RFP COVER PAGE

2010 No Child Left Behind: Oregon University/School Partnership Program

Applicant Organization (lead institution in the eligible partnership		
Address:		
Project Director:		Title:
Tel:	Fax:	E-mail:
Fiscal Contact:		Title:
Tel:	Fax:	E-mail:
Title of Project:		
Brief Description of Project:		

Total grant funds requested:	$ _____	Number of Participants	
Length of project:	_____ months	_____	Teachers
Project start date: _____	End date: (no later than 6/30/2012) _____	_____	Principals
Year 1 funds requested (for projects up to 2 years)	$ _____	_____	Other (specify)

This proposal complies with all policies/regulations and carries the full endorsement of this institution of higher education.

_____

Chief Executive Official (Signature) Title Date

PARTNERSHIP PROFILE FORM

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

Our partnership will consist of:

(1) A state or private institution of higher education and the division of the institution that prepares teachers and/or principals ☐ **Fiscal Agent**	**(2) A School of Arts & Sciences** ☐ **Fiscal Agent**	**(3) A high-need local education agency. See eligible LEAs in Attachment** *If you will work with particular schools within the high-need LEA, list them and place a star (*) next to any partnering school that is "low performing" – did not meet AYP in English/LA or Math (see Appendix)*	**(4) Another LEA, public or private school, public charter school, ESD, nonprofit cultural organization, another institution of higher education, school of arts and sciences within such an institution, division of such an institution that prepares teachers and principals, entity carrying out a preK program, teacher organization, principal organization, business.**

No Child Left Behind: Oregon University/School Partnership Program

Joint Effort Document

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

Joint effort can take a number of forms, ranging from informal discussions and planning for the project to full sharing of administrative and instructional responsibilities. For example, it may involve one or more of the following:

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

Statement of Joint Effort

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

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

Signature:	Printed Name:
Title:	Date:
Department:	

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

Signature:	Printed Name:
Title:	Date:
Department:	

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

Signature:	Printed Name:
Title:	Date:
Department:	

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

Signature:	Printed Name:
Title:	Date:
Department:	

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

Signature:	Printed Name:
Title:	Date:
Department:	

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

Signature:	Printed Name:
Title:	Date:
Department:	

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

Signature:	Printed Name:
Title:	Date:
Department:	

NOTE: Recognizing that collecting signatures from multiple school districts on one document may be logistically difficult, the Joint Effort Document will count as only one page of the 25-page limit.

PROPOSAL NARRATIVE FORM

Directions: Complete the following questions in no more than ten pages. Relevant appendices may be attached. The proposal, signed documents, budget pages, and appendices should not exceed 25 pages.

1. **What are the key objective(s) of this project?**

2. **What key activities are planned to achieve your objective(s)?**

3. **What scientifically-based research is providing the basis for the approaches/strategies in this project?** *(See p. 2 of RFP for NCLB definition.)*

4. **Indicate in what ways LEAs (particularly high-need districts and/or schools) have been involved in planning and will be in implementation.**

5. **Indicate in what ways Arts/Sciences faculty have been involved in planning and will be in implementation.**

6. **Provide a timeline for projected project activities.**

7. **Which of the seven USP performance standards will you be addressing and how do you propose to measure them?**

8. **Indicate who the key personnel for the project will be by name, title at the institution, and brief biographical background (1-2 paragraphs).**

9. **Provide brief examples of relevant, successful involvement in these types of activities by members of the partnership.**

10. **Indicate the key outcomes expected for this project.**

11. **Indicate if you believe you will meet the special criteria for extra consideration in the review process:**

    a. **This project will impact teachers and/or administrators in high-need, low-performing schools.** **No __ Yes __**

    b. **This project will impact teachers and/or administrators in underrepresented geographic locations.** **No __ Yes __**

    c. **This project will work with a significant number of high-need LEAs (3 or more).** **No __ Yes __**

12. **Appendices.** A limited amount of support material (letters of support, brochures, etc.) may be appended to the proposal. The proposal, budget materials, signed documents and appendices may not exceed 25 pages total.

USP BUDGET FORM – Year 1

The budget must be split out by partner (same partners as listed on the Partnership Profile Form) so it can be easily seen that no single partner is using more than 50% of the project budget. If you are proposing a project for up to 24 months, provide a budget for each year (Projects in this RFP must end by 6/30/2012).

	Partner 1 Fiscal Agent	**Partner 2**	**Partner 3**	**Partner 4***
1. Salaries & Wages				
2. Employee Benefits				
3. In-State Travel				
4. Stipends; tuition (exempt from indirect)				
5. Materials & Supplies				
6. Other (specify)				
7. Total direct costs				
8. Indirect costs @ 8% (not available on #4)				
Total Requested				
Cost Sharing by Local Education Agencies (School Districts)				
Cost sharing by other groups in the partnership				

*** Add additional columns per partner**

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

USP BUDGET FORM – Year 2

The budget must be split out by partner (same partners as listed on the Partnership Profile Form) so it can be easily seen that no single partner is using more than 50% of the project budget. If you are proposing a project for up to 24 months, provide a budget for each year (Projects in this RFP must end by 6/30/2012).

	Partner 1 Fiscal Agent	**Partner 2**	**Partner 3**	**Partner 4***
1. Salaries & Wages				
2. Employee Benefits				
3. In-State Travel				
4. Stipends; tuition (exempt from indirect)				
5. Materials & Supplies				
6. Other (specify)				
7. Total direct costs				
8. Indirect costs @ 8% (not available on #4)				
Total Requested				
Cost Sharing by Local Education Agencies (School Districts)				
Cost sharing by other groups in the partnership				

*** Add additional columns per partner**

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

STATEMENT OF ASSURANCES

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

1. Funds derived from Title II, Part A, the Teacher and Principal Quality Training and Recruiting Fund Program, will be used only for the purposes for which they are granted.

2. The applicant will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and all regulations issued by the Department of Education, pursuant to the chapter, to the end that no person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which the applicant received federal financial assistance.

3. The applicant will comply with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (P.L. 92-318) and all regulations issued by the Department of Education, pursuant to the title, to the end that no person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, be denied employment in, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.

4. The applicant will comply with OAR 581-015, 581-21-045, and 581-21-049, Discrimination Prohibited, issued by the State Board of Education, and ORS 326.051 and ORS 659.150, and 580-15-005, 580-15-010, and 580-15-015, issued by the State Board of Higher Education pursuant to these laws, to the end that no person in Oregon shall, on the basis of age, handicap, national origin, race, marital status, religion, or sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity administered or authorized by the State Board of Education or State Board of Higher Education.

5. The applicant will comply with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (Buckley Amendment - Public Law 93-380) and all regulations issued by the Department of Education, pursuant to this Act.

6. The applicant will use funds only to supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the level of funds from non-Federal sources that would, in the absence of funds made available for the purposes of the project, and may not use funds made available under this part to supplant funds from non-Federal sources.

7. Federal funds made available for the proposed program will ensure the equitable participation of private elementary and secondary school teachers in the purposes and benefits of the USP Program.

8. The applicant will make such reports to the State Higher Education Agency, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the agency to perform its duties under this title, and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the state education agency may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

Signature of Chief Executive Officer _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

Oregon High-Need LEAs and Schools for 2010 University/School Partnerships

2008-2009 data (latest available – updated 01/05/10)

Many grants through the U.S. Department of Education require that districts first be authorized as high-need according to U.S. Census Bureau figures and percentages of non-highly qualified teachers. Once the district qualifies, then individual schools within the district can qualify (often based on percentage of students in the school who qualify for free or reduced lunch rates.) In every state, there are high-poverty schools within non-qualifying districts that are not eligible for participation in various grant programs because the district has not first qualified. The federal government has not yet remedied this inequity.

A high-need LEA is defined as one in which 20% or more school-aged children are living in poverty according to U.S. Census figures, AND which has 2.5% or more teachers who are not considered highly-qualified according to NCLB definitions.

If teachers at a private pK-12 school participate in the project, the school must be located within the physical boundaries of an eligible high-need district AND serve significant numbers of high poverty students.

Poverty Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Estimates Branch, Data revised: November, 2009.
http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/saipe/
Oregon School Data Source: Oregon Department of Education – School F/R lunch percentages and district percentage of non HQ teachers: Accessed January 6, 2010.

NOTES:

1. ND = No data reported (school is too small)
2. All schools on this chart have at least 40% F/R lunch. Schools with an F/R rate above 60% are marked by a blue-colored cell.
3. District percentages showing less than 2.5% non HQ teachers are highlighted in yellow. These districts (highlighted in pale yellow) are NOT high need by federal definition, despite their high poverty levels. Consider adding the district and working with their high-need schools as an additional (not required) partner.

School District	County	% of children 5-17 in poverty, 2008 estimates - (updated November 2009)	% non HQ teachers 2008-09 *Must be >2.5%*	School	% F/R lunch 2008-09 (latest at ODE website)
Adrian SD 061	Malheur	27.18%	10.4%	Adrian Elementary	65.3%
				Adrian HS	46.9%
Annex SD 029	Malheur	22.11%	0.0%	Annex Elementary	83.0%
Arock SD 081	Malheur	28.57%	0.0%	W.W. Jones Elementary	ND
Ashwood SD 008	Jefferson	25.00%	0.0%	Ashwood Elementary	ND
Baker SD 05J	Baker	20.87%	1.0%	Baker HS	46.8%
				Baker MS	52.6%
				Brooklyn Elementary	57.3%
				Haines Elementary	48.8%
				North Baker Elementary	58.4%
				South Baker Elementary	62.5%
Bandon SD 054	Coos	27.20%	0.9%	Bandon HS	50.7%
				Harbor Lights MS	57.7%
				Ocean Crest Elementary	54.5%
Burnt River SD 30J	Baker	25.30%	46.1%	Burnt River School	42.3%
Butte Falls SD 091	Jackson	27.35%	27.4%	Butte Falls Elementary	68.1%
				Butte Falls Secondary	56.8%
Coos Bay SD 009	Coos	22.58%	19.5%	Blossom Gulch Elementary	64.5%

School District	County	% of children 5-17 in poverty, 2008 estimates - (updated November 2009)	% non HQ teachers 2008-09 *Must be >2.5%*	School	% F/R lunch 2008-09 (latest at ODE website)
				Bunker Hill Elementary	60.0%
				Madison Elementary	77.3%
				Marshfield Senior HS	55.6%
				Millicoma Intermediate School	66.3%
				Sunset MS	62.4%
Culver SD 004	Jefferson	23.89%	5.3%	Culver Elementary	65.4%
				Culver HS	55.4%
				Culver MS	65.4%
David Douglas SD 40	Multnomah	24.56%	2.0%	Alice Ott MS	68.3%
				Arthur Academy	42.6%
				Cherry Park Elementary	70.7%
				David Douglas HS	65.9%
				Earl Boyles Elementary	76.6%
				Floyd Light MS	71.6%
				Gilbert Heights Elementary	78.7%
				Gilbert Park Elementary	67.4%
				Lincoln Park Elementary	84.8%
				Menlo Park Elementary	76.9%
				Mill Park Elementary	88.6%
				North Powellhurst School	75.9%
				Ron Russell MS	83.0%
				Ventura Park Elementary	75.2%
				West Powellhurst Elementary	79.6%
Diamond SD 007	Harney	20.00%	0.0%	Diamond Elementary	76.9%
Double O SD 028	Harney	25.00%	0.0%	Double O Elementary	ND
Drewsey SD 013	Harney	37.50%	0.0%	Drewsey Elementary	87.5%
Eagle Point SD 009	Jackson	23.10%	0.0%	Eagle Point HS	48.8%
				Eagle Point MS	48.3%
				Eagle Rock Elementary	42.9%
				Elk Trail Elementary	72.9%
				Lake Creek Learning Center	75.6%
				Little Butte School	54.6%
				Mountain View Elementary	94.5%
				Shady Cove School	67.8%
				White City Elementary	81.5%
				White Mountain MS	84.1%
Echo SD 005	Umatilla	23.15%	22.4%	Echo School	48.7%
Elgin SD 023	Union	25.40%	12.3%	Elgin HS	42.9%
				Stella Mayfield Elementary	56.7%
Elkton SD 034	Douglas	26.70%	37.7%	Elkton Elementary	63.4%
				Elkton HS	46.8%
Fossil SD 21J	Wheeler	21.88%	16.0%	Fossil Charter School	40.8%
Gervais SD 001	Marion	20.18%	8.8%	Brooks Elementary	88.1%
				Douglas Ave. Alternative School	80.0%
				Eldridge Elementary	90.0%
				Gervais HS	73.5%
				Gervais MS	81,9%
Grants Pass SD 007	Josephine	22.90%	4.3%	Allen Dale Elementary	49.0%

School District	County	% of children 5-17 in poverty, 2008 estimates - (updated November 2009)	% non HQ teachers 2008-09 *Must be >2.5%*	School	% F/R lunch 2008-09 (latest at ODE website)
				Grants Pass HS	41.1%
				Highland Elementary	48.4%
				Lincoln Elementary	62.4%
				North MS	53.1%
				Parkside Elementary	68.9%
				Redwood Elementary	53.0%
				Riverside Elementary	75.7%
				South MS	53.6%
Harney County SD 3	Harney	20.26%	6.3%	BHS Alternative Education	70.4%
				Burns HS	63.9%
				Henry L. Slater Elementary	59.8%
				Hines MS	71.2%
Harney County SD 4	Harney	28.57%	11.1%	Crane Elementary	66.1%
Harney County Union High SD 1J	Harney	28.57%	12.5%	Crane Union HS	50.0%
Harper SD 066	Malheur	28.57%	41.7%	Harper School	65.9%
Huntington SD 16J	Baker	27.50%	19.3%	Huntington School	62.8%
Jefferson County SD 509J	Jefferson	24.62%	1.2%	Big Muddy Elementary	ND
				Buff Elementary	79.6%
				Jefferson County MS	79.1%
				Madras Elementary	79.2%
				Madras HS	74.8%
				Metolius Elementary	81.6%
				Warm Springs Elementary	87.2%
Jordan Valley SD 003	Malheur	26.92%	46.8%	Jordan Valley Elementary	62.9%
				Rockville Elementary	81.8%
Klamath County SD	Klamath	20.10%	3.1% (7.1% in high-need schools)	Altamont Elementary	86.9%
				Bonanza Elementary	65.5%
				Bonanza Jr/Sr HS	52.4%
				Brixner Jr. HS	63.6%
				Chiloquin Elementary	85.8%
				Fairhaven Elementary	72.0%
				Ferguson Elementary	52.8%
				Gearhart Elementary	66.7%
				Gilchrist Elementary	84.6%
				Gilchrist Jr/Sr HS	67.5%
				Henley Elementary	41.6%
				Henley MS	78.0%
				Keno Elementary	54.0%
				Lost River HS	79.2%
				Malin Elementary	87.0%
				Merrill Elementary	80.4%
				Peterson Elementary	50.3%
				Shasta Elementary	58.3%
				Stearns Elementary	94.3%
Klamath Falls City Schools	Klamath	23.31%	3.1% (4.9% in high-need	EagleRidge HS	75.2%
				Fairview Elementary	82.7%
				Joseph Conger Elementary	70.5%

School District	County	% of children 5-17 in poverty, 2008 estimates - (updated November 2009)	% non HQ teachers 2008-09 *Must be >2.5%*	School	% F/R lunch 2008-09 (latest at ODE website)
				Klamath Union HS	51.2%
				Link River HS	45.1%
				Mazama HS	50.5%
				Mills Elementary	83.2%
				Pelican Elementary	67.6%
				Ponderosa Jr HS	65.5%
Lake County SD 7	Lake	20.29%	5.6%	Daly MS	47.2%
				Fremont/Hay Elementary	45.1%
				Lakeview Sr. HS	40.3%
Lincoln County SD	Lincoln	22.49%	1.8%	Crestview Heights School	67.9%
				Eddyville Charter School	48.0%
				Newport MS	67.0%
				Oceanlake Elementary	65.2%
				Sam Case Elementary	67.7%
				Siletz Valley Early College Academy	75.0%
				Siletz Valley School	74.2%
				Taft Elementary	76.9%
				Taft HS	59.2%
				Toledo Elementary	59.8%
				Toledo HS	49.0%
				Waldport HS	62.5%
				Yaquina View Elementary	52.2%
Medford SD 549	Jackson	20.29%	2.4%	Hedrick MS	40.2%
				Howard Elementary	77.6%
				Jackson Elementary	84.8%
				Jefferson Elementary	66.1%
				Kennedy Elementary	49.0%
				McLoughlin MS	59.5%
				Medford Opportunity HS	40.1%
				Oak Grove Elementary	64.8%
				Roosevelt Elementary	71.2%
				South Medford HS	40.1%
				Washington Elementary	81.6%
				Wilson Elementary	72.6%
Mitchell SD 055	Wheeler	29.41%	41.9%	Mitchell School	61.9%
Neah-kah-nie SD 56	Tillamook	22.23%	27.9% (36.4% in high-need schools)	Garibaldi Elementary	56.9%
				Neah-Kah-Nie HS	68.4%
				Neah-Kah-Nie MS	61.3%
				Nehalem Elementary	57.6%
North Bend SD 013	Coos	20.47%	5.0%	Hillcrest Elementary	55.8%
				North Bay Elementary	70.2%
				North Bend MS	71.6%
				North Bend Sr. HS	45.9%
North Douglas SD 022	Douglas	23.48%	2.4%	North Douglas Elementary	57.9%
North Lake SD 014	Lake	30.52%	14.3%	North Lake School	75.3%
North Powder SD 08J	Union	26.25%	24.6%	Powder Valley School	55.3%
North Wasco SD 21	Wasco	21.09%	8.3%	Chenowith Elementary	74.7%
				Colonel Wright Elementary	61.9%

School District	County	% of children 5-17 in poverty, 2008 estimates - (updated November 2009)	% non HQ teachers 2008-09 *Must be >2.5%*	School	% F/R lunch 2008-09 (latest at ODE website)
				Dry Hollow Elementary	51.2%
				The Dalles MS	65.0%
Nyssa SD 026	Malheur	22.63%	2.1% (5.2% in high-need schools)	Nyssa Elementary	75.8%
				Nyssa MS	66.9%
				Nyssa HS	58.0%
Oakland SD 001	Douglas	23.44%	12.7%	Oakland Elementary	58.9%
				Lincoln MS	57.7%
				Oakland HS	43.6%
Ontario SD 008	Malheur	26.27%	5.0% (5.5% in high-need schools)	Aiken Elementary	81.1%
				Alameda Elementary	86.5%
				Cairo Elementary	66.0%
				May Roberts Elementary	85.7%
				Ontario HS	61.2%
				Ontario MS	74.7%
				Pioneer Elementary	56.9%
Phoenix-Talent SD 004	Jackson	21.99%	0.0%	Armadillo Technical Institute	46.7%
				Orchard Hill Elementary	54.3%
				Phoenix Elementary	68.3%
				Phoenix HS	47.8%
				Talent Elementary	58.6%
				Talent MS	63.9%
Pine Eagle SD 061	Baker	26.72%	17.2%	Pine Eagle Elementary	70.4%
				Pine Eagle HS	59.0%
Plush SD 018	Lake	36.36%	0.0%	Plush Elementary	ND
Port Orford-Langlois SD 2J	Curry	23.78%	2.7% (4.8% in high-need schools)	Blanco School	58.3%
				Driftwood Elementary	78.1%
				Pacific HS	52.5%
Powers SD 031	Coos	30.08%	16.7%	Powers Elementary	61.5%
				Powers HS	41.5%
Prospect SD 059	Jackson	21.13%	3.1%	Prospect School	50.6%
Reynolds SD 007	Multnomah	21.22%	2.0% (3.6% in high-need schools)	Alder Elementary	86.8%
				Davis Elementary	90.8%
				Fairview Elementary	70.1%
				Glenfair Elementary	88.2%
				Hartley Elementary	92.1%
				Hauton B Lee MS	73.4%
				Margaret Scott Elementary	63.2%
				Reynolds HS	51.1%
				Reynolds Learning Academy	83.0%
				Reynolds MS	75.5%
				Salish Ponds Elementary	71.5%
				Troutdale Elementary	48.2%
				Wilkes Elementary	75.0%
				Woodland Elementary	66.9%
Riddle DS 070	Douglas	20.39%	15.5%	Riddle Elementary	82.8%
				Riddle HS	74.2%

School District	County	% of children 5-17 in poverty, 2008 estimates - (updated November 2009)	% non HQ teachers 2008-09 *Must be >2.5%*	School	% F/R lunch 2008-09 (latest at ODE website)
Rogue River SD 035	Jackson	24.50%	20.5%	Evans Valley Elementary	55.0%
				Rogue River Elementary	56.8%
				Rogue River HS	47.7%
				Rogue River MS	59.6%
Santiam Canyon SD 129J	Linn	24.84%	0.0%	Gates Elementary	60.0%
				Mill City MS	58.9%
				Santiam HS	53.8%
Sherman SD 001	Sherman	23.19%	10.3%	Sherman Jr/Sr HS	47.1%
				North Sherman Elementary	59.7%
				South Sherman Elementary	54.2%
Siuslaw SD 97J	Lane	21.22%	2.2%	Siuslaw Elementary	53.3%
				Siuslaw MS	45.4%
South Harney SD 033	Harney	33.33%	50.0%	Fields Elementary	80.0%
South Umpqua SD 019	Douglas	24.41%	3.0 %	Canyonville School	73.2%
				Coffenberry MS	63.8%
				Myrtle Creek Elementary	66.9%
				South Umpqua HS	50.1%
				Tri City Elementary	64.4%
South Wasco County SD	Wasco	26.81%	25.9%	Maupin Elementary	73.4%
				South Wasco County HS	65.0%
Spray SD 001	Wheeler	22.81%	26.8%	Spray School	78.0%
Stanfield SD 061	Umatilla	22.42%	ND	Stanfield Elementary	65.9%
				Stanfield Secondary School	67.4%
Sutherlin SD 130	Douglas	21.73%	3.5%	East Sutherlin Primary	62.9%
				Sutherlin HS	44.9%
				Sutherlin MS	51.4%
				West Sutherlin Intermediate	56.1%
Sweet Home SD 055	Linn	20.67%	4.0% (5.7% in high-need schools)	Crawfordsville Elementary	67.0%
				Foster Elementary	72.0%
				Hawthorne Elementary	67.1%
				Holley Elementary	48.9%
				Oak Heights Elementary	55.7%
				Sweet Home Junior HS	49.5%
Three Rivers SD	Josephine	28.48%	0.9% (4.0% in high-need schools)	Applegate Elementary	55.0%
				Evergreen Elementary	85.2%
				Fleming MS	51.5%
				Fruitdale Elementary	67.4%
				Ft. Vannoy Elementary	54.5%
				Illinois Valley HS	75.8%
				Jerome Prairie Elementary	52.8%
				Lincoln Salvage MS	56.6%
				Lorna Bryne MS	77.7%
				Madrona Elementary	61.6%
				Manzanita Elementary	55.1%
				North Valley HS	40.5%
				Williams Elementary	82.3%
				Wolf Creek Elementary	80.0%
Troy SD 054	Wallowa	25.00%	0.0%	Troy Elementary	ND

School District	County	% of children 5-17 in poverty, 2008 estimates - (updated November 2009)	% non HQ teachers 2008-09 *Must be >2.5%*	School	% F/R lunch 2008-09 (latest at ODE website)
Umatilla SD 006	Umatilla	23.84%	2.2%	Clara Brownell MS	77.2%
				McNary Heights Elementary	81.2%
				Umatilla HS	81.3%
Vale SD 084	Malheur	23.63%	0.0%	Vale Elementary	59.9%
				Vale MS	47.7%
				Willowcreek Elementary	47.1%
Wallowa SD 012	Wallowa	23.83%	11.5%	Wallowa Elementary	52.0%
				Wallowa HS	44.1%
Woodburn SD 103	Woodburn	28.16%	11.2%	Academy of Int'l Studies at Woodburn	75.7%
				French Prairie MS	77.3%
				Heritage Elementary	88.3%
				Lincoln Elementary	94.0%
				Nellie Muir Elementary	94.6%
				Valor MS	92.5%
				Washington Elementary	94.6%
				Wellness, Business & Sports School	75.8%
				Woodburn Academy of Art, Sci, and Tech	75.8%
				Woodburn Arthur Academy	71.4%
				Woodburn arts & Communications Acad.	75.7%
				Woodburn Success	60.1%
Yoncalla SD 032	Douglas	24.19%	22.6%	Yoncalla Elementary	65.4%
				Yoncalla HS	62.9%

By federal definition, a high-need LEA is a district:

(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% 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 [NCLB, Section 2102(3)] *

* 2.5% is the cutoff beginning 2006

Changes from the 2007-2008 list to the 2008-2009 list

12 districts no longer eligible

- Districts that dropped off the high-need list this year because the poverty level of school-aged children was not 20% or more include: Camas Valley SD 21J, Parkrose SD, and Reedsport SD 105.

- Portland Public Schools lost eligibility because it no longer has at least 10,000 school-aged children living in poverty.

- Districts that dropped off the high-need list this year because they no longer have a high enough percentage of non-HQ teachers include: David Douglas SD 40, Jefferson County SD 509J, Lincoln County SD, North Douglas SD 22, Plush SD 18, Santiam Canyon SD 129J, Umatilla SD 6, and Vale SD 84.

14 new districts added

Districts added to the high-need list this year include: Fossil SD 21J, Gervais SD 1, Harney County SD 3, Harney County SD 4, Harney County Union High SD 1J, Harper SD 66, Klamath County SD, Lake County SD, Neah-kah-nie SD 56, North Bend SD 13, North Wasco SD 21, Prospect SD 59, Rogue River SD 35, and Sherman SD 1.

Updated January 6, 2010