

DATE: November 16, 2006

SUBJECT: Improving Teacher Quality Grant Program Awards, 2006-07

ACTION RECOMMENDED: Approval

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Operating as Title II of the No Child Left Behind Act, the Improving Teacher Quality Grant Program is a federally funded program which provides grants to public and private higher education institutions and non-profit organizations. Administered in Tennessee by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, these grants are designed to conduct training for K-12 teachers, paraprofessionals and principals. Eligible subject areas include Mathematics, Science, English/Language Arts, Social Studies, Foreign Languages (including English as a Second Language) and related Arts. The Commission adopted a State plan and created an Advisory Committee to review grant proposals and make funding recommendations to the Commission. This year's Advisory Committee is listed on Attachment A.

The attached materials present the projects and funding levels recommended by the Advisory Committee. The recommended projects reflect those that provide maximum effectiveness in involvement of instructional effort for public and private K-12 schools in Tennessee.

As a method of soliciting proposals in direct alignment with Tennessee's K-12 needs, the Request for Proposals included special categories that could be integrated into a project's goals and objectives. This initiative highlights strategies for professional development. Another feature in this year's review process was a two-tiered competition which included the General Competition and a Capacity Building Competition. The Capacity Building Competition was included to encourage more sustained and time intensive professional development. It differed from the General Competition in three major ways: institutions could request up to \$150,000 over a 17 month period, the participants would receive at least 6 hours of graduate credit, and school administrator participation was mandatory. The General Competition was the same as in previous years with institutions being able to request up to \$75,000 over an 8-month period.

Thirty-nine proposals were submitted; of those, the Advisory Committee recommended funding for 18 projects totaling \$1,326,000.

In past years, there have been questions as to whether projects offering credit courses at public institutions will generate dollars through the funding formula. As in the past, such courses will be required to be designated as contract courses; thus, will not generate dollars under the formula.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION INCLUDED: A list of recommended institutions and funding levels is provided in Attachment B. The General Competition projects will be funded for the period January 1, 2007 to September 30, 2007 and the Capacity Building projects will be funded January 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. The grant review process is described on Attachment C to this agenda item.

OTHER SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE: All grant proposals are available for review at the Commission office.

ATTACHMENT A
2006-07
IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. William Arnold
Tennessee Higher Education
Commission

Dr. Calvin Brown
Tennessee State University

Ms. Linda Creek
Tennessee Department of
Education

Dr. Scott Eddins
Tennessee Department of
Education

Mr. Terrance Gibson
Tennessee Education Association

Dr. John Graef
University of Tennessee at
Chattanooga

Ms. Judy Haston
Tennessee Department of
Education

Dr. Fred Heifner
Cumberland University

Dr. Katie High
The University of Tennessee,
Knoxville

Dr. Mary Jo Howland
State Board of Education

Ms. Heather Jack
Tennessee Independent Colleges and
Universities Association

Dr. Claudia Joplin
University of Tennessee, Martin

Ms. Linda Jordan
Tennessee Department of Education

Dr. Vanita Lytle-Sherrill
Volunteer State Community College

Dr. Deborah Nunn
Belmont University

Dr. Linda Warner
Tennessee Board of Regents

Ms. Tarol Wells
Tennessee Department of Human
Services

Dr. Celeste Williams
Tennessee State University

Dr. Bradley Windley
Tennessee Higher Education
Commission

**ATTACHMENT B
RECOMMENDED PROJECTS FOR 2006-07**

PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

<u>East Tennessee State University</u> Dr. Aimee L. Govett “Building Strong Partnerships for K-6 Elementary School Science”	\$67,500
<u>East Tennessee State University</u> Dr. Rebecca Isbell “East Tennessee Early Childhood Explorations in Mathematics Project”	\$50,000
<u>East Tennessee State University</u> Dr. Clarissa Willis “Autism Inclusion in East Tennessee”	\$50,000
<u>Middle Tennessee State University</u> Dr. Kathy VanFleet “The Academy for Teachers of the Gifted 2007”	\$72,000
<u>Middle Tennessee State University</u> Dr. Cindi Smith-Walters, Dr. Kim Cleary, Sadler Dr. Allyson Bass, Dr. Kyle Butler “Enhancing and Increasing Reading Skills in the Science Content Area”	\$71,500
<u>Middle Tennessee State University</u> Dr. Dovie Kimmins, Dr. Mary B. Martin “McNairy and Hardin County Partnership: Improving Grades 3-8 Mathematics Instruction and Student Achievement”	\$73,500
<u>Tennessee Technological University</u> Dr. Kristen Pennycuff “Empowering Literacy Instruction”	\$140,000
<u>Tennessee Technological University</u> Dr. Holly G. Anthony “Developing Conceptual Understanding of Fractions and Decimals in K-4 Classrooms”	\$71,500
<u>Tennessee Technological University</u> Dr. Helen T. Dainty “Picture This ..Success for Teachers and Their Students with Autism”	\$51,000
<u>The University of Memphis</u> Dr. Jerrie Scott Ms. Sandra Cooley Nichols Ms. Angiline Powell “Math, Assistive Technology, and Reading (MATR): Enhancing Teaching Effectiveness in Inclusive Middle School Classrooms”	\$125,500

<u>The University of Tennessee, Chattanooga</u> Dr. Deborah A. McAllister “Mathematics Navigations and Number Sense”	\$73,000
<u>The University of Tennessee, Chattanooga</u> Dr. Linda Johnston, Dr. Sandy Watson “Differentiated Instruction in Science for General and Special Educators”	\$64,500
<u>The University of Tennessee, Chattanooga</u> Dr. Kay W. Cowan “Vocabulary: A Critical Component of Comprehension”	\$72,000
<u>The University of Tennessee, Chattanooga</u> Dr. Ossama A. Saleh, Dr. Ronald L. Smith “Applications of Algebra and Statistics, III”	\$73,000
<u>The University of Tennessee, Knoxville</u> Dr. Susan E. Riechert “Teaching Science Through Community Learning: Biology in a Box”	\$70,000
<u>The University of Tennessee, Martin</u> Ms. Judy A. Cleek “Technology Enhanced Curriculum for Hispanic Students (TECH II)”	\$71,500
<u>The University of Tennessee, Martin</u> Dr. Cahit Erkal, Dr. Jamie Rickman “Activity Based Physics and Astronomy Summer Institute for Middle and Junior-High School Teachers: Year Five - Technology Version”	\$72,500

PRIVATE FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

<u>Lipscomb University</u> Ms. Tamera Klingbyll “Teaching Nature on a Budget Workshop”	\$57,000
---	----------

ATTACHMENT C

PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS

Upon receipt by THEC, proposals were reviewed to determine if all required materials were included and if the proposal responded to the federal program requirements. Incomplete proposals, late proposals, proposals not addressing identified grant program needs, and proposals from ineligible applicants were excluded from the grant review. Proposal writers were notified by postcard as to whether THEC received the proposal and whether it was sent to reviewers.

The grant review panel was divided into 4 teams. Each proposal was assigned a lead discussant. The lead discussant was responsible for giving a careful 2-5 minute overview of the entire project without offering any personal opinions and the lead discussant served as the moderator of the discussion concerning that proposal including helping the panel arrive at a consensus based on the criteria.

PROCESS

Team 1

Lead discussant 1 – Proposal 1

- 2 –5 minute description of project (without opinion)
- 5-10 minute discussion of all team members that read proposal (opinions allowed)
- 2-5 minute discussion including all panelists who have questions or opinions
- Vote to place proposal in one of three categories: Do not fund, Fund, or Fund based on conditions;
- The numeric ratings were considered in breaking ties later in the review process.

These steps were repeated for the remaining proposals of each lead discussant.

These steps were repeated for Teams 2, 3, and 4 until all proposals are reviewed.