To: Higher Education Committee

From: Joseph P. Frey

Subject: Graduate Level Clinically Rich Teacher Preparation Pilot
                            Program Request for Proposal (RFP)

Date: October 14, 2010

Authorizations:

SUMMARY

Issue for Discussion

Policies related to the Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Graduate Level Clinically Rich Teacher Preparation Pilot Program.

Reason(s) for Consideration

Review of Policy

Proposed Handling

The proposed policies are submitted to the Higher Education Committee for review at its October 2010 meeting.

Background Information

At its November 2009 and December 2009 meetings, the Board of Regents approved the conceptual framework for graduate level clinically rich teacher preparation pilot programs. At the February 2010 meeting, the Board endorsed the plan to implement this pilot program through a Request for Proposal (RFP) process. At the April 2010 meeting, the Board approved an amendment to the regulation relating to the establishment of graduate level clinically rich teacher preparation pilot programs.

An estimated 50 percent of new teachers in high need schools leave within the first five years. Research shows that preparation grounded in a strong clinical approach increases teacher retention. To address the teacher shortage issue, with the approval of the Board of Regents, an RFP process will be implemented to select program providers

for the graduate level clinically rich teacher preparation pilot program. Furthermore, to help ensure the quality of programs from non-collegiate institutions participating in the pilot, the RFP will require that non-collegiate programs seek accreditation from an accrediting body approved by the Board of Regents - National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) or Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC).

Also, the RFP will emphasize the Regents concern that preparation programs focus on teacher shortage areas such as science, mathematics, students with disabilities and English language learners, the use of data and technology to inform student learning and preparing teachers in a variety of cultural learning styles to inform differentiated instruction.

Policy Issues

Policy issues to be considered by the Board of Regents include: a regional approach to funding; the role of the Blue Ribbon Commission; the critical programmatic elements being reviewed and scored, the Regents Priorities to be addressed and the budget scoring process.

1. A regional approach to funding the partnerships being proposed is:

   - New York City
   - The Big Four (Buffalo, Rochester and Syracuse City School districts and Yonkers Public Schools)
   - Long Island
   - Rest of State

   The Department is recommending that a regional approach to awarding grants be followed to ensure an equitable distribution of funds to **high need communities** across the State. The applicants must partner with one or more of the State's 647 high need schools (this includes SURR schools, Persistently Low Achieving Schools and/or Schools in Improvement Status). Funding will be allocated to each region based on the percent of high need students within each region.

2. In New York's Race to the Top application we indicated that a Blue Ribbon Commission of distinguished teacher educators would be convened to assist in the review and rating of all applicants for participation in the pilot program. The Blue Ribbon Commission will be appointed by the Board of Regents. It is recommended that the proposed role of the Blue Ribbon Commission in reviewing and scoring the technical/programmatic section of applicants' proposals be as follows. This section of the RFP would be worth 60 points.

   Each narrative application will be independently reviewed and scored by two members of the Blue Ribbon Commission using the scoring rubric in the proposal. The two scores will be averaged together and that total will be the narrative/technical score for the applicant's proposal. In the event there is a 20-point or more difference between reviewers in the narrative/technical score assigned to an application, a third reviewer of the Commission will evaluate the application. The lowest score will be

dropped and the narrative score will be based on the average of the remaining two evaluations.

Those applications that receive a minimum score of 45 points from the Commission (75 percent of available points) indicating meeting the minimum programmatic levels will be forwarded to a Committee of the New York State Board of Regents for review and scoring. The Committee of the Board of Regents will assign to each application up to 20 points relating to the identified Regents priorities in the evaluation rubric. The Chancellor will appoint members of the Board of Regents to serve on the Committee to review applications under this pilot program. Each application will be read by two Regents and when there is a 10-point or more difference between the two reviewers, a third reviewer will used, consistent with the approach to be used by the Blue Ribbon Commission.

All members on the Board of Regents Committee that review eligible applications will be trained on all aspects of the Graduate Level Clinically Rich Teacher Preparation Pilot Program RFP, with specific reference to Regents Priorities, Proposal Narrative, Proposal Format and Narrative Scoring Rubric(s).

Appropriate protocol will be followed to ensure that there is no conflict of interest on the part of the BRC reviewers or the Regents selected to review the applications.

3. Proposal Review Process Timeline

- Training on general guidelines and scoring rubric for all Reviewers (Blue Ribbon Commission and Regents Committee Reviewers)

    Approximately 1 hour

- Review of questions and answers from Webinar posed by potential applicants (Blue Ribbon Commission and Regents Committee Reviewers)

    Approximately 1 hour

- Reading, Review, Scoring and Ranking of proposals: (Each proposal must have two readings - Blue Ribbon Commission and Regents Committee Reviewers)

    Approximately 3 hour minimum per proposal for each reading (If there are 20 proposals that would mean 40 reviews)

- If more than a 20-point difference in scores for the same proposal a third reviewer will read, review and score the proposal, the lowest score will be dropped and the average of the two highest scores will be used as the score for that proposal. (For Blue Ribbon Commission)

4. Proposed Evaluation Rubric

Non-budgetary components of the evaluation rubric will address both requirements included in the Commissioner's Regulations and programmatic priorities identified by the Board of Regents in their overall reform agenda. Both the Blue Ribbon Commission and the Board of Regents will be asked to assess specific items related to the Regents priorities. Specific Regents priorities include educating students with disabilities; educating English language learners; preparing teachers for hard-to-staff subject areas, especially in the STEM disciplines; and developing innovative approaches for preparing teachers for high need schools that will positively impact student achievement.

I. The proposed elements to be reviewed by the Blue Ribbon Commission (up to 60 points will be awarded by the Blue Ribbon Commission):

A. Institutional Effectiveness (Maximum of 3 points)

The proposal provides a clear description of the institution's history of producing teachers who have had positive impacts in high-needs schools, including detailed examples of the institutions commitment and progress toward meeting the needs of:

1) Students, teachers, and other educators from high-need schools/districts; and

2) Prospective teachers who will be working in high-need schools/districts

B. Partnerships (Maximum of 4 points)

The proposal provides a clear and detailed description of the scope and extent of involvement by collaborating partners, showing substantial collaboration among them in the planning and proposed implementation of project activities. A signed memorandum of agreement (MOA) for each partner is attached (a requirement for funding) and indicates substantial collaboration.

C. Program Approach: Within the framework of a rich clinical approach, applications will be evaluated on how effectively the following objectives will be successfully achieved. (Maximum 50 points)

1. The proposal describes how teachers/residents are prepared in the use of data in an effective and innovative fashion to inform student learning. _____ (Up to 5 Points)

2. The proposal describes how teachers/residents are prepared in the use of technology in an effective and innovative fashion to positively impact student learning. _____ (Up to 5 Points)

3. The proposal describes the preparation of teachers/residents to take into account the rich variety of cultural learning styles so as to enable effective, appropriate, differential instruction. _____ (Up to 5 Points)

4. The proposal describes how the institution will provide sustained, intensive, and high-quality professional development and teacher support activities that address school/district needs in order to prepare the teacher/resident to meet students' educational needs. _____ (Up to 5 Points)

5. The proposal describes in detail how the institution plans to provide training for mentors specific to the models of the pilot programs: Model A and Model B and how the mentors will be employed to provide effective support to the new teacher/resident._____ (Up to 5 Points)

6. The proposal describes in detail how the institution plans to provide strong academic graduate level content and develop effective, research-based pedagogical practices that value equity and diversity by ensuring the ability of educators to produce significant learning gains for all students. _____ (Up to 5 points)

7. The proposal describes in detail how the institution will effectively prepare teachers/residents to work with English language learners. (Up to 10 points)

8. The proposal describes in detail how the institution will effectively prepare teachers/residents to work with students with disabilities. _____ (Up to 10 points)

D. Recruitment (Maximum of 3 points)

Proposal describes the specific strategies and activities that will be used to recruit and select a diverse group of pre-service teachers for participation in the project and lists the specific criteria that must be met by participants in order to be eligible for the program.

II. The proposed elements to be reviewed by the Board of Regents (up to 20 points will be awarded by the Board of Regents):

A. Preparing teachers for hard to staff shortage areas (Up to 10 points)

The extent to which the proposal will prepare teachers in critical teacher shortage areas such as science, mathematics, special education, bilingual education, etc.

B. Using innovative practices to prepare teachers for high-need schools (Up to 10 points)

The extent to which innovative approaches are employed to prepare teachers for high-need schools focused on improving student achievement for educationally at-risk students and providing support to help retain the newly prepared teachers in high-need schools.

III. Budget and Budget Narrative (Maximum of 20 points)

This section of the RFP is independently scored by the Department's Contract Administration Unit.

The budget section of the proposal represents 20 points of the overall score and will be awarded points pursuant to a formula calculating the "best value." This calculation will be computed by the Contract Administration Unit upon completion of the final narrative scoring by the New York State Board of Regents. The RFP will provide in detail the formula to be used in assessing both the Model A and the Model B applications.

5. Final Tabulation

After completing the budget scoring, the Contract Administration Unit will add the point scores for all the scoring sections and provide a rank order of the proposals based on their scores.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board of Regents adopt this approach so the Department can proceed in drafting the RFP and having it reviewed by the Office of the State Comptroller.