

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Educational Technology and Data Coordination
Office of Grants Coordination and School Support

2009-2010 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act - Enhancing Education through Technology Grant Improving Instruction Through Regional Data Initiatives

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

DISCLAIMER:

**THE FOLLOWING COMPETITIVE GRANT IS ANNOUNCED AND AWARD IS
CONTINGENT ON THE AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**

INTRODUCTION:

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) is offering a competitive grant to improve classroom instruction through regional data initiatives. Funding for this program has been awarded to MDE by the U.S. Department of Education under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part D program as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009, **CFDA Number 84.386**. This competitive grant will be known as the Regional Data Initiatives grant.

PURPOSE OF THE GRANT:

The purpose of the grant program is to provide Michigan teachers with real-time access to student data at the classroom level in order to inform instructional decisions. MDE is seeking proposals on how to use best the programs that are currently in place at several intermediate school districts (ISDs). The goal is to provide every educator in Michigan with an opportunity to differentiate and individualize instruction to improve student achievement utilizing state and local student data sets. Proposed projects must address the provision of professional development on the use of data to inform instruction and how to individualize instruction by applying Principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL).

MDE anticipates awarding between five and ten grants to ISDs for the purpose of establishing and leading consortia of other ISDs and their constituent local educational agencies (LEAs) and public school academies (PSAs) in the adoption and use of existing programs of web-based tools, services, resources, and professional development that identify, connect, and combine diverse educational data elements in meaningful ways. MDE intends for this grant to extend and expand existing implementations of data analysis programs to those ISDs, LEAs, and PSAs that do not currently have access to such programs.

PROJECT DESIGN CRITERIA:

Successful applicants must demonstrate how they have already assembled and implemented a package of tools, services, and professional development that meets the purpose and goals of the grant. Applicants must show how their existing data analysis program already meets the following criteria:

- Identifies, connects, and combines diverse educational data elements (e.g., personnel, financial, crime and safety, schools/facilities, and student data, including assessment information and results) in meaningful ways from various sources and over time so that administrators and educators have access to the information they need to guide student learning.
- Integrates elements of participating ISDs' and districts' student information systems and other statewide data into a package of web-based tools, services, resources, and professional development programs to create a system that lowers sustainability costs and increases the access to data by teachers and administrators.
- Incorporates the above data into tools, services, resources, and professional development programs that assist educators to individualize and differentiate instruction for all students.

Successful proposals must describe or provide evidence of:

- A model of deployment, scalability, and financial sustainability by multiple ISDs and their constituent districts, including the applicant's accomplishments deploying its own program.
- Collaboration with and partnership among other ISDs, LEAs, and PSAs, including agreements on the sharing of tools, services, and professional development programs used in the implementation of this grant program.

PROJECT DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

The five to ten successful applicants chosen will be required to work in collaboration through a professional learning community (PLC) facilitated by the Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators (MAISA). In the budget section of this application, applicants will be directed to set aside 20 percent of the total project budget to achieve the goals of the PLC. The purpose of the professional learning community is to find common solutions to, but not limited to, the following items:

- Interfacing Regional Data Initiatives with the Data for Student Success (D4SS) project to achieve common platforms, processes, and protocols for the release of data to the field.
- Interfacing Regional Data Initiatives with district student information systems to allow a streamlined process for aggregating and analyzing data.

- Developing common professional development programs to ensure coverage of essential topics and leveraging shared resources.
- Recommending a common set of state and national course definitions to which LEAs and PSAs can map their particular course offering with the purpose of improving the transmission of secondary credit information across the K12 system and between K12 and higher education.
- Facilitating research relationships with teacher preparation institutions for the purpose of improving education policy and practice and the preparation of teachers.
- Purchasing and sharing of tools and resources for differentiated instruction.
- Developing a common set of reports to assist schools in identifying those students most at risk of dropping out that will help facilitate schools in addressing and lowering dropout rates based on the early warning sign research (<http://www.betterhighschools.org/topics/DropoutWarningSigns.asp>).
- Implementing a common set of standards for use in observing and reporting teacher technology skill level.
- Implementing a common set of assessment items for use in determining 8th grade technological literacy.
- Evaluating the impact of Regional Data Initiatives in terms of instructional impact.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS:

This grant is targeted to eligible partnerships (i.e., consortia of ISDs) that include at least one high need district (LEA), which can be defined as one that:

Is among those districts in Michigan with the highest numbers or percentages of children from families with incomes below the poverty line as defined by the TITLE I - PART A, ALLOCATIONS School Year 2008-09 found at:

http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/MDE-P2_FS_09_T1aAllocListOrig_242286_7.pdf

and

Serves one or more schools identified for improvement or corrective action under section 1116 of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001.

All Michigan LEAs and PSAs are eligible and encouraged to participate in the Regional Data Initiatives grant through their ISD. However, LEAs and PSAs can only participate in the Regional Data Initiatives project in which their ISD is participating.

Consortium Leader

The applicant ISD will serve as Consortium Leader for the several ISDs that join its proposed project. In addition to serving as the fiscal agent on the grant, each Consortium Leader will be responsible for the successful implementation of the Regional Data Initiatives in each ISD that joins its consortium. Furthermore, all Consortium Leaders will be expected to participate in statewide conversations and collaborations to identify and select common tools, resources, and services, including evaluation services, for the grant program as a whole.

Participating ISDs

The applicant ISD will be asked by the Michigan Electronic Grants System (MEGS) to designate the partner ISDs participating in its consortium. Each individual ISD designated by an applicant will then be asked to confirm their partnership on the grant application in MEGS. This confirmation must be completed by the Regional Data Initiatives grant application deadline set forth in this document.

GRANT RANGE:

MDE anticipates funding five to ten projects in the amount of \$250,000 to \$2.5 million each. The actual award amounts will depend on the number of participating ISDs and their constituent LEAs and PSAs that join a given consortium. The funding structure creates a financial incentive for more ISDs to partner in a given consortium. To project the appropriate allocations, certain considerations were used to create a per-LEA and -PSA allocation that went into the ISD estimates:

Size of District

LEAs and PSAs with more than 101 students were grouped and categorized according to size and assigned corresponding dollar amounts ranging from \$2,500 to \$150,000.

High Poverty Districts

LEAs and PSAs with more than 101 students claiming free and reduced lunch were grouped and categorized according to number of students and assigned corresponding dollar amounts, ranging from \$2,500 to \$25,000.

High Priority Schools

LEAs and PSAs with more than 101 students that have schools not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) were assigned \$5,000 for each non-AYP school with a maximum of four non-AYP schools per district.

Minimum ISD Awards

To support the implementation of Regional Data Initiatives at smaller ISDs, a minimum award was set at approximately \$75,000. 'Per LEA/PSA' allocations were increased proportionally to total \$75,000.

Round One Approximate Funding Amounts

The following figures assigned to ISDs are estimated values provided for the purpose of establishing the consortium budgets, based on full participation by LEAs and PSAs within a given ISD. The amounts are based on 100 percent participation by ISD constituent districts. Consortia of ISDs are encouraged and may apply for a combined budget amount. **Actual award amounts may vary based on participation.**

ISD	Estimated Amount	ISD	Estimated Amount
03 Allegan Area ESA	~\$130,000	44 Lapeer ISD	~\$87,500
04 Alpena-Montmorency-Alcona ESD	~\$75,000	46 Lenawee ISD	~\$160,000
08 Barry ISD	~\$75,000	47 Livingston ESA	~\$127,500
09 Bay-Arenac ISD	~\$122,500	50 Macomb ISD	~\$777,500
11 Berrien ISD	~\$252,500	51 Manistee ISD	~\$75,000
12 Branch ISD	~\$75,000	52 Marquette-Alger RESA	~\$82,500
13 Calhoun ISD	~\$212,500	53 Mason-Lake ISD	~\$75,000
14 Lewis Cass ISD	~\$75,000	54 Mecosta-Osceola ISD	~\$100,000
15 Charlevoix-Emmet ISD	~\$100,000	55 Menominee ISD	~\$75,000
16 Cheboygan-Otsego-Presque Isle ESD	~\$92,500	56 Midland County ESA	~\$77,500
17 Eastern U.P ISD	~\$85,000	58 Monroe ISD	~\$167,500
18 Clare-Gladwin RESD	~\$100,000	59 Montcalm Area ISD	~\$110,000
19 Clinton County RESA	~\$75,000	61 Muskegon Area ISD	~\$267,500
21 Delta-Schoolcraft ISD	~\$75,000	62 Newaygo County RESA	~\$97,500
22 Dickinson-Iron ISD	~\$75,000	63 Oakland Schools	~\$1,057,500
23 Eaton ISD	~\$120,000	64 Oceana ISD	~\$75,000
25 Genesee ISD	~\$537,500	70 Ottawa Area ISD	~\$237,500
27 Gogebic-Ontonagon ISD	~\$75,000	72 C.O.O.R. ISD	~\$90,000
28 Traverse Bay Area ISD	~\$215,000	73 Saginaw ISD	~\$285,000
29 Gratiot-Isabella RESD	~\$137,500	74 St. Clair County RESA	~\$162,500
30 Hillsdale ISD	~\$82,500	75 St. Joseph County ISD	~\$105,000
31 Copper Country ISD	~\$75,000	76 Sanilac ISD	~\$92,500
32 Huron ISD	~\$75,000	78 Shiawassee RESD	~\$100,000
33 Ingham ISD	~\$277,500	79 Tuscola ISD	~\$97,500
34 Ionia ISD	~\$102,500	80 Van Buren ISD	~\$177,500
35 Iosco RESA	~\$75,000	81 Washtenaw ISD	~\$290,000
38 Jackson ISD	~\$247,500	82 Wayne RESA	~\$1,975,000
39 Kalamazoo RESA	~\$210,000	83 Wexford-Missaukee ISD	~\$112,500
41 Kent ISD	~\$625,000	Total = ~\$11,605,000	

Addenda for Possible Consideration

Applicants are encouraged to submit addenda to their Regional Data Initiatives grant that propose innovative solutions to the four activities listed below. (Addenda should be kept to four double-spaced pages each, using 11 point Verdana font. Addenda do not count against the total page limit of the original proposal. Addenda should include separate budgets that should not be included in the original project budget. Proposed projects will be considered for funding after the total round one budget—comprising the winning consortia—is determined.)

Addendum 1: Education Research Collaborative Partners

Explain how the consortium will include at least one higher education institution, teacher preparation institution, or education research organization as a partner. This would give the consortium the ability to conduct research on the vast amount of formative and summative data shared across the consortium with the goal of improving education policy and practice and the preparation of teachers.

Addendum 2: Personnel Skilled with Technology

Explain how its addendum project will assist the state in providing a common set of standards used in assessing personnel skilled in technology. The addendum should be based on current work underway to increase educator technology skill levels and should include a statewide organization to assist in rolling out the common set of standards.

Addendum 3: 8th Grade Technological Literacy

Explain how its addendum project will assist the state in providing a common set of assessment items use in determining 8th grade student technological literacy measured against the Michigan Educational Technology Standards for Students (METS-S). The addendum should be based on current work underway and should include a statewide organization to assist in rolling out the common set of assessment items.

Addendum 4: Michigan Superintendent of Public Instruction's Dropout Challenge

Explain how its addendum project will support high and middle schools in addressing Michigan's dropout crisis and meet the Dropout Challenge set forth by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Michael Flanagan.

Collaborative Work / Professional Learning Community

MDE anticipates awarding five to ten Regional Data Initiatives grants. Consortia leaders will be expected to participate in a Professional Learning Community (PLC) comprised of the winning consortia leaders, representatives of the Data for Student Success (D4SS) project, and other stakeholders. The PLC will be administered by MAISA and facilitate the consortia's collaboration, sharing resources, and accomplishing of a common evaluation across all projects. **Applicants should set aside 20 percent of the total project budget for the purpose of collaborating.** Up to 50 percent of the set aside (or 10 percent of the project budget) can be considered "professional development" for the purposes of satisfying the Title IID 25 percent professional development budget requirement.

Round Two Funding

MDE anticipates offering a second round of funding through the winning Regional Data Initiatives consortia for those ISDs and their constituent LEAs and PSAs that require additional time in selecting which winning consortium to join. The approximate values provided for budgeting purposes in Round One are subject to change in Round Two based on funds available.

TOTAL FUNDS:

Approximately \$11.6 million of total funding is available in the combined two rounds of competition.

DATA FOR STUDENT SUCCESS

The State of Michigan has invested significantly in the Data for Student Success (D4SS) project with the goal of providing a common source of compulsory data reported out by the State for use by schools and those organizations supporting school improvement efforts. The Regional Data Initiatives grant program is predicated on aligning regional data systems with D4SS and extending the great work that has been done through D4SS within the context of local initiatives.

There are two areas in which the Regional Data Initiatives should interface with D4SS:

1. For the automated release, transfer, and incorporation of state compulsory data into the package of tools and resources that are central to each Regional Data Initiative. This will allow the state to provide a central or single "data out" platform or "conduit," eliminate redundancy, and reduce the time it takes to return data to our schools.
2. To provide a common set of trainings on data driven decision making that leverage the D4SS professional development. Regional Data Initiatives professional development should look to include critical elements of the D4SS professional development program where they fit.

DISTRICT ASSURANCES:

Final funding amounts will be contingent on assurances provided by participating LEAs and PSAs within consortia ISDs. After the winning consortia are selected, MDE will request, via MEGS, that each LEA and PSA submit assurances certifying full participation in the consortium designated by their ISD. Nonpublic schools will also be invited to submit the same assurances for participation in the consortium designated by their ISD (the requirements of the "Nonpublic School Participation" provision of this application still apply). The assurance process amounts to an "opt in" for LEAs, PSAs, and nonpublic schools indicating their desire to participate. A failure to provide assurances indicates an "opting out" of the Regional Data Initiatives grant program. These assurances will include:

1. District incorporation of the Regional Data Initiatives into the district's educational practices at the classroom level;
2. Interface capability between the Regional Data Initiatives and district student information system to facilitate interchange of data;
3. Dedication of at least four professional development days over two school years for all instructional staff and administrators for professional development related to the Regional Data Initiatives;
4. Participation in the Regional Data Initiatives during the FY2009-10, FY2010-11, and FY2011-12 school years;
5. Full participation in the collective evaluation of the Regional Data Initiatives Title IID grant, including completing surveys and providing additional data to assist MDE in determining the effectiveness of the program in impacting student achievement;
6. Permission for the Regional Data Initiatives to use district data for research purposes of improving education policy and practice and the preparation of teachers;
7. Use of a common set of standards used to determine personnel technology skill level with all instructional staff observed and reported in the Registry of Educational Professionals (REP); and
8. Use of a common set of assessment items used in determining 8th grade technological literacy and reported assessment results in the Michigan Electronic Grants System (MEGS).

Failure to produce assurances may result in reduced funding.

NONPUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION:

The federal Title II, Part D Enhancing Education Through Technology (EETT) program statute requires applicants to provide meaningful opportunity for the equitable participation of teachers and administrators from nonpublic schools in professional learning and equipment funded under EETT. This opportunity **must occur during the planning stages** of the application so that the proposed initiative and the funding request take into consideration the needs of the nonpublic staff. Grant applicants are required to document the planning activities that occur between public and nonpublic entities and to maintain as documentation items such as copies of letters inviting nonpublic participation. Funds may not be used for nonpublic substitute teacher costs.

ASSURANCE OF ACCURACY:

For each application, an assurance must be submitted stating that all information provided within is true and accurate. If, during the implementation of any funded project, MDE establishes that inaccurate or false information was provided in the application, the grant may be rescinded.

OPENING AND CLOSING DATES AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS:

MDE has released the general instructions, scoring rubric, and supporting information for the Regional Data Initiatives grant on Thursday, July 23, 2009 on the www.Michigan.gov/MDE website and the www.TechPlan.org website. The applications will be submitted within MEGS. The window for all submissions is between 9:00 am, Tuesday, September 1, 2009 and 11:59 pm, Tuesday, September 15, 2009. **The final submission deadline is 11:59 pm, Tuesday, September 15, 2009.** Because of required modifications to the MEGS system, these application materials will be available on MEGS after 9:00 am, Tuesday, September 1, 2009.

PROCESS FOR THE GRANT COMPETITION:

Eligible partnerships of ISDs will compete for the 2009-2010 Enhancing Education Through Technology (EETT) program grants through established procedures utilized by MDE in managing its grant programs. Applications will be received and reviewed according to the timeline below. Each proposal will be rated on a 100-point scale as identified later within the application instructions.

The tentative time frame for the operation of this grant program includes these major milestones:

July 23, 2009	Grant Program Announcement
September 1, 2009	Grant Program "live" in MEGS
September 15, 2009	Round One applications due
October 15, 2009	Round One recommendations presented to the Superintendent of Public Instruction; awards issued
February 25, 2010	Round Two applications due if funding is available
March 25, 2010	Round Two recommendations on continuation funding presented to the Superintendent of Public Instruction; awards issued
June 30, 2011	Projects to be completed; all funds expended
July 31, 2011	Final Performance Report due
August 31, 2011	Final Expenditure Report due

All dates are subject to change.

REJECTION OF PROPOSALS:

The Department of Education reserves the right to reject any and all proposals received as a result of this announcement.

REVIEW PROCESS:

MDE utilizes a review panel when scoring its competitive grants. For this grant program, review teams will be composed of people both within MDE and outside MDE as needed, with expertise in student data collection, the use of formative and summative student assessments, and professional development design. MDE staff will supervise the review.

Award selections will be based on merit and quality, as determined by points awarded through the rubric provided below, and all other relevant information. All funding will be subject to the approval by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. All applicants will be notified of the Superintendent's action.

The maximum score for the following criteria is 100 points. In addition to the content of the rubric categories below, the Superintendent of Public Instruction may apply other factors in making funding decisions, such as (1) geographic distribution, (2) duplication of effort, (3) duplication of funding, and/or (4) performance of the fiscal agent on previously funded initiatives.

REVIEW CRITERIA:

The Enhancing Education Through Technology (EETT) grant program is intended to improve student achievement through the use of technology in the elementary and secondary schools. EETT is also intended to combine high quality professional learning to teachers and administrators with technology tools to further enhance learning opportunities for all children. The scoring rubric below should be used as a guide when writing the proposal. The reviewers will judge proposals against the elements described in the rubric. The proposals most likely to be funded are those that have most completely addressed all the elements described in the "Exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous" column of the rubric. A narrative that is written in the sequence of the rubric facilitates evaluation by the grant readers.

FINAL REPORT:

The grantee will provide a report of the project to include measurable outcomes based on grant objectives. The report will include a detailed PowerPoint presentation. PowerPoint reports will be posted on the MDE website, as received. The intent of the PowerPoint is to share the project outcomes with interested educators. The grantee will also be required to compile data to provide a means to evaluate the effectiveness of the grant.

GRANT ABSTRACT:

On one separate, double-space page, include a 300-word description of the proposed Regional Data Initiatives. Detailed, clearly articulated abstracts that allow the reader to thoroughly understand the scope of project will receive **5 points** in the scoring of the grant proposal.

Abstract is vague and lacks clarity	Abstract has some details and sufficient clarity	Abstract is thoroughly detailed and clearly articulated
--	---	--

GRANT NARRATIVE:

The 20-page grant narrative should be written in the sequence of the rubric.

A. Identification of the Need

Describe how the proposed package of tools, services, and resources meets the needs of the consortium ISDs and their constituent districts. Explanation should discuss how the proposed consortium will function and include a list of the participating ISDs. Articulate a clear vision for how the project will impact high needs and high poverty student populations; explain how this impact will be achieved. This section of the proposal is worth a maximum of **15 points**.

Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Response is comprehensive, rigorous	Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
The proposal provides a basic description of participating ISDs but remains vague about how the consortium will function or how the project will impact high poverty/needs students.	The proposal provides a thorough description of participating ISDs and adequately explains how the consortium will function. Also includes explanation of how project will impact high poverty/needs students.	In addition to describing participants and explaining the consortium's function, the proposal articulates a clear vision of how each ISD will contribute. Includes clear goals for impacting high poverty/priority students at the building and classroom levels.

B. Project Design

Provide a description of the methodology, design, and strategies to be used to accomplish each of the project design components described below. This section of the proposal is worth a maximum of **50 points**.

10 points ***Data Warehousing Definition:*** Describe how the proposed package of tools, services, and resources meets or exceeds the Michigan Association of Intermediate Superintendents Association (MAISA) general definition of data warehousing, as well as how the system will impact high poverty/priority students.

MAISA Definition: A data analysis and reporting tool to help districts become data driven in order to meet the requirements of NCLB and EdYES! that includes a collection of various sets of data found in a variety of unrelated locations and formats brought into one relational database. The tool allows districts to find answers and ask complex questions that uncover underlying problems – leading to the design of data driven student achievement and school improvement strategies. Data incorporated into a fully relational data warehouse includes: financial data, personnel data, building infrastructure data, student demographic data, student achievement data, and assessment data. (2005)

Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Response is comprehensive, rigorous	Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
The proposal provides a general description of how the consortium’s package of tools, services, and resources works, but fails to provide detail of how the proposed package satisfies the MAISA definition.	The proposal provides a detailed description of how the consortium’s package of tools, services, and resources works and explains how the proposed package satisfies the MAISA definition.	In addition to providing a detailed description of how the consortium’s package of tools, services, and resources works and an explanation of how the proposed package satisfies the MAISA definition, the proposal explains how ISDs and their constituent districts will use the proposed system to impact high poverty/priority students.

B. Project Design (Continued)

15 points *Current Implementation:* Explain which elements of the proposed package are currently implemented and which elements would be newly implemented. Detail how the current system interfaces with local district student information systems and what would be needed, if anything, to automate data transfers between the regional data initiatives and local districts. In this section, include which ISDs are currently using these elements and provide the number of districts and students served. Also include those ISDs that will be implementing the package for the first time and provide the total number of districts and students that will be served.

Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Response is comprehensive, rigorous	Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
The proposed package has not been implemented sufficiently to warrant consideration under this section.	A significant portion of the proposed package is in place and currently serving a limited number of districts and students.	A significant portion of the proposed package is currently serving a large number of districts and students.
The proposed package would be a new implementation.	The proposal only suggests minor enhancements to the system currently in operation.	The proposal details the extensive enhancements to the system that would occur because of project funding.
There is limited or no interoperability between the proposed system and local district student information systems and/or no plans to achieve this interoperability.	There is limited interoperability with the student information systems of the local districts currently using the system, but the proposal adequately lays out how the interoperability would be accomplished.	There is significant interoperability with the student information systems of the local districts currently using the system and the proposal adequately lays out how the interoperability would be accomplished.
The proposal does not seek to add new ISDs outside those currently using the system.	The proposal seeks to add new ISDs, but in a limited number in terms of total student population served.	The proposal seeks to add new ISDs, which will greatly increase the number of districts and students served.

B. Project Design (Continued)

10 Points Differentiated Instruction: Describe how the consortium will incorporate tools, services, and resources to assist educators in individualizing and differentiating instruction for all students at the classroom level. (Note that the winning consortia will be tasked with collaboratively developing a common approach, set of tools and resources, etc., to achieve this objective.)

Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Response is comprehensive, rigorous	Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
The proposal does not specifically address which tools, services, and resources will be incorporated and/or does not provide enough detail to convey an understanding of how to achieve this objective.	The proposal provides sufficient detail on which tools, services, and resources will be used to achieve this objective and includes discussion on how differentiated instruction will occur in certain instances and in certain subject areas and/or grades.	The proposal's main elements are focused on the classroom and work backwards to the consortium, providing detail on which tools, services, and resources will enable teachers to differentiate and individualize instruction across subject areas and grades.

15 Points Professional Development: Describe how the consortium will design and implement professional development that increases educator capacity to use data to inform instruction and principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) to differentiate and individualize instruction. (Note that the winning consortia will be tasked with collaboratively developing common professional development programs to assure continuity across the state.)

Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Response is comprehensive, rigorous	Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
The proposal provides a limited description of professional development or a majority of the consortium ISDs has not implemented Data for Student Success (D4SS).	The proposal provides a description of professional development and suggests how the participating ISDs intend to localize the implementation.	In addition to describing the professional development program in detail, the proposal articulates how the participating ISDs intend to localize the implementation.
	Members of the consortium ISDs have implemented or have committed to implementing D4SS.	A majority of the consortium ISDs has implemented or has committed to implementing D4SS.

C. Deployment and Sustainability

Describe the consortium’s model of deployment, scalability, and financial sustainability across the multiple ISDs and their constituent districts in the proposed Regional Data Initiatives. The applicant’s accomplishments in previous data-related programs will be considered. This section of the proposal is worth a maximum of **15 points**.

Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Response is comprehensive, rigorous	Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
The proposal includes little explanation of how the participating ISDs and their constituent districts will deploy the project.	The proposal provides a detailed explanation of how ISDs and their constituent districts will deploy the Regional Data Initiatives.	The proposal provides a detailed explanation of deployment and sustainability of the project.
The applicant doesn’t propose effective ways of covering the costs associated with sustaining the project once the Regional Data Initiatives grant is complete.	The applicant does propose ways of covering the costs associated with sustaining the project once the Regional Data Initiatives grant is complete.	The applicant provides examples of how each participating ISD has built or will build sustainability costs into their operating budget.

D. Project Leadership

Project leadership is key to the success of this grant program. Describe key personnel and their responsibilities related to the completion of project goals. This section of the proposal is worth a maximum of **5 points**.

Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Response is comprehensive, rigorous	Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
The proposal does not adequately identify key personnel and/or lacks specificity of project responsibilities.	The proposal identifies key personnel, their project responsibilities, and the amount of time assigned to the project.	The proposal includes a chart identifying key personnel and their relationships; the key personnel hold senior positions in each of the participating ISDs.
The proposal does not lay out the project in terms of project milestones, deliverables, deadlines, etc.	The proposal provides a description of a project management design including detailing project milestones, deliverables, deadlines, etc.	The proposal details project responsibilities, deliverables, percentage of time devoted to each element of the project, and a timeline for completion of activities.
Little definition of the project team management is provided and limited information on who makes up the project management team and how that team will function.	The proposal includes biographies of the project management team and clear lines of authority and oversight necessary to complete the project successfully.	Clear lines of authority are articulated, with members of each participating ISD playing key roles. The proposal lays out a clear plan for providing leadership and oversight necessary to complete project goals.

E. Program Budget

Provide in this narrative as well as within the MEGS Budget Pages Section a detailed program budget that includes software and hardware costs, salaries and/or stipends for all participants, and a detailed description of technology and other resources required for project completion. A minimum of 25 percent of the budget must be expended on professional development activities. The project budget should set aside 20 percent for collaborative work. This section of the proposal is worth a maximum of **10 points**.

- Up to two double-spaced pages for the budget detail
- Up to one double-spaced page for the budget expenditure timeline

Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Response is comprehensive, rigorous	Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
The project budget provides little detail and/or more than 50 percent of the budget is consumed by ISD salaries.	The project budget provides sufficient detail and expenditures are itemized by participating ISDs.	The project budget provides excellent detail and expenditures are itemized by participating district.
The proposed budget does not properly allocate 25 percent of the budget to professional development.	The proposed budget properly allocates 25 percent of the budget to professional development.	The proposed budget properly allocates 40 percent or more of the budget to professional development.
The budget does not include a set-aside for collaborative work.	The budget includes a set-aside for collaborative work that is less than 20 percent.	The budget includes a set-aside of 20 percent for collaborative work.
The proposal does not include a timeline for expenditures.	The proposal includes a timeline for expenditures.	The proposal includes a detailed timeline for expenditures.
Project budget does not include any reference to matching funds as it relates to the total project budget.	Project budget does include references to matching funds as it relates to the total project budget.	Project budget includes significant matching funds as it relates to the total project budget.

INFORMATION CONCERNING OTHER REQUIREMENTS

Grant Reviewers:

Readers for EETT grants will be selected on expertise, geographic location, and need, as determined by the number of applications received. All individuals chosen to be grant reviewers may be required to participate in a grant reviewer training session to become familiar with the specifics of the program and funding priorities prior to the beginning of the review processes.

Length of Award:

Funding will be effective immediately following approval of grant awards by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, with an ending date of June 30, 2011.

Indirect Charges:

Federal law limits charging indirect rates on contracted services to the first \$25,000.

Payment Schedule:

Grantees will request funds using the Cash Management System (CMS). Requests for funds are limited to reimbursement.

Financial Reporting:

A final expenditure report will be required within 60 days of the grant ending date, showing all bills paid in full.

Preparing the Narrative:

All pages in attachments should have one-inch margins and be collated and numbered consecutively throughout. The **narrative** is limited to **20 double-spaced pages using 11 point Verdana font**. Appendices of charts and graphs should be limited to four pages per participating ISD. Addenda accompanying applicant proposals should be limited to four double-spaced pages using 11 point Verdana font.

Ownership of Materials Produced:

Ownership of products resulting from an EETT grant, which are subject to copyright of economic value, shall remain with the Michigan Department of Education unless such ownership is explicitly waived. This stipulation covers recipients as well as subcontractors receiving funds through this grant program.