

**MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Educational Technology and Data Coordination  
Office of Educational Improvement and Innovation**

**2009-2010 Title II, Part D  
Enhancing Education through Technology Competitive Program Grant  
21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Environments Initiative**

**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 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Environments Initiative. 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 of 2009, CFDA Number 84.318. This competitive grant will be known as Michigan's 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Environments Initiative.

**PURPOSE OF THE GRANT:**

The purpose of the grant program is to foster 21st century learning environments in Michigan schools that support innovative teaching and learning strategies, enabled by high access to educational technology, and that help accelerate achievement in core academic subject areas, close achievement gaps, and prepare Michigan students for 21st century jobs.

Competitive grants issued under Title II, Part D, Enhancing Education through Technology (EETT) shall assist local education agencies (LEAs) or eligible local partnerships in implementing and supporting comprehensive, technology-based solutions in elementary and secondary schools, both inside and outside the traditional classroom, to improve student academic achievement and the use of data and educational technology as effective tools for improving teaching and learning. Also allowable are local and state efforts to use technology in promoting parent and family involvement in education and to enhance communication and the sharing of teaching, learning, data, information, and best practices among students, parents, teachers, principals, administrators, and other education stakeholders. In addition, all grants funded under this program will incorporate concepts of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and contain a rigorous evaluation component, particularly regarding the impact on student academic achievement.

**PROGRAM STRUCTURE:**

To achieve the broad goals of this grant program, MDE has established categories of funding for which qualified applicants can apply:

1. ***Student-Centered, 21st Century Learning Environments:***  
These competitive grants seek to support implementation of evidence-based innovative models of student-centered learning (i.e., instructional strategies focused on the student's needs, abilities, interests, and learning styles with the teacher as a facilitator of learning). These 21<sup>st</sup> century learning environments should not be dependent on physical facilities and time; they should incorporate concepts of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and the effective use of mobile and one-to-one computing technology. Priority will be given to dropout prevention and reengagement initiatives that utilize digital environments to enable project-based learning, nontraditional instructional methods, cyber learning, and other methods aimed at engaging students who have dropped out or who are at-risk of dropping out.
2. ***Digital Professional Learning Environments for Administrators:***  
These competitive grants seek to support the extension of online professional learning communities for district and building level administrators. The goal of these communities is to facilitate an increase in school leaders' capacity to lead systemic, technology-based school improvement efforts. Efforts should focus on 1) dropout prevention and 2) creating 21<sup>st</sup> century digital learning environments for all students, including the use of project based learning and mobile technology based learning strategies.
3. ***Algebra For All:***  
This competitive grant seeks to support the successful development and implementation of a nontraditional concept of algebra instruction for the successful completion of Algebra I by students who have traditionally struggled in mathematics. The winning applicant should propose a blended professional development program where mathematics teachers from across the state engage in active, sustained learning that strongly impacts student achievement with Algebra I content. The program is intended to support the work of the Michigan Mathematics and Science Center Network (MMSCN) and Michigan Virtual University (MVU) in this collaborative project, and fund the evaluation of program effectiveness.
4. ***eLearning Consortium: \****  
This continuation grant continues the support of Michigan Virtual University (MVU) statewide activities through partnerships with several intermediate school districts (ISDs). The goal is to strengthen the virtual school's ability to serve Michigan students, particularly at-risk students, by pursuing activities, policies, and practices that increase the overall number of Michigan Virtual High School course enrollments and course completions.
5. ***Michigan Learns Online: \****  
This continuation grant advances the expansion of online learning throughout the state of Michigan by supporting multiple options for e-learning and/or virtual learning for all Michigan schools at the district level, particularly secondary schools, in meeting the Michigan Merit Curriculum (MCC) requirements. Emphasis will be placed on assisting teachers in adopting "blended" teaching strategies and practices that utilize low-cost / no cost online resources to improve student learning.
6. ***MI Champions: 21st Century Learning Classroom by Classroom: \****  
This continuation grant seeks to support a successful, statewide model for professional development that increases the capacity of teachers at the building level to implement student-centered, 21<sup>st</sup> century learning environments, including the use of project based learning and mobile technology based learning strategies.

- \* In addition to meeting the "Eligible Applicants" requirements set forth in the following section, applicants for grant categories 4-6 must be a FY2007, FY2008, or FY2009 Title IID competitive grant recipient.

Please refer to the specific instructions for each category to determine application category requirements and guidelines.

#### **ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS:**

This grant program is targeted to local education agencies (LEAs), public school academies (PSAs), and eligible partnerships (i.e., consortia of LEAs, PSAs, and/or 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 (minimum of 40 percent of total blended FTE count enrollment claiming free and reduced lunch) 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\\_08\\_T1aAllocListOrig\\_199917\\_7.pdf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/MDE-P2_FS_08_T1aAllocListOrig_199917_7.pdf)

*and*

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

#### **GRANT RANGE:**

MDE anticipates funding ten or more projects in the amount of \$100,000 to \$2.0 million each. The following estimates are provided, by grant category, for the purposes of budgeting:

1. ***Student-Centered, 21st Century Learning Environments:*** anticipated award amounts range from \$100,000 to \$300,000 each. The number of grants funded will be determined by the quality of applicants and the availability of funding.
2. ***Digital Professional Learning Environments for Administrators:*** up to three awards to be given ranging from \$100,000 to \$250,000. This category will be awarded as a competitive grant with preference given to applicants who previously demonstrated success with a Title IID grant during FY2007, FY2008, or FY2009.
3. ***Algebra for All:*** approximately \$500,000 awarded to one eligible applicant. Applicants must apply in partnership with the Michigan Mathematics and Science Center Network (MMSCN) and Michigan Virtual University.
4. ***eLearning Consortium:*** approximately \$1 million awarded to one applicant. This category will be awarded as a continuation grant; therefore the eligible applicant must be a FY2007, FY2008, or FY2009 Title IID grant recipient. Michigan Virtual University also must be named as a partner on this grant.
5. ***Michigan Learns Online:*** approximately \$1.25 million awarded to one applicant. This category will be awarded as a continuation grant; therefore the eligible applicant must be a FY2007, FY2008, or FY2009 Title IID grant recipient.

6. ***MI Champions: 21st Century Learning Classroom by Classroom***: approximately \$2 million awarded to one applicant. This category will be awarded as a continuation grant; therefore the eligible applicant must be a FY2007, FY2008, or FY2009 Title IID grant recipient.

**TOTAL FUNDS:**

**Approximately \$9.4 million of total funding is available.**

**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 21<sup>st</sup> Century Digital Learning Environments Initiative on September 15, 2009 in the Michigan Electronics Grants System (MEGS) and on the [www.Michigan.gov/MDE](http://www.Michigan.gov/MDE) and [www.TechPlan.org](http://www.TechPlan.org) websites. **All applications must be submitted within MEGS.**

- **The final submission deadline for Categories 2-6 is 11:59 pm, Monday, October 12, 2009**
- **The final submission deadline for Category 1 is 11:59 pm, Wednesday, October 28, 2009**

**PROCESS FOR THE GRANT COMPETITION:**

LEAs, PSAs, and eligible partnerships will compete for the 2009-2010 Enhancing Education Through Technology (EETT) 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:

September 15, 2009	Grant program announcement
October 12, 2009	Categories 2-6 applications due
October 28, 2009	Category 1 (Student Centered, 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Learning Environments) applications due
October 28, 2009	Recommendations on Categories 2-6 presented to the Superintendent of Public Instruction; awards issued
November 30, 2009	Recommendations on Category 1 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.

#### **REQUIRED STRUCTURE OF PROPOSALS:**

MDE requires that all proposals submitted under the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Digital Learning Environments Initiative program meet certain submission requirements. Any proposal not meeting these requirements may be disqualified for consideration:

##### ***Abstract***

On one separate, double-spaced page, applicants must provide up to a 300-word description of the proposed project. Clearly articulated abstracts allow the reader to understand the scope of project. The abstract does not count in the total number of narrative pages (see below).

##### ***Grant Narrative***

All pages in the narrative section of the application should have one-inch margins and be collated and numbered consecutively throughout. **The narrative is limited to 15 double-spaced pages using 11 point Verdana font.** Charts, graphs, and bulleted lists may be single-spaced.

##### ***Proposal Outline***

All grant applications must adhere to the following outline and use the following section headers:

1. Abstract
2. Narrative
  - A. Identification of Need
  - B. Project Design
  - C. Project Deployment and Sustainability
  - D. Project Leadership

- E. Program Evaluation
- 3. Project Budget
- 4. Appendices

**Project Budget**

Project budgets are uploaded as a separate function and document in MEGS. Project budgets do not count as part of the narrative page total.

**25 Percent Professional Development Requirement**

According to Title IID guidance, a minimum of 25 percent of the budget must be expended on professional development activities. The budget must clearly indicate which items reflect the 25 percent requirement.

**Appendices**

Addenda accompanying applicant proposals should be limited to four double-spaced pages using 11 point Verdana font. Addenda pages are not figured into the 15-page limit on the narrative section of the application. Charts, graphs, and bulleted lists may be single spaced.

**SCORING RUBRIC:**

For consistency in judging applications, MDE uses a standard scoring rubric. The maximum score for the following criteria is 100 points:

- |                                          |           |
|------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Abstract                              | 5 points  |
| 2. Narrative                             |           |
| A. Identification of Need                | 10 points |
| B. Project Design*                       | 50 points |
| C. Project Deployment and Sustainability | 15 points |
| D. Project Leadership                    | 5 points  |
| E. Program Evaluation                    | 5 points  |
| 3. Project Budget                        | 10 points |

\*A scoring rubric is provided below. Individual rubrics for “Project Design” have been created for each category of this grant (i.e., Student-Centered, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Environments, Algebra for All, etc.).

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.

**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 innovative instructional models, educational technology, online learning, and/or 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.

**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.

**1. GRANT ABSTRACT:**

**\*\*\*THIS RUBRIC APPLIES TO ALL APPLICATIONS SEEKING FUNDING.\*\*\***

On one separate, double-spaced page, include up to a 300-word description of the proposed project. Clearly articulated abstracts that allow the reader to understand the scope of project will receive **5 points** in the scoring of the grant proposal.

<b>Abstract is vague and lacks clarity</b>	<b>Abstract has some details and sufficient clarity</b>	<b>Abstract is thoroughly detailed and clearly articulated</b>
--------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------

**2. GRANT NARRATIVE:**

**\*\*\*The 15-page grant narrative should be written in the sequence of the rubric.\*\*\***

**A. Identification of the Need**

**\*\*\*THIS RUBRIC APPLIES TO ALL APPLICATIONS SEEKING FUNDING.\*\*\***

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 **10 points**.

<b>Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor</b>	<b>Response is comprehensive, rigorous</b>	<b>Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous</b>
The proposal provides a basic description of participating ISDs, LEAS, and/or PSAs, but remains vague about how the project will impact high poverty/needs students.	The proposal provides a thorough description of participating ISDs, LEAS, and/or PSAs. Also includes an explanation of how project meets the requirement of impacting high poverty/needs schools.	In addition to describing participants, the proposal articulates a clear vision of how each ISD, LEA, and/or PSA will participate with the goal of improving student achievement. Includes clear goals for impacting high poverty/priority students at the building and classroom levels.

**B.1 Project Design: Student-Centered, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Environments**

**\*\*\*THIS RUBRIC APPLIES ONLY TO THOSE APPLICATIONS SEEKING FUNDING UNDER THE "STUDENT-CENTERED, 21<sup>st</sup> CENTURY LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS" CATEGORY.\*\*\***

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**.

**20 points** *Student-Centered Learning:* Describe how the proposed project implements a proven, evidence-based, student-centered model of instruction that allows each student, particularly those at risk of dropping out of school, to "own" their own learning, choose the outcomes and products of their learning, progress at their individual pace, and succeed using their own learning style (see page 2, paragraph 1).

<b>Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor</b>	<b>Response is comprehensive, rigorous</b>	<b>Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous</b>
Does not provide evidence that the proposed instruction model is proven or sound and lacks in innovation.	Provides evidence in support of the proposed instruction model and is innovative in its application.	Provides evidence that the proposed instruction model aligns with a national or international evidenced-based program, successful in engaging at risk youth in learning.
Little evidence of being student-centered or student-focused.	Provides evidence of moving on a continuum towards student-centered or student-focused paradigm.	Empowers students to accept responsibility and take ownership of their learning and progress to meet state standards.
Outcome or product of learning and pace of instruction remains determined by district and school.	Provides flexibility in instruction to accommodate individual student learning styles.	Empowers students to determine the outcome and product of the learning experience with significant control of the pace at which they learn.
Does not provide multiple means of learning the content, multiple means of demonstrating knowledge gained, and/or multiple means of assessing that knowledge.	Provides some opportunities for multiple means of learning the content, demonstrating knowledge gained, and assessing that knowledge.	Empowers students in determining how they access content and how they demonstrate knowledge gained. The measurement tools used to determine student progress incorporate multiple means of assessment for Content Expectations and 21st Century Skills.

**B.1 Project Design: Student-Centered, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Environments (Continued)**

**10 points** *Standards-Focused:* Describe how the proposed project implements a standards-focused paradigm measured by demonstrated student progress against the Michigan Merit Curriculum (MMC) and High School Content Expectations (HSCEs) as opposed to relying on traditional means of assessment.

<b>Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor</b>	<b>Response is comprehensive, rigorous</b>	<b>Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous</b>
Instructional design shows little evidence of being standards-focused.	Focus is placed and appropriate coverage given to state standards and requirements.	Predicates a model that clearly identifies and articulates which standards will be met by which activities and students understand and set goals to meet the state's content expectations.

**10 points** *21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills:* Describe how the proposed project integrates 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills into teaching and learning, as defined by the Partnership for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills, while paying particular attention to Internet, Computer, and Technology (ICT) skills.

<b>Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor</b>	<b>Response is comprehensive, rigorous</b>	<b>Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous</b>
Does not provide indication that 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Skills are integral to new instructional model.	Integrates 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Skills, particularly ICT skills, into some facets of teaching and learning.	Integrates 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Skills and assesses the student's full range of 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Skills, not just ICT skills, on a frequent and ongoing basis as part of learning outcomes and products.

**10 points** *Digital Media Arts and STEM:* Describe how the proposed project incorporates a digital media arts program or an advanced Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) focus.

<b>Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor</b>	<b>Response is comprehensive, rigorous</b>	<b>Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous</b>
May offer occasional opportunities but does not significantly integrate digital media arts or advanced STEM programming.	Significantly integrates digital media arts or advanced STEM programming.	Significantly integrates digital media arts or advanced STEM programming such that students leave the program with certifications and/or college credit in addition to their high school diploma.

## B.2.A Project Design: Digital Professional Learning Environments for Administrators

**\*\*\*THIS RUBRIC APPLIES TO THOSE APPLICATIONS SEEKING FUNDING UNDER THE “DIGITAL PROFESSIONAL LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS FOR ADMINISTRATORS” CATEGORY.\*\*\***

\*PLEASE NOTE: there are two options under this category; unique project proposals should address only one option.

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

**30 points** ***OPTION A (Part 1) – Digital Professional Learning Environments for District Administrators:*** Describe how the proposed project will assist administrators, specifically district-level administrators, in enhancing their understanding and leadership skills as it relates to leading educational technology integration efforts in their districts to create 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Environments that help ALL students succeed. Also include a conversation on how the professional learning community will address Michigan’s dropout crisis. Describe how educational technologies will be used to facilitate a professional learning community and how principles of Universal Design for Learning will be discussed. Explain how administrators will be selected and encouraged to participate.

<b>Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor</b>	<b>Response is comprehensive, rigorous</b>	<b>Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous</b>
Limited description of how the project will enhance administrator understanding and leadership skills as it relates to leading technology integration efforts.	Adequately describes how the project will enhance administrator understanding and leadership skills as it relates to leading technology integration efforts.	In addition to describing activities, the proposal provides demonstrated impact based on evaluations of previous programs.
Lacks description on how the program will also address Michigan’s dropout crisis.	Provides adequate description on how the program will also address Michigan’s dropout crisis.	In addition to describing activities, the proposal provides explanation of how dropout prevention elements align with other state and national initiatives.
Lacks description on how the program will also address principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL).	Provides description on how the program will also address principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL).	In addition to describing activities, the proposal provides examples of how UDL was applied in previous programs.
Short on explaining on how administrators are selected to participate.	Explains the participant administrator selection process and provides projections on participation.	In addition to including projections, includes a statewide process for engaging administrators from economically and academically disadvantaged districts.

**B.2.A Project Design: Digital Professional Learning Environments for Administrators (Continued)**

**20 points**    **OPTION A (Part 2) – CEU Leadership:** Explain how the proposed project would also provide statewide leadership in assisting Continuing Educational Units (CEUs) providers in improving, automating, and applying technology to professional development activities for ALL Michigan educators.

<b>Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor</b>	<b>Response is comprehensive, rigorous</b>	<b>Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous</b>
Lacks definition on how project would assist CEU providers in improving their offerings.	Provides definition on how project would assist CEU providers in improving their offerings.	In addition to describing activities, the proposed project provides a common means of evaluating all professional development programs using a single evaluation tool.

## B.2.B Project Design: Digital Professional Learning Environments for Administrators

**\*\*\*THIS RUBRIC APPLIES TO THOSE APPLICATIONS SEEKING FUNDING UNDER THE “DIGITAL PROFESSIONAL LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS FOR ADMINISTRATORS” CATEGORY.\*\*\***

\*PLEASE NOTE: there are two options under this category; unique project proposals should address only one option.

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

**50 points** ***OPTION B – Digital Professional Learning Environments for Building Level Administrators:*** Describe how the proposed project will assist building-level administrators address Michigan’s dropout crisis through the development of a digital professional learning community (PLC). Describe how educational technologies will be used to facilitate the digital learning community and how principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) will be applied. Explain how administrators will be selected and encouraged to participate. Also explain how best practices will be shared.

<b>Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor</b>	<b>Response is comprehensive, rigorous</b>	<b>Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous</b>
Limited description of how the project will enhance administrator understanding and leadership skills as it relates to leading dropout prevention efforts.	Adequately describes how the project will enhance administrator understanding and leadership skills as it relates to leading dropout prevention efforts.	In addition to describing activities, the proposal provides explanation of how most successful practices of dropout reduction participating administrators will be recognized.
Lacks a description on how the program will address Michigan’s dropout crisis.	Provides an adequate description on how the program will address Michigan’s dropout crisis.	In addition to describing activities, the proposal provides explanation of how the proposed dropout prevention program aligns with other initiatives.
Lacks description on how the program will also address principles of UDL.	Provides a description on how the program will also address principles of UDL.	In addition to describing activities, the program uses multiple means of accessing the learning provided by the PLC.
Short on explaining on how administrators are selected to participate.	Explains the participant administrator selection process and provides projections on participation.	In addition to including participant projections, includes a statewide process for engaging administrators serving areas with high dropout rates.

**B.3 Project Design: Algebra for All**

**\*\*\*THIS RUBRIC APPLIES ONLY TO THOSE APPLICATIONS SEEKING FUNDING UNDER THE "ALGEBRA FOR ALL" CATEGORY.\*\*\***

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**.

**30 points** ***Theory of Action:*** Describe how the project will support the successful development and implementation of a nontraditional concept of algebra instruction for the successful completion of Algebra I by students who have traditionally struggled in mathematics. The winning applicant should propose a blended professional development program where mathematics teachers from across the state engage in active, sustained learning that strongly impacts student achievement with Algebra I content. The program should leverage relationships with the Michigan Mathematics and Science Center Network (MMSCN) and Michigan Virtual University (MVU).

Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Response is comprehensive, rigorous	Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
Lacks description of how the project will support the successful development and implementation of a nontraditional concept of algebra instruction.	Provides description of how the project will support the successful development and implementation of a nontraditional concept of algebra instruction.	In addition to a thorough project description, the proposal explains how it intends to address students who traditionally struggled in mathematics.
Does not include blended professional development in design.	Includes blended professional development in design.	Uses educational technology to engage educators statewide in active, sustained learning that strongly impacts student achievement with Algebra I content.
Does not explain the relationship of the project with MMSCN and MVU.	Names MMSCN and MVU as partners, but provides limited explanation of how the relationship would benefit Michigan by working with MMSCN and MVU.	Explains how MMSCN and MVU each play critical roles in implementing the project's theory of action.

**B.3 Project Design: Algebra for All (Continued)**

**20 Points** *Pre-Assessment and Evaluation:* Describe how the program will use pre-program evaluation and post-program evaluation to guide implementation and measure progress toward the goal of improving Algebra I instruction for ALL Michigan students.

<b>Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor</b>	<b>Response is comprehensive, rigorous</b>	<b>Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous</b>
Lacks depth in its application of evaluation to guide implementation.	Includes pre- and post-program evaluation components.	Pre- and post-program evaluations figure prominently into the implementation plan.

## B.4 Project Design: eLearning Consortium

**\*\*\*THIS RUBRIC APPLIES TO THOSE APPLICATIONS SEEKING FUNDING UNDER THE "eLEARNING CONSORTIUM" CATEGORY.\*\*\***

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**.

**30 points** *Scholarships*: Describe how the eLearning Consortium, in partnership with Michigan Virtual University (MVU), will use scholarships—either partial or full—to increase the number of enrollments and successful, online course completions at the Michigan Virtual School (MVS), especially by at-risk students and economically and/or academically disadvantaged students.

Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Response is comprehensive, rigorous	Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
Lacks specifics on how scholarships will advance enrollments and successful course completions at MVS. No mention of impact to at-risk, economically disadvantaged, and/or academically disadvantaged students.	Discusses the types of scholarships used to advance enrollments and successful course completions at MVS. Includes discussion of how scholarships would target at-risk, economically disadvantaged, and/or academically disadvantaged student populations.	Provides specifics on number and type of scholarships; sets targets for enrollments and successful course completions at MVS. Provides strategies for targeting at-risk, economically disadvantaged, and/or academically disadvantaged student populations.

**20 points** *Professional Development*: Describe how the eLearning Consortium will use the 25 percent professional development requirement of all Title IID grants to increase the capacity of MVS to deliver high quality, online instruction and increase the capacity of schools to provide quality mentoring for online students.

Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Response is comprehensive, rigorous	Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
Little description of the professional development activities provided through the grant.	Describes the activities funded by the grant to increase the capacity of MVS to deliver high quality, online courses.	In addition to thorough descriptions, plans are included with specifics on the numbers and types of new and existing online teachers that will be prepared.
	Describes the activities funded by the grant to increase the capacity of schools to provide high quality online mentoring.	In addition to thorough descriptions, plans are included with specifics on the numbers and locales of mentor trainings.

**B.5 Project Design: Michigan Learns Online**

**\*\*\*THIS RUBRIC APPLIES TO THOSE APPLICATIONS SEEKING FUNDING UNDER THE "MICHIGAN LEARNS ONLINE" CATEGORY OF THIS GRANT PROGRAM.\*\*\***

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**.

**30 points** Develop additional options for e-learning and/or virtual learning to aid Michigan schools toward achieving the Michigan Merit Curriculum (MMC) and provide professional development for teachers, increasing their capacity to deliver blended instruction with the goal of having at least one teacher in every high school trained by the end of the school year 2010-2011. The professional development model should include a "train the trainer" model utilizing intermediate school districts (ISDs). Proposal will include continued collaboration with the Regional Educational Media Centers of Michigan (REMCAM) on the Michigan Learns Online Portal (MLO Portal).

<b>Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor</b>	<b>Response is comprehensive, rigorous</b>	<b>Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous</b>
Does not include options for e-learning and/or virtual learning to aid Michigan schools toward achieving the MMC.	Included in the e-learning options are modularized content that is aligned to the High School Content Expectations (HSCEs) that comprise the MMC.	Included in the e-learning options are modularized content that is aligned to the HSCEs on multiple learning management platforms (e.g., Blackboard and Moodle).
Does not explain professional development program for teachers and how it increases their capacity to deliver blended instruction.	Explains professional development program for teachers and how it increases their capacity to deliver blended instruction.	Included in the explanation are action steps to achieve the goal of having at least one teacher in every high school trained by the end of the 2010-2011 school year.
Does not include a "train the trainer" model utilizing ISDs.	Professional development includes a "train the trainer" model utilizing ISDs.	In addition to describing a "train the trainer" model, the proposal defines a training schedule involving ISDs.
Continued collaboration with REMCAM on the Michigan Learns Online Portal (MLO Portal) is not mentioned.	Outlines collaboration with REMCAM on the MLO Portal.	Provides detailed description of the role REMCAM will play in rolling out the MLO Portal.

**B.5 Project Design: Michigan Learns Online (Continued)**

**20 Points** ***MORE Portal Development and Leadership:*** Describe how the project will continue to support and lead the Michigan Online Resources for Educators (MORE) development program.

<b>Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor</b>	<b>Response is comprehensive, rigorous</b>	<b>Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous</b>
Lacks description around MORE activities.	Provides adequate description around MORE activities.	In addition to adequately describing activities, proposal lists content development objectives and lays out a plan for state and national leadership in the area of free online resources for Michigan educators.

**10 Points** ***Online Learning Collaboration:*** Describe how the project will support schools around Michigan in adopting online learning initiatives.

<b>Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor</b>	<b>Response is comprehensive, rigorous</b>	<b>Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous</b>
Lacks description about creating meaningful opportunities.	Provides description about meaningful opportunities that fosters the adoption of online programs.	In addition the describing the activities and opportunities facilitated by the project, the proposal lays out goals and objectives for these activities.

**B.6 Project Design: MI Champions: 21st Century Learning Classroom by Classroom**

**\*\*\*THIS RUBRIC APPLIES TO THOSE APPLICATIONS SEEKING FUNDING UNDER THE "MI CHAMPIONS: 21<sup>st</sup> CENTURY LEARNING CLASSROOM BY CLASSROOM" CATEGORY.\*\*\***

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**.

**20 points** *Technology Integration Professional Development:* Describe how the proposed project will assist teachers in enhancing their technology skills, in particular, their ability to integrate technology into everyday classroom instruction. Include a discussion of how the program is structured to provide participating teachers with the ability to create 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Environments that help ALL students learn through advanced teaching and learning strategies, including principles of Universal Design for Learning. Explain how teachers will be selected to participate.

Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Response is comprehensive, rigorous	Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
Limited description of how the project will enhance teacher technology skills.	Adequately describes the professional development program and the technology skills teachers will receive.	In addition to an adequate description of activities, provides demonstrated impact based on evaluations of previous programs.
Lacks definition around program structure.	Provides definition around program structure.	Explains how program structure uses UDL concepts to support learning by teachers and how teachers are provided with training on UDL principles to assist ALL students in learning.
Insufficient explanation on how teachers are selected to participate.	Explains the participant teacher selection process.	Explanation includes a statewide process that uses an objective scoring rubric to determine participants, giving points to teachers serving in economically and/or academically disadvantaged schools. Takes into account geographic representation.

**B.6 Project Design: MI Champions (Continued)**

**15 points** *Project Based Learning and Leadership (PBL):* Describe how the proposed project will assist teachers in developing instructional capabilities in project-based learning enhanced with technology and become leaders in their buildings by participating in the PBL portion of the grant. Include a discussion of how the program is structured to provide participating teachers with the ability to create 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Environments that help ALL students learn through advanced teaching and learning strategies, including principles of Universal Design for Learning. Explain how teachers will be selected to participate.

<b>Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor</b>	<b>Response is comprehensive, rigorous</b>	<b>Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous</b>
Limited description of how the project will assist teachers in developing project based learning and leadership capabilities.	Adequately describes how the project will assist teachers in developing project based learning and leadership capabilities.	In addition to an adequate description of activities, provides demonstrated impact based on evaluations of previous programs.
Lacks definition around program structure.	Provides definition around program structure.	Explains how program structure uses UDL concepts to support learning by teachers and how teachers are provided with training on UDL principles to assist ALL students in learning.
Limited explanation on how teachers are selected to participate.	Explains the participant teacher selection process.	Explanation includes a statewide, objective process to determine participants, takes into account economically and academically disadvantaged schools, and geographic representation.

**B.6 Project Design: MI Champions (Continued)**

**10 Points** *iTunes U Mobile Media Development and Leadership:* Describe how the project will continue to support and lead Michigan’s iTunes U mobile media development program known as “MI Learning on iTunes U.”

Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Response is comprehensive, rigorous	Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
Lacks description around iTunes U activities.	Provides adequate description around iTunes U activities.	In addition to adequately describing activities, proposal lists content development objectives and defines a plan for state and national leadership in the area of mobile content development.

**5 Points** *Educational Technology Collaboration:* Describe how the project will provide opportunities for educational technology leaders from around Michigan to communicate and collaborate on important technology-infused teaching and learning issues.

Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Response is comprehensive, rigorous	Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
Lacks description about creating meaningful opportunities.	Provides description about meaningful opportunities.	In addition to describing the activities and opportunities facilitated by the project, the proposal sets forth goals and objectives for these activities.

**C. Deployment and Sustainability**

**\*\*\*THIS RUBRIC APPLIES TO ALL APPLICATIONS SEEKING FUNDING.\*\*\***

Describe the applicant's model of deployment, scalability, and financial sustainability for the project during the proposed grant period and extending three years past the end of grant funding. The applicant's current level of technology usage and funding programs will be considered. This section of the proposal is worth a maximum of **15 points**.

<b>Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor</b>	<b>Response is comprehensive, rigorous</b>	<b>Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous</b>
The proposal includes little explanation of how the applicant will deploy the project.	The proposal provides an explanation of applicant will deploy the project.	Provides a detailed explanation of deployment including a timeline with a discussion of roll out and adoption strategies.
The proposal includes little explanation of how the applicant will scale the project after the initial deployment.	The proposal includes explanation of how the applicant will scale the project after the initial deployment.	Explanation includes a vision for scaling the project beyond the initial implementation and action steps for achieving the vision.
The applicant doesn't propose effective ways of covering the costs associated with sustaining the project once the grant is complete.	The applicant proposes effective ways of covering the costs associated with sustaining the project once the grant is complete.	The applicant provides examples of how its operating budget will support, sustain, and extend the project once the grant is complete.

**D. Project Leadership**

**\*\*\*THIS RUBRIC APPLIES TO ALL APPLICATIONS SEEKING FUNDING.\*\*\***

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**.

<b>Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor</b>	<b>Response is comprehensive, rigorous</b>	<b>Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous</b>
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 applicant organization(s).
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 applicant organization(s) playing key roles. The proposal lays out a clear plan for providing leadership and oversight necessary to complete project goals.

**E. Program Evaluation**

***\*\*\*THIS RUBRIC APPLIES TO ALL APPLICATIONS SEEKING FUNDING EXCEPT FOR CATEGORY 1: APPLICATIONS (STUDENT-CENTERED, 21<sup>st</sup> CENTURY LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS.) CATEGORY 1 GRANTS WILL BE EVALUATED COMMONLY. TO RECEIVE POINTS FOR EVALUATION, ALL CATEGORY 1 APPLICANTS MUST INCLUDE A LETTER AGREEING TO PARTICIPATE IN AND FUND THE COMMON EVALUATION. (THE COMMON EVALUATION WILL NOT AMOUNT TO MORE THAN 10 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET.)***

Provide a description of the evaluation design, including the specific method and measurement that will be used. Describe how the program will use program evaluation to guide implementation and measure progress toward the project goals. This section of the proposal is worth a maximum of **5 points**.

<b>Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor</b>	<b>Response is comprehensive, rigorous</b>	<b>Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous</b>
Lacks depth in its application of evaluation to guide implementation.	Includes description of program evaluation components.	Program evaluation elements are varied and figure prominently into the implementation plan.

### 3. Project Budget

**\*\*\*THIS RUBRIC APPLIES TO ALL APPLICATIONS SEEKING FUNDING.\*\*\***

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**.

<b>Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor</b>	<b>Response is comprehensive, rigorous</b>	<b>Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous</b>
The project budget provides little detail and/or more than 50 percent of the budget is consumed by applicant salaries.	The project budget provides sufficient detail and expenditures are itemized.	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 budget does not include a set-aside for collaborative work.*		The budget includes a set-aside of 10 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.

\* Applies only to applications for Category 1 (Student-Centered, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Environments).

## **INFORMATION CONCERNING OTHER REQUIREMENTS**

### **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 regulation limits charging indirect rates on contracted services to the first \$25,000 of each contract.

### **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.

### **Final Reporting:**

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.

### **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.