

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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

**2010-2011 Title IID - 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 student achievement by extending the use of instructional data systems through the Regional Data Initiatives. Funding for this program has been awarded to the MDE by the U.S. Department of Education under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part D program of 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, **CFDA Number 84.318**. This competitive grant will be known as the Regional Data Initiatives continuation grant.

PURPOSE OF THE GRANT:

The purpose of the grant program is to continue providing Michigan teachers with real-time access to student data at the classroom level in order to inform instructional decisions. The MDE is seeking proposals on how to best use the programs that are currently in place at several Intermediate School Districts (ISDs). The goal continues to be 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 use of data to inform instruction, particularly in addressing school improvement planning, third grade literacy, career-and-college readiness, and high school dropout prevention. Professional development on how to individualize instruction by applying principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) should also be considered.

The MDE anticipates awarding eight grants to ISDs for the purpose of leading consortia of other ISDs and their constituent Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) and Public School Academies (PSAs) in the extension 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.

PROJECT DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS:

The eight 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) to develop a comprehensive plan form implementing the following design considerations:

- Interfacing Regional Data Initiatives with the Michigan Education Data Portal (MEDP) 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.
- Defining a strategy to assist the districts and schools within the consortia in integrating the Regional Data Initiatives into 2011 and 2012 School Improvement Plans and District Improvement Plans.
- Developing a common set of reports and tools to assist schools in determining third grade reading readiness which can be used in pre-school, kindergarten, first, second, and third grades utilizing local assessments tied to third grade reading proficiency determined by the Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP).
- Developing a common set of data supported reports and tools to assist schools in determining career and college readiness in eighth, ninth, tenth, and eleventh grades using appropriate and valid assessments tied to proficiency on the Michigan Merit Examination (MME).
- Developing a common set of data supported reports to assist schools in identifying those students most at risk of dropping out that will help schools in addressing and lowering dropout rates based on the early warning sign research (<http://www.betterhighschools.org/topics/DropoutWarningSigns.asp>).
- Developing the ability to move student data from one school district to another when the student relocates within a given consortium.
- 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 eighth 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 2010-11 found at:

http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/MDE-P2_FS_11_T1aAllocListRegOrig_337062_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.

and

Received a Regional Data Initiatives, Title IID competitive grant through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009.

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.

GRANT RANGE:

The MDE anticipates funding eight projects in the amount of \$70,000 to \$650,000 each with an estimated total award of \$1,940,004.00.

Collaborative Work / Professional Learning Community

The MDE anticipates awarding eight 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 MEDP project, and other stakeholders. The PLC funds will be awarded to one of the eight awardees in partnership with MAISA who will facilitate the consortia's collaboration, sharing resources, and accomplishing of a common evaluation across all projects.

TOTAL FUNDS:

Approximately \$1.94 million of total funding is available.

MICHIGAN EDUCATION DATA PORTAL:

The State of Michigan has invested significantly in the MEDP, formerly known as Data for Student Success (D4SS), 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 MEDP and extending the great work that has been done through MEDP within the context of local initiatives.

The Regional Data Initiatives will interface with MEDP 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 schools.

DISTRICT ASSURANCES:

The assurances of participation provided by LEAs under round one of the Regional Data Initiatives program remain in place for this round of funding. These assurances included:

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 the 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),
8. Use of a common set of assessment items used in determining 8th grade technological literacy and reported assessment results in the MEGS.

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, the MDE establishes that inaccurate or false information was provided in the application, the grant may be rescinded.

OPENING AND CLOSING DATES AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS:

The MDE has released the general instructions, scoring rubric, and supporting information for the Regional Data Initiatives continuation grant on June 24, 2011 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 5:00 pm, June 24, 2011, and 11:59 pm, Thursday, July 21, 2011. **The final submission deadline is 11:59 pm, Thursday, July 21, 2011.**

PROCESS FOR THE GRANT COMPETITION:

Eligible partnerships of ISDs will compete for the 2010-2011 EETT program grants through established procedures utilized by the 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:

June 17, 2011	Grant Program Announcement
July 3, 2011	Grant Program "live" in MEGS
July 21, 2011	Applications due
August 16, 2011	Recommendations presented to the Superintendent of Public Instruction; awards issued

September 30, 2012	Projects to be completed; all funds expended
October 31, 2012	Final Performance Report due
November 30, 2012	Final Expenditure Report due

All dates are subject to change.

REJECTION OF PROPOSALS:

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

REVIEW PROCESS:

The MDE utilizes a review panel when scoring its competitive grants. For this grant program, review teams will be composed of people both within the MDE and outside the 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 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 complete a report provided by the MDE of the project to include measurable outcomes, professional development, and financial activities based on the grantee's approved application.

GRANT ABSTRACT:

On one separate, double-spaced 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 12-page grant narrative should be written in the sequence of the rubric.

A. Identification of the Need

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 **5 points**.

Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Response is comprehensive, rigorous	Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
The proposal provides a thorough description of participating ISDs, but lacks basic description of how the project will impact high poverty/needs students.	The proposal provides a thorough description of participating ISDs. Also includes explanation of how project will impact high poverty/needs students.	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 considerations of the General Instructions. The following rubric applies to all five design considerations. (Address the five design considerations in separate sections for the benefit of grant reviewers.) This section of the proposal is worth a maximum of **45 points**.

Response is marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Response is comprehensive, rigorous	Response is exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
The proposal failed to adequately address the design criteria.	The proposal provides an adequate description of the design criteria.	The proposal provides a thorough description of the design criteria and includes mock-up and sample reports.

10 points *Supporting School Improvement:* Define a strategy to assist the districts and schools within the consortia in integrating the Regional Data Initiative into 2011 and 2012 School Improvement Plans and District Improvement Plans.

10 points *3rd Grade Reading Readiness:* Describe the common set of reports and tools to assist schools in determining 3rd grade reading readiness that can be used in pre-school, kindergarten, first, second, and third grades using local assessments tied to 3rd grade reading proficiency determined by the MEAP.

10 points *Career and College Readiness:* Describe the common set of data supported reports and tools to assist schools in determining career and college readiness in eighth, ninth, tenth, and eleventh grades using appropriate and valid assessments tied to proficiency on the MME.

10 points *Dropout Prevention:* Develop a common set of data supported reports to assist schools in identifying those students most at risk of dropping out that will help schools in addressing and lowering dropout rates based on the early warning sign research (<http://www.betterhighschools.org/topics/DropoutWarningSigns.asp>).

5 points *Data Transport:* describe how the consortium will develop the ability to move student data from one school district to another when the student relocates within a given consortium.

B. Project Design (Continued)

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 UDL to differentiate and individualize instruction. This section of the proposal is worth a maximum of **20 points**.

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.	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.
The proposal does not address how the consortium is going to provide professional development for district and building level leadership.	The proposal includes district and building level leadership in professional development design, but does not specify the type of professional development these audiences would receive.	The proposal includes specific description on how every district and building level administrator will receive professional development by September 30, 2012 and provides a thorough description on how the professional development will include using data in school improvement, third grade reading readiness, career-and-college readiness, dropout prevention, and data transport.

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 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 **10 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 grant is complete.	The applicant does propose ways of covering the costs associated with sustaining the project once the 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 to other key personnel.
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.

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. This section of the proposal is worth a maximum of **10 points**.

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 salaries.	-----	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 proposal does not include a timeline for expenditures.	-----	The proposal includes a detailed timeline for expenditures.

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 September 30, 2012. A portion of the awarded funds must be spent by September 30, 2011. MDE will clarify this amount upon award notification.

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 **12 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 six (6) 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.