



STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
LANSING

RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

BRIAN J. WHISTON  
STATE SUPERINTENDENT

**October 6, 2016**

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Institutions of Higher Education

FROM: Leah C. Breen, Director  
Office of Professional Preparation Services

SUBJECT: 2016-2017 Title II, Part A(3)  
Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program

For 2016-2017, the Michigan Department of Education is authorized to award approximately \$2.2 million for the Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program.

The focus of this request for applications is on the provision of research-based professional learning opportunities to emerging teachers and their mentors, which will result in increased learning for all students. These grants are available to teacher education departments of Michigan's approved educator preparation institutions, in partnership with their divisions of arts and sciences and high-needs local education agencies (LEAs). Please pay special attention to the priorities and funding criteria in the application package.

The purpose of these grants is to support partnerships in the provision of professional learning opportunities needed to achieve the goal of having properly certified, endorsed and highly qualified teachers in all classrooms with deep knowledge of the content they are assigned to teach and instructional delivery skills to meet learning needs of all students.

Guidelines and instructions for the 2016-2017 Title II, Part A(3) funding cycle are located under *Professional Learning Grants/2016-2017 Title II, Part A(3), Improving Teacher Quality* at:

[http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-5683\\_5703-137803--,00.html](http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-5683_5703-137803--,00.html)

**A technical assistance session will be held Thursday, October 20, 2016, 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. in the MSBO/MASA Board Room of the MELG Building, 1001 Centennial Way in Lansing, Michigan.**

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

JOHN C. AUSTIN – PRESIDENT • CASANDRA E. ULBRICH – VICE PRESIDENT  
MICHELLE FECTEAU – SECRETARY • PAMELA PUGH – TREASURER  
LUPE RAMOS-MONTIGNY – NASBE DELEGATE • KATHLEEN N. STRAUS  
EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER • RICHARD ZEILE

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909  
www.michigan.gov/mde • 517-373-3324

**Participation in this session is highly recommended if you are considering applying for these funds, as criteria may need explanation. Please fax the attached form to register. (Note registration deadline.)**

Deadline for Submitting Intent to Apply Letter: **October 31, 2016, 11:59 p.m.**

Deadline for Submitting Grant Application: **December 6, 2016, 11:59 p.m.**

Estimated Available Funds: **\$2.2 million**

Estimated Range of Awards: **Up to \$500,000**

Estimated Number of Awards: **4-5**

Project Period: **Date of official approval is anticipated to be January, 2017. Project period runs from February, 2017 through September, 2018.**

Budget Period: **Up to 20 months**

If you have questions regarding this information or other aspects of this grant program, please contact Donna L. Hamilton, Education Consultant, Professional Preparation and Learning Unit, at [HamiltonD3@michigan.gov](mailto:HamiltonD3@michigan.gov) or 517-241-4546, or Sarah-Kate LaVan, Consultant Manager, Professional Preparation and Learning Unit, at [LavanS@michigan.gov](mailto:LavanS@michigan.gov) or 517-335-0874.

## MICHIGAN STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

### Criteria for Title II, Part A(3):

#### Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program

The State Board of Education (SBE) adopted the Goals for Developing Michigan into a Top 10 Education State in 10 Years in December 2015. The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) engaged multiple groups of educators and stakeholders to develop targeted strategies to enact the Top 10 in 10 Guiding Principles and Goals. The MDE is committed to implementing projects that are aligned with the strategies and goals adopted by the SBE. Teacher residency programs that both train emerging teachers and build the capacity of existing teachers show promise of meeting Strategic Goal 3, "Develop, support, and sustain a high-quality prepared, and collaborative education workforce."

#### **BACKGROUND/PURPOSE OF GRANT**

Competitive

Formula

New

Continuation

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 authorized a teacher and principal professional development competitive grants program as defined within Title II, Part A(3), of the legislation. The competitive grants program supports the formation of partnerships between high-needs Local Educational Agencies (LEAs), as defined in Section 2101A(3) of the NCLB Act, colleges or departments of teacher education, and colleges or departments of arts and sciences. The program is intended to provide grant awards to support professional development in the core academic subjects for both emerging and mentor teachers. It is the intent of this program to have effective teachers in every classroom who have both a deep knowledge of the content that he/she is assigned to teach as well as strong pedagogical skills in the core content area/s.

#### **TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE**

There is approximately \$2.2 million available to fund competitive grant awards to support research-based professional learning opportunities to emerging teachers and their mentors. A portion of these funds (a minimum of \$400,000) will be targeted for projects that involve small or rural schools that meet the high poverty criteria. The Office of Professional Preparation Services proposes to manage a competitive process for the awarding of grants from the available funds.

#### **LEGISLATION**

President Bush signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 - No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 - into law on January 8, 2002.

The legislation focuses on improving student achievement for all students, especially children in the nation's most disadvantaged schools and communities. Title II, Part A(3), authorizes the Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program for establishing partnerships between high-needs LEAs, colleges or departments of teacher education, and colleges or departments of arts and sciences to provide professional development to teachers, paraprofessionals, and principals.

## **RATIONALE FOR CRITERIA/STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION PRIORITIES**

The Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program further assists the SBE with implementing the Goals for Developing Michigan into a Top 10 Education State in 10 Years by prioritizing services to high needs schools. The program addresses the policy recommendations for ensuring effective educators through prioritizing applicants that propose partnerships between high-needs LEAs and Educator Preparation Institutions (EPIs).

### **CRITERIA**

Defined in Legislation    Defined in Department's Grant    Proposed by Staff

Consistent with the priorities and criteria announced for selection of grant recipients (including strategies outlined in the Top Ten in Ten Goals), the MDE must make awards of Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Program funds to support the following types of partnership activities to enhance student achievement in participating high-needs LEAs:

1. Professional development activities in core academic subjects to ensure that:
  - a. Teachers and highly qualified paraprofessionals (and principals, when appropriate) have subject matter knowledge in the academic subjects that the teachers teach (including knowledge of how to use computers and other technology to enhance student learning), and
  - b. Principals have the instructional leadership skills to help them work more effectively with teachers to help students master core academic subjects consistent with the recommendations of the SBE Task Force on Elevating Educational Leadership.
2. Development and provision of assistance to LEAs and to their teachers, highly qualified paraprofessionals, or school principals, in providing sustained, high-quality professional development activities that:
  - a. Ensure that participants can use challenging state academic content standards, student academic achievement standards, and state assessments, to improve instructional practices and student academic achievement;
  - b. Include intensive programs designed to prepare individuals to provide instruction related to the professional learning described in the preceding paragraph to others in their schools; and
  - c. Include activities of partnerships between one or more LEA, one or more of the LEA's schools, and one or more Institution of Higher Education for the purpose of improving teaching and learning at low-performing schools.

Eligibility is limited to partnerships comprised at a minimum of (1) an approved Michigan public or private EPI; (2) a division/school of arts and sciences from that EPI; and (3) a high-needs LEA, or group of high-needs LEAs.

A high-needs LEA is defined as one:

1. That serves not fewer than 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line; **OR**
2. For which not less than 20 percent of the children served by the agency are from families with incomes below the poverty line; **AND**
3. For which there is a high percentage of teachers not teaching in the academic subjects or grade levels that the teachers were trained to teach; **OR**
4. For which there is a high percentage of teachers with emergency, provisional, or temporary certification or licensing. (In Michigan, such teachers hold Full-year Basic Substitute Permits, Full-year Shortage Substitute Permits and Expert Substitute Permits.)

The Center for Educational Performance and Information has generated a list of eligible LEA partners for consideration in this grant program. Only LEAs from this list can be included in the partnership. The list can be found at:

[http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Eligible\\_LEA\\_Partners\\_347277\\_7.xls](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Eligible_LEA_Partners_347277_7.xls).

An eligible partnership also may include another LEA (public charter school, elementary or secondary school), nonpublic school, Educational Service Agency (ESA), nonprofit educational organization, another EPI, school of arts and sciences within that EPI, the division of that EPI that prepares teachers and principals, nonprofit cultural organization (NPO), an entity carrying out a pre-kindergarten program, a teacher organization, principal organization, or business.

An NPO for purposes of this application is one that has, as its primary purpose, the improvement of student learning in mathematics, science, reading, or other core academic subjects, and can document the provision of effective teacher training programs.

### **ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

**All applications for a grant award must be made by eligible Educator Preparation Institutions.** *(An educator preparation institution which has been designated as "At-Risk" or "Low-Performing" may not be eligible to apply for this grant, depending on its Corrective Action Plan.)*

### **OFFICE ADMINISTERING GRANT**

Office of Professional Preparation Services

### **PROGRAM ADMINISTERING GRANT**

Professional Preparation and Learning Unit

## **PROGRAM CONTACT**

Donna L. Hamilton at 517-241-4546, [HamiltonD3@michigan.gov](mailto:HamiltonD3@michigan.gov) or Sarah-Kate LaVan at 517-335-0874, [LavanS@michigan.gov](mailto:LavanS@michigan.gov).

## **GRANT CATEGORIES**

There are two categories for this grant program. Applications are expected to address how a residency-based program will be provided on-site at partner LEA/s, with ongoing, sustained professional development, support, mentoring and/or coaching for emerging teachers in the identified categories. Emerging teachers are teachers holding Full-year Basic Substitute Permits, Full-year Shortage Substitute Permits, and Expert Substitute Permits and highly qualified paraprofessionals enrolled in teacher preparation programs.

**Funding, up to \$500,000, will be awarded in the following grant categories:**

- 1. Partnerships for residency-based professional learning opportunities in mathematics, literacy, science and/or social studies at the elementary level in which the project:**
  - a. Provides residency-based, on-site professional development activities that address Michigan's content expectations and aligned instructional delivery skills to emerging teachers, their mentors and/or coaches.
  - b. Develops strong cadres of mentor teachers and coaches, to ensure they strengthen their content and instructional skills as well as skills in conducting observations, providing feedback, modeling, supporting and guiding the development of emerging teachers in applying such skills.
- 2. Partnerships for residency-based professional learning opportunities in mathematics, literacy, science or social studies at the secondary level in which the project:**
  - a. Provides residency-based, on-site professional development activities that address Michigan's content expectations and aligned instructional delivery skills to emerging teachers, their mentors and/or coaches.
  - b. Develops strong cadres of mentor teachers and coaches, to ensure they strengthen their content and instructional skills as well as skills in conducting observations, providing feedback, modeling, supporting and guiding the development of emerging teachers in applying such skills.

## **DISTRIBUTION OF GRANT FUNDS**

An annual allocation of approximately \$2.2 million for competitive grants has been awarded to the State of Michigan. Grant awards will be made for up to \$500,000 to fund projects sustained over 20 months.

In compliance with federal guidelines, 100 percent of the total grant allocation will be awarded for residency programs in the core academic subjects.

**APPLICATION INFORMATION**  
**2016-2017 Cycle of the NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT, TITLE II, Part A(3)**  
**IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY COMPETITIVE GRANTS PROGRAM**

**TITLE II OF P.L. 107-110**  
**State Grants to Strengthen Skills of Teachers and Instruction in the Core**  
**Academic Curriculum**  
**FEDERAL CFDA Number 84.367B**

**PART I - GENERAL INFORMATION AND APPLICATION GUIDELINES**

The enclosed materials provide application information to enable approved public and private EPIs to participate in the Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program. An approved EPI must apply for funding on behalf of a proposed partnership, which involves a high-needs LEA, and a college/department of arts and sciences. The primary purpose of the program is to support residency-based programs for emerging teachers by building mentor and/or coaching capacity within a high needs LEAs. Emerging teachers are teachers holding Full-year Basic Substitute Permits, Full-year Shortage Substitute Permits, and Expert Substitute Permits and Highly Qualified Paraprofessionals enrolled in teacher preparation programs. A second purpose of the program is to identify successful strategies for building partnerships between higher education and local LEAs to provide high-quality professional development to emerging and mentor teachers.

The MDE anticipates having approximately \$2.2 million available for grants to be awarded by the SBE under the NCLB, Title II, Part A(3) Competitive Grant Program.

Consistent with the priorities and criteria it has announced for selection of grant recipients, the MDE must make awards of Improving Teacher Quality State Grant funds to support residency programs to enhance emerging teacher and mentor developments, as well as student achievement.

**A. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

Any one of the Michigan universities approved by the SBE to prepare teachers and principals is eligible to form a partnership comprised of one or more high-needs LEAs. *(An EPI which has been designated as "At-Risk" or "Low-Performing" may not be eligible to apply, depending on its Corrective Action Plan.)*

Eligibility is limited to partnerships comprised at a minimum of (1) an approved Michigan public or private EPI; (2) a division/school of arts and sciences from that EPI; and (3) a high-needs LEA, or group of high-needs LEAs (as defined on page 4).

A list of approved educator preparation institutions and their approved content programs is located at: <https://mdoe.state.mi.us/proprep/>.

A list of eligible LEAs is located at:  
[http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Eligible\\_LEA\\_Partners\\_347277\\_7.xls](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Eligible_LEA_Partners_347277_7.xls).

See the October 5, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for Title II, Part A on the United States Department of Education's website at:

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/guidance.pdf>.

## **B. APPLICATION PROCEDURES**

Institutions interested in applying for an Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grant in this cycle must submit a letter indicating an intent to apply. A letter of intent must be submitted electronically by 11:59 p.m. on October 31, 2016 to [Educatorprograms@michigan.gov](mailto:Educatorprograms@michigan.gov). This letter should be only 1-2 pages, and provide a brief description of the proposed residency program, academic content to be addressed, a list of anticipated LEA partners, the number of expected participants, an estimate of the grant amount that will be requested, and contact information for a representative of the applicant for follow-up questions. Only applicants who have provided an Intent to Apply letter will be considered in the review process.

Complete applications must be submitted by 11:59 p.m. on December 6, 2016 to [EducatorPrograms@michigan.gov](mailto:EducatorPrograms@michigan.gov). It is anticipated that award letters will be issued in January, 2017. Although no funds may be expended until official award notices are received, colleges and universities are encouraged to use this time to continue to build partnerships with K-12 partners for final planning and recruitment of participants.

## **C. REQUIRED COMPONENTS**

In order to justify the funding for the residency program being proposed, applications must meet all criteria outlined in Part II of this application.

## **D. SELECTION OF AWARD RECIPIENTS**

Grants will be awarded through a competitive review process. The review and scoring of each application will be based on criteria that support residency-based, on-site professional development activities that address Michigan's content expectations and aligned instructional delivery skills to emerging teachers, their mentors and/or coaches.

Grant applications will be reviewed using external and internal panels of experts. Because the number and type of applications received usually exceeds the level of available funding, the review panels will be used to evaluate all eligible applications submitted.

The external review process is intended to identify the most promising applications for which funding should be considered. (See Scoring Rubric at the end of this document.)

The internal review panel includes MDE consultants, with the intent of assuring attention to state content standards and SBE policies, as well as coordinating funding and other initiatives to better meet the teaching and learning needs of educators across the state.

The number of grants recommended for awards will be influenced, among other factors, by availability of funds, the quality of proposals submitted, geographical distribution, and the size of the final budget negotiated for each project.

## **E. REPORTS**

The awardee is expected to submit an interim report that addresses progress toward program goals and plans for program implementation in 2017-2018.

The awardee is expected to submit a final narrative report that addresses all aspects of the proposed evaluation plan in the application. The awardee also is expected to submit supporting data/evidence related to the analysis of the program and its effects.

The awardee must submit a final expenditure report for a project funded under this grant that reflects the budget submitted with this application and must include, at a minimum, the following information:

- The amount of funds under the grant or subcontract;
- How the grantee or subcontract used the funds;
- The total cost of project activities;
- The share of the cost provided from other sources; and
- Other records to facilitate an effective audit.

## **F. STATE OF MICHIGAN MONITORING VISITS**

The MDE is required to monitor a cross section of the grant projects. Under ordinary circumstances, these monitoring visits are not conducted for the purpose of rescinding grants or penalizing grant recipients for information not collected. They occur for the purpose of collecting project information to ensure the proper implementation of the Title IIA(3) Competitive Grant Program.

University staff must maintain and make available, in the event of a monitoring visit, evidence to support the complete implementation of the proposed project including the data referenced in Section E of Part II.

## **G. WHERE TO OBTAIN HELP**

Instructions contained in these materials are issued by the MDE, which is the sole point of contact for this program. Questions regarding proposals should be directed to the Office of Professional Preparation Services, Michigan Department of Education, P.O. Box 30008, Lansing, Michigan 48909 to either Donna L. Hamilton, by telephone at (517) 241-4546, or by e-mail at [HamiltonD3@michigan.gov](mailto:HamiltonD3@michigan.gov), or to Sarah-Kate LaVan, by telephone (517-335-0874), or email at [LavanS@michigan.gov](mailto:LavanS@michigan.gov). Questions also can be raised at the Technical Assistance session to be held on October 20, 2016.

## **PART II – REVIEW CRITERIA**

### **Abstract**

The Abstract of the Proposal should provide an overview of the proposed residency program including the partnership, the residency model, and the needs of the district. The abstract should focus on the delivery model(s) needed to ensure the residency model will develop a strong cadre of coaches and/or mentor teachers who will support emerging teachers in effective instruction in the following content areas; mathematics, literacy, social studies or science at the elementary or secondary levels. Applicants must address how the plan will meet specific needs of the district(s), as determined by the data used to inform the school or district improvement plan.

All applications will be evaluated on the basis of the criteria described hereafter. The narrative portion of applications should address the criteria. Applications must address all criteria. The maximum possible number of points is 126. The value assigned for each section is as follows:

#### **A. DEMONSTRATION OF NEED (15 points)**

The application must describe how the proposed program will meet the needs of the district(s) and improve the capacity of emerging and mentor teachers to deliver instruction in the content areas specified above and as identified by the district needs assessment and in alignment with Michigan's K-12 content standards.

All applications must address all criteria. Each application will be reviewed to determine the extent to which the following items are described:

1. Evidence that the proposed residency program addresses the needs of the district/s to improve the capacity of emerging teachers and their mentors to deliver instruction in core content areas;
2. A description of how the proposed residency program aligns with the identified goal/s of the building or district improvement plan;
3. Evidence that the proposed residency program addresses educators' needs for subject matter and pedagogical content (related to specific Michigan content standards), as shown in results from a needs assessment survey. Michigan's content standards can be found at: <http://www.michigan.gov/academicstandards>;
4. Evidence that the proposed residency program is informed by results from reviewing aggregate student data in the specified content area and grade levels from the partner LEAs; and
5. A description of actions taken to involve private non-public schools within the geographic region of the LEA partner(s) in identifying their needs and planning the project.

## **B. PLANNING PROCESS (15 points)**

Proposals must describe the planning process used by the partnership.

All applications must address all criteria. Each application will be reviewed to determine the extent to which the following items are described:

1. A description of the collaborative activities of the partnership, including evidence of how all parties were involved in planning and developing the proposed residency program;
2. A description of the processes in place to support and build capacity in residency placement sites;
3. A description of target population of emerging and mentor teachers, and the anticipated number to be included in the program (minimum of 30 expected);
4. Strategies for recruiting members of the identified target population of emerging teachers into the proposed residency program; and
5. Processes and criteria for identifying and selecting emerging teachers;

## **C. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (18 points)**

Applications should demonstrate that the proposed residency program exemplifies research-based features of quality teacher development and describe how the proposed program will be implemented.

All applications must address all criteria. Each application will be reviewed to determine the extent to which the following items are described:

1. An overview of the research basis for key program features of the proposed residency program;
2. The processes and criteria for selecting and supporting strong mentor teachers for the content areas identified;
3. The processes for supporting, assessing and evaluating emerging teachers;
4. Aligned coursework and ongoing adult learning experiences that build content knowledge for teaching of both emerging and mentor teachers;
5. Aligned coursework and ongoing adult learning experiences that builds instructional expertise of both emerging and mentor teachers; and
6. Timeline of planning and implementation activities across the 20 month grant period.

#### **D. ROLES OF PARTNERS (27 points)**

Proposals must describe the role of each partner in the development and implementation of the project, including the responsibilities of individuals identified for each institution and the qualifications of each to fulfill their responsibilities.

Applications must include copies of signed Memoranda of Understanding from building administrators of LEA partners.

All applications must address all criteria. Each application will be reviewed to determine the extent to which the following items are described:

1. The role of the EPI education school/division partner in the planning and implementation of the proposed residency program;
2. The specific responsibilities of individuals from the EPI education school/division for planning and implementation of the proposed residency program;
3. The qualifications of the named individuals from the EPI education school/division with K-12 curriculum, instructional strategies, program evaluation and current research or experience in residency programs;
4. The role of the EPI arts and sciences school/division partner in the planning and implementation of the proposed residency program;
5. The specific responsibilities of individuals from the EPI arts and sciences school/division for planning and implementation of the proposed residency program;
6. The expertise of the EPI arts and sciences school/division faculty in the content area, research and their anticipated implications for K-12 instruction in the proposed residency program;
7. The role of the specified high-needs LEA partner and secondary LEA partner/s (with emerging and/or mentor teachers) in the planning and implementation of the proposed residency program;
8. The specific responsibilities of individuals from the high-needs LEA and secondary LEA partner/s for planning and implementation of the proposed residency program, including but not limited to the support of emerging teachers and their mentors; and
9. Evidence of partners' commitment to participate in the proposed residency program, including a description of the nature of the partnership with and commitment from the high needs LEA(s) and the university and other partners. The Memorandum of Understanding for School Administrators can be found at: /documents/mde/Memo\_of\_Understanding-Principal\_347422\_7\_537537\_7.pdf

### **E. EVALUATION PLAN (21 points)**

Applications must provide a detailed description of the evaluation plan partners will use to measure program efficacy and implement change during the program.

All applications must address all criteria. Each application will be reviewed to determine the extent to which the following items are described:

1. Clear explanation of the residency program outcomes that will be used to measure program efficacy and implement change during the program;
2. Clear explanation of the outcomes for emerging teachers, including measures of impact on instructional practices and retention;
3. A description of data and evidence to be collected and analyzed to evaluate program outcomes and outcomes for emerging teachers and their mentors, including at a minimum a valid and reliable observation tool;
4. A detailed plan to document and evaluate the project's impact on students of emerging teachers and their mentors, which could include analyzing samples of student work or projects, achievement data, or test scores (project-level, building-level or district-level, state-level);
5. A detailed plan to evaluate the project's impact on the instructional practice of emerging teachers, which could include systematic collection and analysis of lesson plans, curriculum units, instructional tools, student assessments, scoring rubrics, or classroom observations;
6. A detailed plan to evaluate the project's impact on the instructional practice of mentors, which could include systematic collection and analysis of lesson plans, curriculum units, instructional tools, student assessments, scoring rubrics, or classroom observations; and
7. A plan and timeline for collecting and analyzing data to determine overall program efficacy.

### **F. CAPACITY (15 points)**

Proposals must demonstrate capacity to perform the work stated in the application. A review of each application will be made to determine whether the qualifications of key personnel are appropriate. Each application also will be reviewed for information that shows the applicant is committed to, and capable of, the successful implementation and continuation of the project.

All applications must address all criteria. Each application will be reviewed to determine the extent to which the following items are described:

1. Evidence of partners' capacity to engage in the proposed residency program, including involvement in previous related work and the outcomes of such work;

2. Description of the partners' plan to continue the project when federal assistance ends, including strategies to identify and secure continuation funding;
3. Evidence of previous successful experiences in facilitating projects associated with K-12 partners in the content area(s) being addressed in the proposed residency program;
4. The percentage of the time assigned to the above identified persons will commit to the project; and
5. Description of the qualifications of specified internal evaluator/s who will complete formative and summative evaluation tasks, such as data collection and analysis, assessment of progress toward intended program outcomes and outcomes for emerging teachers and their mentors.

**G. BUDGET AND COST EFFECTIVENESS (15 points)**

Applications must provide detailed information about the project budget. All applications must address all criteria. Each application will be reviewed to determine the extent to which the narrative in the application describes the expenses shown in the budget:

1. The budget narrative provides a clear breakdown of all budgeted items and explanation of how each is necessary for achieving program outcomes;
2. The budget narrative provides a detailed explanation of personnel costs, including all employees and consultants; if stipends are included in the budget, application must explain how stipend costs were calculated to show they are necessary and reasonable;
3. The budget narrative provides an explanation of how the budget adheres to allowable costs; i.e., (a) indirect cost of no more than 8 percent, (b) consultant fees limited to no more than \$800/day, (c) no purchase of classroom instructional materials (limited to only what is needed to conduct the professional development), (d) no purchase of nonexpendable supplies;
4. The budget narrative includes identification of proportion of grant funds used by each partner entity (EPI arts and sciences school/division partner, EPI education school/division partner and LEA or LEA group partner) (see Special Rule Section 2132(c) below) and describes how expenditures directly benefit each partner entity; and
5. The budget narrative explains how the budget is cost effective, adequate to support the proposed project only, and complies with the budget requirements of the Request for Proposals (RFP), including an explanation of how the proposed budget amount is appropriate for the number of targeted participants.

**UNALLOWABLE COSTS:** Costs of entertainment, including amusement, diversion, and social activities and any costs directly associated with such costs (such as tickets to shows or sports events, meals, lodging, rentals, transportation, and gratuities) are unallowable. Costs of alcoholic beverages are unallowable.

SPECIAL RULE Section 2132(c): Legislation requires that no single participant in an eligible partnership receiving a grant in this program may use more than 50 percent of the grant funds. For example, each of three required partner entities (teacher education, arts and sciences, and a high-needs LEA or group of LEAs) may share 1/3 of the total grant equally, or one partner/entity may use 50 percent of the grant with the other two partners/entities each using 25 percent each, etc., but none may use more than 50 percent of the total grant.

Note: Neither capital nor nonexpendable supply expenditures are allowed. Also, Title II, Part A funds must be used to supplement, and not supplant, any non-Federal funds that would otherwise be used for authorized Title II, Part A activities.

### **ADDITIONAL REVIEW FACTORS**

In addition to the criteria listed above, the MDE may apply other factors in making decisions to fund proposals, such as evidence that:

- a. The applicant has performed satisfactorily on previous projects, completed required evaluation tasks, exercised prudent fiscal management, and submitted final reports;
- b. The funding of the project will not result in duplication of effort;
- c. The project will serve specific geographic areas; and
- d. The project will facilitate the state in meeting the overall professional learning vision and standards, curriculum improvement, and teacher education goals.

## **PART III – APPLICATION AND INSTRUCTIONS**

### **A. LENGTH OF NARRATIVE**

Proposal narratives are to be no longer than 20 pages, including data presented in charts, tables and graphs. Appendices in the form of additional attachments, may be included with each proposal, although reviewers are not required to read these in detail and each attachment may not exceed 15 pages. Proposals are required to address all identified criteria within the narrative section of the application. Narratives that exceed the allowed number of pages will not be reviewed.

Narratives are required to be double-spaced using no less than eleven (11) font size and no less than 1-inch margins. Proposals using less than the required spacing, font, and margin size will not be reviewed.

### **B. SUBMISSION DATE**

The application must be submitted via email to [EducatorPrograms@michigan.gov](mailto:EducatorPrograms@michigan.gov) by 11:59 p.m. on December 6, 2016. Late submissions will not be reviewed.

### **C. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE MEETING/WEBINAR**

EPIs that intend to submit an application for this cycle of funding are encouraged to participate in this session. Representatives who will be involved in developing and submitting the application may elect to attend, electronically or in person, the technical assistance webinar on **October 20, 2016**.

Topics of the session will include:

1. Changes in application requirements and scoring rubric;
2. The MDE categories for priorities in funding;
3. Data requirements for the 2016-2017 projects; and
4. A list of eligible LEA partners.

Individuals are welcome to attend the webinar in person OR via internet and telephone connections.

Participation in this session is recommended for those interested in preparing an application, as criteria may need explanation. **Please fax the attached form to register.**

Persons with disabilities needing accommodations for participation in this function are invited to contact the MDE to request mobility, visual, hearing, or other assistance. Please contact Donna L. Hamilton at (517) 241-4546 or by e-mail at [HamiltonD3@michigan.gov](mailto:HamiltonD3@michigan.gov) for assistance with special needs.

### **D. COMPLETING THE APPLICATION**

All applications must be submitted to [EducatorPrograms@michigan.gov](mailto:EducatorPrograms@michigan.gov) by 11:59 p.m. on December 6, 2016. Late submissions will not be accepted.

#### **1. GRANT PACKET**

**Cover Page:** Grant Contact and Fiscal Agent Information –Please complete all items in Sections I, II and III, as each determines where letters are sent, and who receives information about the grant award. Attach additional sheets, as needed, to include contact information for all LEA partners.

**Section IV:** Check whether the private non-public schools have been consulted.

**Section V:** Assurances and Certifications – By signing this section, the applicant is making the assurances listed in this section.

**Section VI:** Program Title - Enter the project title here; please include in the title the curriculum content that you intend to address in your project, i.e. literacy, mathematics, etc. Choose from the checklist, the category for which you are applying.

**Section VII:** Abstract - Enter a 200-word description of this proposed residency program. Please list in the abstract the school partners served, the specific core content, and grade levels addressed by the project.

**Section VIII:** Narrative – Use the same title you have entered into the description line of the application here and attach your narrative to the Application Form. Prepare a concise and clearly written narrative response to the requirements. The narrative should not exceed twenty (20) pages, including data presented in charts, tables and graphs, and it should address the review criteria listed. (See Review Criteria on page 11 of this document.) Label each section in the narrative and be sure it responds to the criteria required for the section and reflected in the Scoring Rubric.

**Section IX:** Budget Pages - Complete the Budget Summary form and the Budget Detail. Only the allowable categories are shown in the budget summary form.

Projects that receive financial or other contributions from the LEA partner and others must keep a statement confirming that contribution on file.

## **2. ATTACHMENTS**

**Section X:** Signed Memoranda of Understanding from building administrators should be included in one attachment to the proposal.

**Miscellaneous** – Applicant may name and attach appendices to provide additional information about the proposal or prior projects, although reviewers are not required to read and consider them in scoring the application. Each attachment may not exceed 15 pages.

## **E. FINAL PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND REVIEW PROCESS**

All final proposals must be submitted by an EPI which also serves as the fiscal agent.

All applications will be reviewed and rated in accordance with the format and review criteria cited in the general instructions. Up to 126 points will be awarded and distributed, based on the applicable criteria. It is essential that each evaluative criterion be addressed.

## **F. RUBRIC**

Following is a scoring rubric to help proposal writers discern whether they have sufficiently addressed all the required elements of the RFP and to help reviewers score the applications.

Narrative section titles should be consistent with section titles within the scoring rubric. Each subsection should begin with the appropriate letter designation in the rubric.

## Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2016-2017

To qualify, the application must have **all** of the following to be considered for complete review:

- |       |   |
|-------|---|
| ___1. | Required partners:<br>F. Approved Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) College/School of Education AND<br>G. EPI College of Arts and Sciences AND<br>H. One or more high-needs Local Education Agency/ies (LEAs), shown on eligibility list |
| ___2. | Specific grade level/s and content areas being addressed by the project   |
| ___3. | Evidence of collaborative partnership and commitment to project, including the signed Memoranda of Understanding  |
| ___4. | Evidence of contact and response of non-public schools  |
| ___5. | Evaluation plan to measure program efficacy and implement change during the program   |
| ___6. | Budget meets Section 2132 (c): No single participant in an eligible partnership receiving a grant may use more than 50% of the grant funds.   |
| ___7. | Proposals are required to be double-spaced (not including data presented in charts, tables and graphs), using no less than 11 point font size, no less than 1 inch margins and no more than 20 pages.   |

**REVIEWERS ARE NOT REQUIRED TO CONTINUE PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT IF THESE CRITERIA ARE NOT MET.**

## Rubric for Scoring Applications

### A. Demonstration of Need (15 points)

Aspect	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
A-1	Lacks a description of the needs of the district.	Provides vague references to the needs of the district. Does not address how the needs of the district relate to improving the capacity of emerging and mentor teachers.	Provides general overview of how the residency program addresses the needs of the district and builds capacity of the emerging teachers and mentor teachers.	Provides clear evidence of how the residency program addresses the needs of the district in content areas and how that relates to the improving the capacity of emerging and mentor teachers.
A-2	Lacks references about the building or district improvement plan.	Provides vague references to the building or district improvement plan.	Provides general overview of how the residency program aligns with the identified goal/s of the building or district improvement plan.	Provides a clear and detailed description of how the residency program aligns with the identified goal/s of the building or district improvement plan.
A-3	Lacks reference to a needs assessment survey.	Provides vague references to a needs assessment survey of educator needs.	Provides general description that the residency program addresses educators' needs based on results from a needs assessment survey.	Provides clear evidence that the residency program addresses educators' needs based on results from a needs assessment survey related to Michigan's content standards and related pedagogy.

Aspect	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
A-4	Lacks references to aggregate student data review.	Provides vague references to aggregate student data review in specific content and grade levels from the partner LEA.	Provides general description that the residency program is informed by results from aggregate students data review in specific content and grade levels from the partner LEA.	Provides clear evidence that the residency program is informed by results from aggregate student data review in specific content and grade levels from the partner LEA.
A-5	No description of actions taken to involve nonpublic schools.	Provides vague description of actions taken to involve nonpublic schools within the geographic region.	Provides general description of actions taken to involve nonpublic schools within the geographic region in planning the project.	Provides clear evidence of actions taken to involve nonpublic schools within the geographic region in identifying their needs and planning the project.

**B. Planning Process (15 Points)**

<b>Aspect</b>	<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 Point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>	<b>3 Points</b>
B-1	Lacks description of partnership and evidence of involvement of all parties.	Provides a vague references to the partnership and no evidence of involvement of all parties.	Provides general overview of the activities of the partnership with evidence of involvement of all parties.	Provides clear and detailed description of the collaborative activities of the partnership with evidence of meaningful involvement of all parties.
B-2	Lacks description of how program will support and build capacity.	Provides a vague description of how program will support and build capacity in residency placement sites.	Provides general description of how program will support and build capacity in residency placement sites.	Provides clear and detailed description of processes in place to support and build capacity in residency placement sites.
B-3	Lacks a description of target population of emerging teachers.	Provides a vague description of target population of emerging teachers to be in program.	Provides general description of target population of emerging and mentor teachers to be in program.	Provides clear and detailed description of target population of emerging and mentor teachers to be in program, including number of anticipated participants.
B-4	Lacks a description of recruiting strategies.	Provides a vague description of strategies for recruiting identified target population of emerging teachers into the program.	Provides general description of strategies for recruiting identified target population of emerging teachers into the program.	Provides clear and detailed strategies for recruiting identified target population of emerging teachers into the program.
B-5	Lacks a process or criteria for identifying and selecting emerging teachers.	Provides a vague processes and criteria for identifying and selecting emerging teachers.	Provides general process and criteria for identifying and selecting emerging teachers.	Provides clear and detailed processes and criteria for identifying and selecting emerging teachers.

### **C. Implementation Plan (18 Points)**

<b>Aspect</b>	<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 Point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>	<b>3 Points</b>
C-1	Lacks a clear overview of project and no research basis for project.	Vague overview of the proposed residency program with little detail and no research basis for project.	There is a general overview of project, but a minimal description of research basis for key program features.	There is a clear overview of project and description of research basis for key program features.
C-2	Lacks description of how mentors will be selected.	Provides vague description for selecting and supporting strong mentor teachers for content areas identified.	Provides general description for selecting and supporting strong mentor teachers for content areas identified.	Provides clear and detailed description of processes and criteria for selecting and supporting strong mentor teachers for content areas identified.
C-3	Lacks a description for supporting and evaluating emerging teachers.	Provides a vague description of the processes for supporting, assessing and evaluating emerging teachers.	Provides a general description of the processes for supporting, assessing and evaluating emerging teachers.	Provides clear and detailed description of the processes for supporting, assessing and evaluating emerging teachers.
C-4	Lacks a description of aligned coursework and ongoing adult learning.	Provides a vague description of the aligned coursework and ongoing adult learning that builds content knowledge for emerging and mentor teachers.	Provides a general description of the aligned coursework and ongoing adult learning that builds content knowledge for emerging and mentor teachers.	Provides a clear and detailed description of aligned coursework and ongoing adult learning that builds content knowledge for emerging and mentor teachers.

Aspect	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
C-5	Lacks a description of aligned coursework and ongoing adult learning.	Provides a vague description of aligned coursework and ongoing adult learning that builds instructional expertise for emerging and mentor teachers.	Provides a general description aligned coursework and ongoing adult learning that builds instructional expertise for emerging and mentor teachers.	Provides a clear and detailed description of aligned coursework and ongoing adult learning that builds instructional expertise for emerging and mentor teachers.
C-6	No timeline provided.	Provides vague description of a timeline of planning and implementation activities across the entire grant award period.	Timeline lacks specificity of planning and implementation activities across the entire grant award period.	Clearly describes or presents a timeline of planning and implementation activities over the entire grant award period.

**D. Roles of Partners (27 Points)**

Aspect	0 Points	1 point	2 Points	3 Points
D-1	No EPI education school/division partner mentioned.	Provides vague references to EPI education school/division partner role in planning and implementing the proposed residency program.	Provides general overview of EPI education school/division partner role in planning and implementing the proposed residency program.	Provides clear and detailed description of EPI education school/division partner role in planning and implementing the proposed residency program.
D-2	No individuals from EPI education school/division partner mentioned.	Provides vague references to responsibilities of individuals from the EPI education school/division partner in planning and implementing the proposed residency program.	Provides general overview of responsibilities of specific individuals from the EPI education school/division partner in planning and implementing the proposed residency program.	Provides clear and detailed description of responsibilities of specific individuals from the EPI education school/division partner in planning and implementing the proposed residency program.
D-3	No qualifications or relevant experience of individuals from the EPI education school/division partner are described.	Qualifications and experience of individuals from the EPI education school/division partner with K-12 curriculum, instructional strategies, program evaluation, and current research or experience in residency programs are generally described.	Qualifications and experience of specific individuals from the EPI education school/division partner with K-12 curriculum, instructional strategies program evaluation, and current research or experience in residency programs are present but limited.	Qualifications and experience of specific individuals from the EPI education school/division partner with K-12 curriculum, instructional strategies, program evaluation, and current research or experience in residency programs are detailed and extensive.

Aspect	0 Points	1 point	2 Points	3 Points
D-4	No EPI arts and sciences school/division partner mentioned.	Provides vague references to EPI arts and sciences school/division partner role in planning and implementing the proposed residency program.	Provides general overview of EPI arts and sciences school/division partner role in planning and implementing the proposed residency program.	Provides clear and detailed description of EPI arts and sciences school/division partner role in planning and implementing the proposed residency program.
D-5	No individuals from EPI arts and sciences school/division partner mentioned.	Provides vague references to responsibilities of individuals from the EPI arts and sciences school/division partner in planning and implementing the proposed residency program.	Provides general overview of responsibilities of specific individuals from the EPI arts and sciences school/division partner in planning and implementing the proposed residency program.	Provides clear and detailed description of responsibilities of specific individuals from the EPI arts and sciences school/division partner in planning and implementing the proposed residency program.
D-6	No expertise or relevant experience of individuals from the EPI arts and sciences school/division partner are described.	Expertise and experience of individuals from the EPI arts and sciences school/division partner in their content area(s), research, and anticipated implications for K-12 instruction are generally described.	Expertise and experience of specific individuals from the EPI arts and sciences school/division partner in their content area(s), research, and anticipated implications for K-12 instruction are present but limited.	Expertise and experience of specific individuals from the EPI arts and sciences school/division partner in their content area(s), research, and anticipated implications for K-12 instruction are detailed and extensive.
D-7	No high-needs LEA or secondary LEA partner/s mentioned.	Provides vague references to high-needs LEA partner's and any secondary LEA partners' roles in planning and implementing the proposed residency program.	Provides general overview of high-needs LEA partner's and any secondary LEA partners' roles in planning and implementing the proposed residency program.	Provides clear and detailed description of high-needs LEA partner's and any secondary LEA partners' roles in planning and implementing the proposed residency program.

Aspect	0 Points	1 point	2 Points	3 Points
D-8	No individuals from the high-needs LEA and secondary LEA partner/s mentioned.	Provides vague references to responsibilities of individuals from the high-needs LEA and secondary LEA partner/s in planning and implementing the proposed residency program; mechanisms for supporting emerging teachers and their mentors may not be described.	Provides general overview of responsibilities of specific individuals from the high-needs LEA and secondary LEA partner/s in planning and implementing the proposed residency program, including mechanisms for supporting emerging teachers and their mentors.	Provides clear and detailed description of responsibilities of specific individuals from the high-needs LEA and secondary LEA partner/s in planning and implementing the proposed residency program, including mechanisms for supporting emerging teachers and their mentors.
D-9	No description of partnership between IHE and high-needs LEA partner(s).	A vague description of the partnership between IHE and high-needs LEA partner(s), but lacks specificity.	Describes general description of the partnership and roles and responsibilities of EPI and high-needs LEA partner(s). MOUs from some LEA administrators are attached.	Clearly describes the nature of the partnership, provides evidence of commitment, and describes roles and responsibilities of EPI and high-needs LEA partner(s). MOUs from all LEA administrators are attached.

**E. Evaluation (21 Points)**

<b>Aspect</b>	<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 Point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>	<b>3 Points</b>
E-1	No plan for collecting outcome data; only general statements about collecting participation, activity, and other descriptive data.	Plan is described with little or no detail about the outcomes and measures.	Describes evaluation plan for residency program, but elements missing from the description, such as measurable outcomes for the program; measures used to collect the data; how data will be used to implement change.	Plan clearly describes evaluation plan for residency program, including measurable outcomes used to guide program; measures used to collect data that will be used to determine program efficacy; how the data will be used to inform or implement change during the program.
E-2	Provides no description of outcomes or measure of impact.	Provides vague explanation of outcomes for emerging teachers.	Provides general explanation of outcomes for emerging teachers, including measures of impact on instructional practice.	Provides clear explanation of specific outcomes for emerging teachers, including measures of impact on instructional practices and anticipated retention.
E-3	No description of data, evidence or outcomes; only general statement(s) about collecting data.	A vague description of data and evidence to be collected and analyzed to evaluate program outcomes and outcomes for emerging teachers and their mentors and no description of observation tool.	A general description of data and evidence to be collected and analyzed to evaluate program outcomes and outcomes for emerging teachers, including a valid and reliable observation tool.	A detailed description of data and evidence to be collected and analyzed to evaluate program outcomes and outcomes for emerging teachers and their mentors, including a valid and reliable observation tool.

Aspect	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
E-4	No plan to document and evaluate the project's impact on students of emerging teachers and their mentor.	A vague description of plan to document and evaluate the project's impact on students of emerging teachers and their mentors, with no analysis of student achievement.	A general plan to document and evaluate the project's impact on students of emerging teachers and their mentors, with limited description of analysis of student achievement.	A detailed plan to document and evaluate the project's impact on students of emerging teachers and their mentors, which include analysis of multiple measures of student achievement.
E-5	No plan to evaluate the project's impact on instructional practice.	Vague plan to evaluate the project's impact on instructional practice of emerging teachers.	General plan to evaluate the project's impact on instructional practice of emerging teachers, with limited description of measures for analysis.	Clearly details a plan to evaluate the project's impact on instructional practice of emerging teachers, which could include analysis of lesson plans, classroom observations, curriculum units, instructional tools, student assessments, scoring rubrics, samples of student work or projects.
E-6	No plan to evaluate the project's impact on instructional practice.	Vague plan to evaluate the project's impact on instructional practice of mentor teachers.	General plan to evaluate the project's impact on instructional practice of mentor teachers, with limited description of measures for analysis.	Clearly details a plan to evaluate the project's impact on instructional practice of mentor teachers, which could include analysis of lesson plans, classroom observations, curriculum units, instructional tools, student assessments, scoring rubrics, samples of student work or projects.

Aspect	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
E-7	Provides no timeline or plan for collecting data	Describes brief timeline and vague plan for collecting and analyzing data to determine program efficacy.	Describes a timeline and general plan for collecting and analyzing data to determine program efficacy.	Clearly describes a timeline and detailed plan for collecting and analyzing data to determine overall program efficacy.

**F. Capacity (15 Points)**

Aspect	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
F-1	Lacks reference to previous work demonstrating capacity.	Provides vague references to previous work to demonstrate capacity.	Provides general evidence of involvement in previous related work and outcomes of such work to demonstrate capacity.	Provides clear and detailed evidence of involvement in previous related work and outcomes of such work to demonstrate capacity.
F-2	Lacks a description of the partnership's capacity to continue the project.	Provides vague description of the partnership's capacity to continue the project.	Provides general description of the partnership's capacity to continue the project and to identify continued funding.	Provides clear and detailed description of partnership's capacity to continue the project and plan to identify continued funding.
F-3	No description of previous successful experiences in facilitating projects with K-12 partners.	Provides vague description of previous successful experiences in facilitating projects associated with K-12 partners.	Provides general description of previous experiences in facilitating projects associated with K-12 partners in the content area/s being addressed in the proposed residency program.	Provides evidence of previous successful experiences in facilitating projects associated with K-12 partners in the content area/s being addressed in the proposed residency program.

Aspect	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
F-4	No description of how time will be allocated to assure achievement of project goals and objectives.	Vague statements about how time will be allocated or verbiage from this scoring rubric repeated in the proposal.	General description of how time will be allocated by staff and partners, but lacks specificity.	Clearly describes in detail how time will be allocated by specific staff and partners to achieve goals and objectives.
F-5	No description of qualifications of project personnel who will complete evaluation tasks.	Vague statements about qualifications of project personnel who will complete formative and summative evaluation tasks.	Provides general description of the qualifications of internal evaluator who will complete formative and summative evaluation tasks.	Provides clear and detailed description of the qualifications of internal evaluator who will complete formative and summative evaluation tasks.

**G. Budget (15 Points)**

Aspect	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
G-1	No detailed breakdown.	Budget description in narrative is incomplete; insufficient detail about all anticipated costs.	General budget description in narrative has adequate detail for expenditures, including supports for participants.	Provides a clear breakdown of all budgeted items and explanation of how each is necessary for achieving program outcomes.

Aspect	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
G-2	Provides no description of personnel costs.	Provides vague explanation of most personnel costs.	Provides general explanation of most personnel costs, including employees and contractors.	Provides a detailed explanation of personnel costs, including all employees and consultants; if stipends are included in the budget, application explains how stipend costs were calculated to show they are necessary and reasonable.
G-3	No detailed description of adherence to all allowable costs.	Budget description provides minimal detail addressing adherence to limitations.	Budget description provides general summary of adherence to limitations.	There is adherence to allowable costs; i.e., (a) indirect cost of no more than 8 percent, (b) consultant fees limited to no more than \$800/day, (c) no purchase of classroom instructional materials (limited to only what is needed to conduct the professional development), (d) no purchase of nonexpendable supplies.

Aspect	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
G-4	No narrative description of how grant funds will be used by partners.	The budget narrative provides incomplete description of proportion of grant funds to be used by each partner entity (EPI arts and sciences school/division partner, EPI education school/division partner and LEA or LEA group partner) and describes how expenditures directly benefit each partner entity.	The budget narrative provides a general summary of proportion of grant funds to be used by each partner entity (EPI arts and sciences school/division partner, EPI education school/division partner and LEA or LEA group partner)) and describes how expenditures directly benefit each partner entity.	The budget narrative includes identification of proportion of grant funds, by percent and dollar amount to be used by each partner entity (EPI arts and sciences school/division partner, EPI education school/division partner and LEA or LEA group partner) and describes how expenditures directly benefit each partner entity.
G-5	No detailed budget breakdown.	Budget breakdown in narrative is incomplete; insufficient detail about all partner costs.	General budget breakdown in narrative has adequate detail for expenditures, cost effectiveness, including how budget supports participants.	Budget breakdown in narrative has sufficient detail to show all costs, cost effectiveness and how proposed budget amount is appropriate for the number of participants.

**2016 - 2017**  
**Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality**  
**Competitive Grants Program**  
**Technical Assistance Session**

**October 20, 2016, from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.**

**Location:**

MSBO/MASA Board Room of the MELG Building  
1001 Centennial Way, Lansing, MI

**Please select one option:**

**Webinar**      Registration limited to **one site** per organization; webinar arrangements will be provided with confirmation.

**OR**

**Meeting**      Attend in person; location directions will be provided with confirmation.

**Registration Due: October 18, 2016**

**Fax to: 517-373-0542**

**ATTN: Donna L. Hamilton**

Contact Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

E-Mail: \_\_\_\_\_

If further information is needed, please contact Donna Hamilton at (517) 241-4546 or [HamiltonD3@michigan.gov](mailto:HamiltonD3@michigan.gov).

**Deadline for Submission of Grant Application: December 6, 2016**