



Michigan Department of Education  
Competitive Grant

**Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants  
Evaluation**

<b>GRANT ANNOUNCED.....</b>	<b>02/14/2011</b>
<b>BY: .....</b>	<b>Michigan Department of Education John A. Hannah Building 608 W. Allegan Street P.O. Box 30008 Lansing, MI 48909</b>
<b>STATE CONTACT.....</b>	<b>Mark Coscarella Coscarellam@michigan.gov (517) 373-8480</b>
<b>PROPOSALS DUE.....</b>	<b>03/17/2011</b>
<b>AT: .....</b>	<b>Michigan Department of Education Office of Education Improvement and Innovation c/o Mark Coscarella 608 W. Allegan Street PO Box 30008 Lansing, MI 48909</b>

**GRANT ANNOUNCEMENT**

**Michigan School Improvement Grant Evaluation**

**Grant Program Evaluation/Educational Research**

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) is offering a competitive grant opportunity for qualified intermediate school districts (ISDs)/regional educational service agencies (RESA), universities, educational research, or support organizations complying with all terms and conditions described in this document.

Mark all documents **Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants (SIG) Evaluation**

Mail or deliver all proposals and accessory documents to:

Michigan Department of Education  
Office of Education Improvement & Innovation  
c/o Mark Coscarella  
608 W. Allegan Street  
PO Box 30008  
Lansing, MI 48909

Proposals must be manually signed on this MDE form in the space provided below.

Submit seven (7) printed copies and one (1) electronic copy, in PDF format, on CD. Please clearly mark the original copy as "ORIGINAL" on the cover. Electronic versions of the proposal may also be submitted via email to MDE-SSoS@michigan.gov.

I have read the terms and conditions of this grant and submit for consideration the attached proposal and exhibits.

I acknowledge that there is no conflict of interest, as defined by Section 5.8, unless otherwise expressly disclosed by attachment to this page.

_____	_____
Company Name	Company Telephone Number
_____	_____
Company Address	Company Fax Number
_____	
City, State, Zip Code	
_____	_____
Authorized Signer's Full Name and Title	Authorized Signature                      Date

# **Michigan School Improvement Grant Table of Contents**

## **1.0 Proposal Overview**

- 1.1 Scope of Services Sought
- 1.2 School Improvement Grant Goal
- 1.3 Grant Award
- 1.4 Definitions
- 1.5 Statutory Authorization

## **2.0 Applicant Instructions**

- 2.1 Grant Inquiries
- 2.2 How To Respond
- 2.3 Calendar of Events

## **3.0 Grant Deliverables**

## **4.0 Proposal Evaluation**

- 4.1 Minimal Qualifications
- 4.2 Proposal Checklist
- 4.3 Selection Criteria
- 4.4 State Rights in Evaluating Proposal

## **5.0 Terms and Conditions**

- 5.1 Alteration of Application
- 5.2 Rejection of Proposal
- 5.3 Incurring Costs
- 5.4 Confidentiality of Proposal
- 5.5 Applicant Conduct
- 5.6 Applicant Responsibilities
- 5.7 Applicant Staff
- 5.8 Conflict of Interest
- 5.9 Lobbying for Grants and Cooperative Agreements
- 5.10 Insurance
- 5.11 Indemnification
- 5.12 Tax Exempt
- 5.13 Audit Requirements
- 5.14 Audit of Pricing and Billing Procedures
- 5.15 Access to Records and Financial Statements
- 5.16 State and Federal Monitoring Visits
- 5.17 Cancellation
- 5.18 Joint Proposals
- 5.19 Designation of Subcontractors
- 5.20 Certification Regarding Nondiscrimination

- 5.21 Assurance Concerning Materials Developed
- 5.22 Section 511 of the United States Department of Education (USED) Appropriation Act of 1990
- 5.23 Contract Award
- 5.24 Length of Contract
- 5.25 Non-Exclusive
- 5.26 Compliance with Grant Program Requirement
- 5.27 Governing Law

**Appendix A** Selection Criteria Rubric

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL**  
**Michigan School Improvement Grant**

**1.0 Proposal Overview**

**1.1 Scope of Services Sought**

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) is requesting proposals for the evaluation of the School Improvement Grant (SIG) as defined under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, Title I, Part A, Section 1003(g), and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA).

**1.2 SIG Goal**

The goal of the SIG is to improve student achievement in the persistently lowest achieving secondary schools eligible to receive Title I funds, and Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring so as to enable those schools to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) and exit improvement status.

**1.3 Grant Award**

This grant award will be 100% federally funded as a part of the Section 1003(g) Title I SIG awarded to the MDE.

**1.4 Definitions**

Applicant: Organization or individual submitting a grant application

ARRA: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act

AYP: Adequate Yearly Progress

ESEA: Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

Grantee: Successful applicant awarded the grant

ISD: Intermediate School District

LEA: Local Education Agency

MDE: Michigan Department of Education

OEII: Office of Education Improvement and Innovation

RESA: Regional Educational Service Agency

RFP: Request for Proposal

SIG: School Improvement Grant

State: State of Michigan

### 1.5 Statutory Authorization

The ESEA of 1965, as amended, Title I, Part A, Section 1003(g), and the ARRA authorize the State to grant funds to LEAs for the purpose of turning around the lowest performing schools.

## 2.0 Applicant Instructions

### 2.1 Grant Inquiries

All inquiries concerning this grant, including but not limited to, requests for clarifications, questions, and any changes to the grant, **shall be emailed with the subject line reading "SIG Evaluation"**, citing the grant title, page, section, and paragraph and submitted to the following point of contact:

Mark Coscarella  
Michigan Department of Education  
Office of Education Improvement & Innovation  
[Coscarellam@michigan.gov](mailto:Coscarellam@michigan.gov)  
Subject: "SIG Evaluation"

Applicants are encouraged to submit questions via email; however, the State assumes no liability for assuring accurate/complete email transmission/receipt and is not responsible to acknowledge receipt.

Inquiries must be received by the State's point of contact (see above) no later than the conclusion of the applicant inquiry period (see calendar of events). Inquiries received later than the conclusion of the applicant inquiry period shall not be considered properly submitted and will not be considered.

The State intends to issue official responses to properly submitted inquiries on or before the date specified in the calendar of events; however, this date may be subject to change at the State's discretion. The State may also consolidate and/or paraphrase questions for sufficiency and clarity. The State may, at its discretion, amend this grant on its own initiative or in response to issues raised by inquiries, as it deems appropriate. Oral statements, representations, clarifications, or modifications concerning the grant shall not be binding upon the State. The State will make publicly available all inquiries and responses, upon request.

### 2.2 How to Respond

The cover page of this grant document contains specific instructions as to where and to whom your response should be addressed, the number of copies needed, the due date and cut off time, along with other important instructions.

### 2.3 Calendar of Events

The following table provides the calendar of events for this grant:

<u>EVENT</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
Grant announcement	02-14-2011	12:00 p.m. (EST)
Applicant inquiry begins	02-15-2011	8:00 a.m. (EST)
Final date for application submission/receipt	03-17-2011	4:00 p.m. (EST)
Anticipated award	04-12-2011	N/A

### **3.0 Grant Deliverables**

1. Design and develop the evaluation for the Section 1003(g) SIG.
2. Evaluate the SIG by the use of a rigorous evaluation system and determine the effectiveness of the interventions (turnaround, closure, restart, and transformation) chosen by the LEAs.
3. Include an analysis of the fidelity of implementation of the critical features of the reform model (turnaround, closure, restart, and transformation) that the LEA has chosen for each school in relation to the SIG. Include rigorous and appropriate procedures to monitor the fidelity of implementation. Discussion agreements shall be included in the final instrument design.
4. Use rigorous statistical models to analyze the impact of the intervention models (turnaround, closure, restart, and transformation).
5. A minimum of three case studies of school interventions are required.
6. Report the findings in a timely and user friendly format.
  - a) The evaluation assesses the systemic and programmatic success and challenges faced by individual Title I, and Title I eligible secondary school buildings and the districts in which they reside. At a minimum, the following areas must be addressed:
    - i. school culture and climate
    - ii. staffing
    - iii. professional development
    - iv. parent and community involvement
    - v. instructional practice
    - vi. capacity to sustain programs and initiatives after the grant period has expired
  - b) The evaluation assesses the impact of the intervention models on student achievement, including, but not limited to:
    - i. performance on standardized tests
    - ii. performance on formative and summative assessments
    - iii. other indicators of student success such as data on drop out rates, graduation rates, expulsion/suspension rates, and attendance

### **4.0 Proposal Evaluation**

#### **4.1 Minimal Qualifications**

The applicant must show clear evidence of meeting the following conditions:

1. A minimum of two years of recent experience, one of which must be within the last three years, in the development of projects similar to that described in this grant.
2. The applicant has experience in conducting scientifically based research and in designing and conducting experimental evaluations.

#### **4.2 Proposal Checklist**

The proposal must include the following:

1. A description of the applicant's experience in providing services required, including discussion of previous related work. Please include vitae of staff.
2. A narrative describing how each of the grant deliverables will be accomplished.
3. A management, staffing, and budget plan for the internal management of the grant work that will ensure accomplishment of the deliverables.
4. An organization chart indicating staff (by name), task, responsibilities, and timeline.

### **4.3 Selection Criteria**

A panel will review the proposal and award points based on the level of competence (superior, high, average, limited) in the following areas:

1. Applicant experience
2. Grant deliverable narrative #1
3. Grant deliverable narrative #2
4. Grant deliverable narrative #3
5. Grant deliverable narrative #4
6. Grant deliverable narrative #5
7. Grant deliverable narrative #6
8. Management, staffing, organizational chart
9. Budget plan
10. Overall RFP

A total of **76 points** is possible. Refer to **Appendix A** for complete selection criteria rubric.

### **4.4 State Rights in Evaluating Proposal**

The State reserves the right to:

1. Consider any source of information in evaluating proposals
2. Omit any planned evaluation step if, in the State's view, the step is not needed
3. At its sole discretion, reject any and all proposals at any time
4. Hold open discussions with the second highest scoring applicant, if the State is unable to reach an agreement on award terms with the highest scoring applicant

## **5.0 Terms and Conditions**

### **5.1 Alteration of Application**

The original application document is on file with the MDE. Any alteration to this application or any file associated with the application is prohibited. Any such changes may result in a proposal being rejected.

### **5.2 Rejection of Proposal**

MDE reserves the right to reject any or all proposals that are not responsive to the RFP, are outside of the fiscal constraint, or are not in the best interest of MDE.

### **5.3 Incurring Costs**

There is no express or implied obligation of MDE to reimburse any individual or firm for any costs incurred in preparing or submitting responses; for providing additional information when requested by MDE; or for participating in any applicant conference, technical assistance meeting, interview, or negotiation.

### **5.4 Confidentiality of Proposal**

A proposal must remain confidential until the effective date of any resulting award as a result of this RFP. An applicant's disclosure or distribution of proposals, other than to the MDE, will be grounds for disqualification.

### **5.5 Applicant Conduct**

During the application window (the date from release of the RFP to final award), applicants are not permitted to contact any MDE employee or members of the State Board of Education regarding the grant unless written permission is given by the State point of contact identified within this document. No gratuities of any kind will be accepted, including meals, gifts, and trips, except as provided as a reference site visitation during finalist evaluations, if needed. Violation of these conditions will constitute immediate disqualification.

## **5.6 Applicant Responsibilities**

The applicant shall be solely responsible for meeting all requirements and terms and conditions specified in this RFP, its proposal, and any resulting award, regardless of whether or not it proposes to use any subcontractor.

## **5.7 Applicant Staff**

MDE may conduct reference and background checks on the applicant, assigned workers, or subcontractors. MDE reserves the right to reject the applicant, assigned workers, or subcontractor as a result of such reference and background checks.

## **5.8 Conflict of Interest**

All applicants must disclose the name of any officer, director, or agent who is also employed by or represents the MDE. All applicants must disclose the name of any employee or representative who owns, directly or indirectly, any interest in the applicant's business or any of its branches.

## **5.9 Lobbying for Grants and Cooperative Agreements**

No federal, appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of a federal agency, a member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a member of Congress in connection with the making of any federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment or modification of any federal grant or cooperative agreement. If any funds other than federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a member of Congress in connection with this federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form – LLL “Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying,” in accordance with its instructions. The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the awards documents for all sub-awards at all tiers (including sub-grants, contracts under grant and cooperative agreements, and sub-contracts) and that all sub-recipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

## **5.10 Insurance**

The final negotiated contract language will include a requirement that the applicant agrees that the financial responsibility for claims or damages to any person, or to the applicant's employees, sub-contractors, and agents, shall rest with the applicant. The applicant is required to maintain insurance coverage including, but not limited to, workers' compensation, employee liability, professional liability, automobile liability, and umbrella liability to support such financial obligation.

MDE must be named as an additional insured under the applicant's commercial general liability insurance, including product liability insurance and umbrella liability insurance. The certificate of insurance or policies of insurance, evidencing all coverage, must include a statement that MDE will be afforded a thirty (30) day written notice of cancellation, non-renewal or material change by any of the applicant's insurers providing the coverage required by MDE for the duration of the contract. Insurance companies must be acceptable to MDE and must have a current A.M. Best rating of A- or better.

Documentation of insurance, in the form of Certificate of Insurance, will be required to be submitted prior to the award of the contract. Documentation is not required at the time of RFP response. In your proposal, indicate whether or not you will be able to obtain the required coverage and meet the specified terms and conditions.

### **5.11 Indemnification**

The applicant is required to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless MDE, its agents, board members, officers, and employees (indemnities) from and against any and all actual or alleged claims, demands, actions, causes of action, injuries, personal injuries, contingent liabilities or damages, and reasonable attorney fees. An indemnity's recovery is not limited due to the fact that MDE is named as an additional insured under any contractor's insurance policies. The contractor is solely responsible for any payment of any deductible or retention under its insurance policies.

### **5.12 Tax Exempt**

MDE is exempt from sales and use tax by state statute.

### **5.13 Audit Requirements**

All contract recipients who receive \$500,000 or more in federal funds from all sources are required to have an audit performed in compliance with the Single Audit Act (effective January 2004).

### **5.14 Audit of Pricing and Billing Procedures**

MDE reserves the right to conduct periodic audits of pricing and billing procedures, as well as other terms, conditions and procedures of the grant award between the awardees and MDE.

### **5.15 Access to Records and Financial Statements**

The applicant hereby assures that it will provide the pass-through entity, and auditors with access to the records and financial statements as necessary for the pass-through entity to comply with Section 400 (d) (4) of the U.S. Department of Education Compliance Supplement for A-133.

### **5.16 State and Federal Monitoring Visits**

All contract awards are subject to onsite review. Applicant staff must maintain and make available, in the event of a state and/or federal monitoring visit, evidence to support the complete implementation of the proposed contract.

### **5.17 Cancellation**

In the event an applicant shall default in any of the covenants, agreements, commitments, or conditions and any such default shall continue unremedied for a period of ten (10) days after written notice to the grantee, MDE may, as its option and in addition to other rights and remedies which it may have, terminate the agreement and all rights of the vendor under the agreement. Failure to maintain the required certificates of insurance, permits, licenses and/or bonds will be cause for grant termination.

### **5.18 Joint Proposals**

MDE requires a single application for all grant items. In the event a group of applicants elect to submit a single response, all participating applicants must be identified in the response, and a "primary applicant" must be assigned who will be responsible for negotiating all grant matters.

MDE reserves the right to accept the primary applicant, but reject any secondary applicant. The primary applicant will have the option of withdrawing its application, without penalty, or replacing the rejected subcontractor.

### **5.19 Designation of Subcontractors**

The applicant may employ subcontractors to deliver required services, subject to the terms and conditions of this grant. The applicant shall remain wholly responsible for performance of the entire contract regardless of whether a subcontractor is used. MDE will

consider the applicant to be the sole point of contact with regard to all contractual matters, including payment of any and all charges resulting from the award.

#### **5.20 Certification Regarding Nondiscrimination**

The applicant hereby agrees that it will comply with all federal and Michigan laws and regulations prohibiting discrimination and, in accordance therewith, no person, on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, sex, marital status, or handicap, shall be discriminated against, excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or otherwise be subjected to discrimination in any program or activity for which it is responsible or for which it receives financial assistance from the USED or the MDE.

#### **5.21 Assurance Concerning Materials Developed**

The applicant assures that the following statement will be included on any publication or project materials developed with funds awarded under this program, including reports, films, brochures, and flyers: "These materials were developed under a grant awarded by the Michigan Department of Education."

#### **5.23 Section 511 of the USED Appropriation Act of 1990**

When issuing statements, press releases, requests for proposals, solicitations, and other documents describing this project, the recipient shall state clearly: 1) the dollar amount of federal funds for the project; 2) the percentage of the total cost of the project that will be financed with federal funds; and 3) the percentage and dollar amount of the total cost of the project that will be financed by nongovernmental sources.

#### **5.23 Contract Award**

A grant award not to exceed \$1,000,000 will be based upon criteria, standards, and weighting identified in this grant. Each applicant proposal will be considered as a whole solution, without limitation, including all services proposed, qualifications of the applicant, and any subcontractor, and cost. Wayne Regional Education Service Authority (Wayne RESA) will act as the contract fiscal agent through the MDE ISD Collaboration Grant.

#### **5.24 Length of Contract**

The grant award period is three years, with the option for two additional one-year extensions.

#### **5.25 Non-Exclusive**

A grant award by MDE will be based upon criteria, standards, and weighting identified in this grant. Each applicant proposal will be considered as a whole solution, without limitation, including all services proposed, qualifications of the applicant, and any subcontractor, and cost.

#### **5.26 Compliance with Grant Program Requirement**

The applicant agrees to comply with all applicable requirements of all state statutes, federal laws, executive orders, regulations, policies, and award conditions governing this program. The applicant understands and agrees that if it materially fails to comply with the terms and conditions of the grant award, MDE may withhold funds otherwise due to the applicant from this grant program, any other federal grant programs or the State School Aid Act of 1979 as amended, until the applicant comes into compliance or the matter has been adjudicated and the amount disallowed has been recaptured (forfeited). MDE may withhold up to 100% of any payment based on a monitoring finding, audit finding, or pending final report.

#### **5.27 Governing Law**

The provisions of any award, resulting from this RFP, shall be constructed in accordance with the laws of the State of Michigan.

## Appendix A - Selection Criteria Rubric

It is strongly suggested the narrative be written in the sequence of the rubric.

<b>Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants Evaluation</b>	<b>Superior</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Limited</b>
<p><b>Applicant Experience:</b> <i>(8 points)</i></p> <p>The applicant’s experience and background demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of relevant educational content and the ability to meet the grant objectives and requirements.</p> <p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b></p>	8	6	4	2
<p><b>Grant Deliverable Narrative #1:</b> <i>(8 points)</i></p> <p>The extent to which the evaluation plan describes an objective and appropriate method for the evaluation of the SIG.</p> <p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b></p>	8	6	4	2
<p><b>Grant Deliverable Narrative #2:</b> <i>(8 points)</i></p> <p>The extent to which the evaluation plan explains the use of a rigorous evaluation system and determines the effectiveness of the interventions (turnaround, closure, restart, and transformation) chosen by the LEA.</p> <p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b></p>	8	6	4	2
<p><b>Grant Deliverable Narrative #3:</b> <i>(8 points)</i></p> <p>The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear, well-documented, and rigorous method for measuring the fidelity of implementation of the critical features of the intervention.</p> <p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b></p>	8	6	4	2

<p><b>Grant Deliverable Narrative #4: (12 points total)</b></p> <p>The extent to which the evaluation plan describes rigorous statistical procedures for the analysis of the data that will be collected, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A clear discussion of the relationship between hypotheses, measures, and independent and dependent variables. (3 points)</li> <li>b) Appropriate statistical techniques for taking into account the clustering of students within schools. (3 points)</li> <li>c) The use of data on students' achievement in prior years as a covariate to improve statistical precision. (3 points)</li> </ul> <p>In the case of qualitative data analyses, the use of appropriate and rigorous methods to index, summarize, and interpret data. (3 points)</p> <p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b></p>	12	9	6	3
<p><b>Grant Deliverable Narrative #5: (8 points)</b></p> <p>The extent to which the evaluation plan describes the process and product for at least three case studies of schools implementing intervention models.</p> <p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b></p>	8	6	4	2
<p><b>Grant Deliverable Narrative #6: (12 points total)</b></p> <p><b>The extent to which the narrative:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Provides an overview/summary detailing how the evaluation plan proposes to report the findings in a timely and user friendly format. (4 points)</li> <li>b) Addresses how the applicant will assess and report on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. the systemic and programmatic success and challenges faced by individual Title I, and Title I eligible secondary school buildings and the districts in which they reside (4 points)</li> <li>II. the impact of the intervention models on student achievement (4 points)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b></p>	12	9	6	3

<p><b>Management, Staffing, Organizational Chart: (4 points)</b></p> <p>The applicant's management and staffing plan ensures successful development and implementation of the grant deliverables.</p> <p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b></p>	4	3	2	1
<p><b>Budget Plan: (4 points)</b></p> <p>The budget plan and narrative clearly describes reasonable and necessary costs required to facilitate successful grant development and implementation.</p> <p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b></p>	4	3	2	1
<p><b>Overall RFP: (4 points)</b></p> <p>The overall RFP is well organized, comprehensive and paints a clear picture of applicant's ability to meet the identified deliverables.</p> <p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b></p>	4	3	2	1
<p><b><u>Total Points Awarded: 76 Possible Points</u></b></p> <p><b>Overall Reviewer Comments:</b></p>				