

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT TITLE I ACCOUNTABILITY GRANT

INFORMATION AND APPLICATION

General Instructions

INTRODUCTION

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) is offering a grant opportunity for an Intermediate School District (ISD), Regional Education Service Agency (RESA), or an organization representing ISDs/RESAs. The opportunity also applies to Michigan colleges and universities with teacher training accreditation programs. The grant recipient will partner with MDE to provide technical support to Title I high priority (HP) schools.

The grant criteria outlined in this announcement and supporting application has been approved by the State Board of Education at its March 11, 2008 meeting.

Services will be provided to ISDs or RESAs with Title I HP schools within their service areas.

GRANT PURPOSE

The purpose of the Title I Accountability Grant is to expand and enhance Michigan's current Statewide System of Support (SSOS) and technical assistance for Title I schools with the greatest need to improve student achievement. Professional development and technical assistance to support data-driven decision making and build capacity for educators and administrators are key components of this initiative for targeted populations (high schools, alternative education, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency). The following goals will be implemented:

Goals 1: Provide customized technical assistance to HP school staff at the request of ISDs and Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to address the needs of the following target populations that did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics or English language arts:

- ❖ **Whole Group**
- ❖ **Students With Disabilities**
- ❖ **English Language Learners**

The first year goal is to assist Title I schools currently in AYP Phases 1 and 2 for proficiency in whole group or the subgroups of students with disabilities and English language learners to meet AYP within 2 years by providing technical assistance in

mathematics and English language arts (ELA). While the primary recipients for this grant are Phase 1 and 2 schools in the first year of implementation, services to Title I schools in other phases will be served once the Phase 1 and 2 schools have received services.

Grant applicants should propose the most effective activities based on research for meeting the goal. Applicants should demonstrate a thorough understanding of

- the Michigan SSOS for Title I HP schools, exclusive of Wayne RESA, as designed and implemented in the 2007-08 academic year;
- the Michigan School Improvement Framework (SIF); and
- the Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCE) and High School Content Expectations (HSCE).

The SSOS, SIF, GLCE and HSCE are the foundation upon which the grant activities will build.

The services of the grant recipient will be requested by the ISD serving the HP school. For purposes of the grant application, the applicants should build their proposal upon the assumption that 69 schools will request technical content support in Mathematics and 73 will request technical content support in ELA with some schools needing technical support in both content areas. The proposed content support must include coordination with other elements of the SSOS and contribute to a single, cohesive, and comprehensive system.

A growing number of HP schools are high schools and alternative schools. Thus successful grant applicants must propose specific activities to address the needs of these schools. For purposes of the proposal, applicants should base their proposal upon the following number of 2007-2008 Title I HP schools for the first year of the grant:

Phase	Elementary	Middle	High	K-12	Special Education Center	Alternative Education Center
1	15	9	8	4	3	1
2	5	2	3	0	0	1
3	5	0	13	1	0	4
4	5	2	27	1	0	1
5	5	3	0	0	0	0
6	2	8	0	0	0	0
7	7	1	1	0	0	0
8	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total	45	25	52	6	3	7

We expect applicants to outline specific direct services to HP schools such as content coaches, data coaches, sustained professional development activities, or other research proven activities to improve direct instruction and student learning. The proposal should comprehensively address all important aspects of an activity. For example, if content coaches are proposed, the RFP should address at least the following components:

- Coach employer or contracting entity
- Coach training
- Coach selection
- Coach evaluation
- Ongoing coach sustained learning activities

MDE curriculum staff will provide leadership, coordination, and guidance to the contracting agency.

Proposed activities must ensure that instruction in HP school classrooms is data-driven.

Proposed activities must build local school instructional staff capacity to sustain the activities after the school succeeds in meeting AYP and returns to Phase Zero.

Proposed activities must be built upon the GLCE and/or HSCE, complement the local curriculum and be flexible enough to utilize existing curriculum materials and methods as adopted in the wide diversity of HP schools across the state.

We encourage the applicant to partner with Michigan content organizations, teacher education colleges or other qualified entities to fulfill its proposal.

Goal 2: Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address identified needs

Grant applications must be based upon existing educational research and cite specific research results and trends upon which the proposal is developed. Proposed activities must be consistent with the research in duration, intensity, and fidelity. For example, if the research trend indicates that content coaches must have a model of effective instruction, demonstrate effective instruction, observe instruction, give feedback on instruction, and coach the teachers in an elementary building at least 60 days per school year, a proposal for content coaches must address each of the elements cited in the research.

The proposal should include indications of how the applicant will identify and disseminate information about promising practices for the targeted school populations.

The proposal must contain a description of the impact of each proposed activity on student achievement.

Based on the needs identified by an analysis of the LEA's data, the grantee will train and/or organize services that meet the needs of the LEAs. The grantee will provide technical assistance regarding best practices in delivering high level curriculum to students who have not met proficiency standards to staff in Title I schools, focusing on alternative education, English language learners and students with disabilities populations. The primary recipients of these services will be Title I Phase 1 and 2

schools in year one of the grant and schools in higher phases by year two of the grant.

Goal 3: Create partnerships for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice

The grantee will work in close partnership with MDE curriculum and special education consultants. The MDE Office of School Improvement will collaborate and provide guidance regarding instructional support. The grant recipient is encouraged to work collaboratively with other professional organizations such as Michigan content organizations, teacher education colleges and other entities specifically serving mathematics, ELA, alternative education, students with disabilities, English language learners and high schools.

Goal 4: Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of the school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the SSOS

The grantee will research current practices used by other states with HP Title I schools, specifically focused on improving content instruction for the targeted populations to continuously improve and refine the effectiveness of the content support.

Proposals should include appropriate professional development to schools and districts with common needs: for example, giving ISDs, LEAs, and school staff the needed professional development on effective instructional practices with identified subgroup AYP challenges in common. We expect that content coaches will have or be trained to have the ability to integrate the development, analysis, and use of specific data-driven instructional strategies. For example, providers in the area of High School ELA coaching may need additional training on ELA data development, analysis and instructional interventions. The grant should include funds to train coaches or providers as well as the HP school staff. A description of how needs will be determined for such training should be included.

Goal 5: Expanding Capacity

It is expected that the grantee will describe a plan for expanding the capacity to ramp up and support the program to include more schools in the second and third years of the grant.

TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE

It is estimated that \$4.2 million dollars will be available in the first year of the grant, with a possibility for renewal for two additional years upon satisfactory evaluation of performance annually. The projected budget for the second year of the grant is approximately \$17 million depending on the availability of funds.

GRANT PERIOD

September 1, 2008 through September 30, 2009

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

Eligible applicants would be an ISD, (RESA), a consortium of ISDs/RESAs , or an organization representing ISDs and RESAs.

TARGETED POPULATION

The target population are all Title I schools failing to make AYP for two or more years, based on achievement.

ASSURANCE OF ACCURACY

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

CLOSING DATE AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

Please submit a letter of intent by July 30, 2008.

The original copy bearing ORIGINAL signatures and two (2) additional copies (for a total of three) of the grant application must be postmarked **no later than August 15, 2008, to Mike Radke, Office of School Improvement,** at the following address:

Michigan Department of Education
Office of School Improvement
Field Services Unit
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909

If shipping by overnight express or UPS, the following address must be used:

Michigan Department of Education
Office of School Improvement
Field Services Unit
608 West Allegan Street
Lansing, MI 48933

Hand-delivered submissions will not be accepted.

It is anticipated that the official award letter will be issued by **August 25, 2008**. Although no funds may be expended until official award notices are received, eligible local partnerships are encouraged to use this time to continue to build on their partnership through planning and recruitment of participants.

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

July 10, 2008	Application posted and notice e-mailed to eligible applicants
July 18, 2008	Technical Assistance for potential grantees
July 30, 2008	Letter of Intent Due to MDE
August 15, 2009	Proposal Due to MDE
August 25, 2008	Competitive application review completed/funding recommendations presented to the Superintendent of Public Instruction
January 31, 2009	Interim Performance Report due
October 31, 2009	Final Performance Report due
November 28, 2009	Final Expenditure Report due

REJECTION OF PROPOSALS

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

REQUIRED COMPONENTS

The application must address each strategy as described above and each criterion outlined in the scoring rubric detailed on the following pages.

In addition, the application must include a narrative including a description of the organization's capacity to administer the grant, budget summary, detailed budget, certification of the fiscal agent and any participating agencies, other attachments if needed, and contact information.

LENGTH OF NARRATIVE

Proposal narrative will be no longer than 20 pages including charts and graphs. Appendices in the form of additional attachments may not exceed 5 pages. Proposals are required to address all identified criteria.

The abstract and narrative will be prepared in 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 or that exceed the page requirements may be disqualified.

SELECTION OF THE AWARD RECIPIENTS

This grant will be awarded through a competitive review process. An expert review panel composed of individuals representing the MDE and other selected individuals will review grant applications. The review of each application will be based on the attached scoring rubric. The proposals most likely to be funded will have completely addressed all of the elements described in the "Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous" column of the criteria rubrics. The grant awards will be based upon merit and quality, as determined by points awarded.

Part II – REVIEW CRITERIA

RUBRIC

Following is a rubric to help proposal writers discern whether they have sufficiently addressed all of the required elements and to help reviewers score the proposals. It is strongly suggested that the narrative be written in the sequence of the rubric.

A. Vision for Service Agency Partnership

Provide a clear description of the vision of the system for implementation of the enhancement and expansion of the current SSOS including but not necessarily limited to:

1. Demonstrate a thorough understanding of Michigan's current SSOS for Title I schools.
2. Identify the proven history of collaboration and partnerships with the MDE, LEAs and other educational organizations around the area of school improvement.
3. Describe the overarching principles that will guide this grant. Cite relevant research and the key findings from this research.
4. Identify the goals of the grant.
5. Describe the overarching organization of the grant recipient(s) indicating how this entity will work in partnership with MDE to implement the grant.
6. Describe the processes that will be used to coordinate this grant with the SSOS and the tools related to the SIF.
7. Describe how the grant recipient(s) have or will develop the capacity to implement the grant in the first year, expand into the second and third years and meet the proposed goals.

This section is worth a maximum of **30 points**.

Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
<p>This proposal demonstrates:</p> <p>The applicant has only a limited understanding of Michigan’s current SSOS.</p>	<p>This proposal demonstrates:</p> <p>The applicant has a basic understanding of Michigan’s current SSOS</p>	<p>This proposal demonstrates:</p> <p>The grant applicant has a thorough knowledge of Michigan’s current SSOS for Title I schools.</p>
<p>This proposal identifies:</p> <p>Weak examples of collaboration with the primary organization or with the supporting organizations.</p>	<p>This proposal identifies:</p> <p>One strong example of collaboration and partnership with the primary organization and with some of the supporting organizations.</p>	<p>This proposal identifies:</p> <p>More than one strong example of a history of collaboration and partnership with the primary organization and with most of the supporting organizations.</p>
<p>The proposal provides:</p> <p>A vague vision is present, but does not connect to the current SSOS, no research is cited.</p>	<p>The proposal provides:</p> <p>A description of the vision of the grantee, but is not tied directly to the SSOS, minimal research is cited.</p>	<p>The proposal provides:</p> <p>A complete description of vision of the principles that will guide the grantee to enhance the current SSOS, citing relevant research.</p>
<p>The proposal provides:</p> <p>A minimal description of the grantee’s organization, with limited evidence of how to partner with MDE to provide services.</p>	<p>The proposal provides:</p> <p>A description of the grantee’s organization, but only a vague account of a plan to partner with MDE to provide services.</p>	<p>The proposal provides:</p> <p>A clear description of how the grantee’s organization can reach the schools involved in the Title I SSOS with a detailed account of how it will partner with MDE to provide services.</p>
<p>The proposal provides:</p> <p>Minimal description of the processes used to coordinate the grant. No connections to the SIF, GLCEs, and HSCEs are drawn.</p>	<p>The proposal provides:</p> <p>A description of the process used to coordinate the grant, with no examples offered. Vague connections to the SIF, GLCEs, and HSCEs are offered.</p>	<p>The proposal provides:</p> <p>A clear description of the processes used to coordinate this grant with the current Title I SSOS with examples that may be considered. Connections to the SIF, GLCEs, and HSCEs are clearly drawn.</p>
<p>The proposal provides:</p> <p>Vaguely stated goals, with no measurable results. Benchmarks and timelines are weak or non-existent.</p>	<p>The proposal provides:</p> <p>Clearly stated goals, but lacking timeline or benchmarks.</p>	<p>The proposal provides:</p> <p>Clearly stated, measurable goals for implementation, including timeline and benchmarks.</p>

B. Project Design

Provide a description of the methodology, design, and strategies to be used to accomplish the project goals. Address the following elements:

1. Describe the specific strategies to be used to implement the grant and relate these to the specifics included in the review of relevant research.
2. Identify the external partners (e.g., content organizations, teacher education colleges, etc.) proposed as part of the grant; describe the role of each partner in serving ISDs and LEAs to improve student achievement in high priority Title I schools; and describe how the agency will identify specific needs of each school.
3. Identify the nature of any technical assistance and professional development activities, coaches or other interventions proposed; tie these back to the research cited earlier; include frequency, intensity, duration and content of each proposed intervention; and identify how data-driven instruction will be addressed.
4. Identify the targeted populations and explain how services will be tailored to meet the specific needs of each population within the framework of the variety of curriculum materials and methods that exist in the high priority schools across the grant area.
5. Describe the methods that will be undertaken to build local school instructional staff capacity to sustain the activities after the school(s) return to Phase Zero.
6. Address consistency of each intervention, cohesion between interventions and the existing SSOS, fidelity to proposed interventions and accountability for improving achievement.

This section is worth a maximum of **30 points**.

Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
Strategies are listed, but do not have accompanying research.	Strategies are listed with accompanying research, but don't specifically address the targeted populations in Phases 1 & 2.	Specific strategies for each of the populations in Phases 1 & 2 are addressed; research is cited that supports the strategies.
No external partners are named or are limited in their capacity to provide the described technical assistance.	Qualified external partners are named, but only a vague description of their involvement is addressed.	External partners are named that will assist the grantee in increasing student achievement for the subpopulations named. A description of how collaboration with these partners will take place is clearly described. Evidence of support to implement the grant strategies with fidelity from the external partners is provided.
Interventions and supports are listed, but are not on-going or job-embedded. No mention of data is offered.	Interventions and supports such as professional development are listed, but are not supported by research. Limited use of data.	Professional development and/or other interventions and supports are listed using job-embedded, on-going strategies. Interventions must be supported by earlier research citations. The proposal describes how data will be used to determine interventions.
Target population needs are undefined; integration with local needs is not addressed.	Needs are identified, but not linked to specific target populations. There is not a plan for integrating assistance with GLCE/HSCE and local materials or programs.	Specific needs for target populations are identified. A plan for integrating the grantee's assistance with the local LEA in terms of GLCE/HSCE and local programs or materials is defined.
No plan for capacity building is described.	A plan for capacity building at the local level is described, but does not address the target populations.	A plan for capacity-building at the local level is described, including a plan for each target population.
The plan does not address coherence with the current SSOS.	A description of how the plan will work in coherence with the SSOS does not include the grantee's proposed interventions.	A description of how coherence to the current SSOS will be addressed; include how the grantee's interventions with the target populations will fit with the current SSOS.

C. Project Evaluation and Accountability

MDE expects to contract with a nationally-recognized program evaluation agency to conduct the overall evaluation of the entire SSOS including the components identified in this grant application. Therefore, the recipient of this grant will have input into the overall program evaluation, fully cooperate in the overall program evaluation and the evaluation of each of the recipient's major component strategies.

However, we do expect the grant recipient to establish and implement criteria for the selection of any staff or contractors, to evaluate the performance of each staff member and contractor and to address any performance issues forthrightly. This must be done in cooperation with MDE and the other core team members, and to the satisfaction of MDE.

Provide a description of the staff selection and evaluation methodologies. Address the following:

1. Describe how the grant staff and contractors will be selected and evaluated.
2. Indicate how the grant recipient(s) will cooperate with the overall SSOS program evaluation.
3. Describe how the grant recipient will identify and disseminate information about promising practices throughout the state.
4. Describe how any issues will be addressed in cooperation with MDE.
5. Describe how the grantee will monitor the interventions to assure that they are directed to Title I HP schools in Phases 1 and 2 that target subpopulations addressed.

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

Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Addresses the hiring of contractors, but does not describe the process for hiring or evaluating.</p>	<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Includes a description of how contractors and staff will be selected and evaluations described, but with no timeline.</p>	<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Includes a description of how contractors and staff will be selected and evaluated including timelines for preparing contractor agreements and evaluation measures.</p>
<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Does not address the evaluation issue.</p>	<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Includes a willingness to cooperate with the evaluation of the SSOS, but does not describe how this might happen.</p>	<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Includes a description of how the grantee will cooperate with the overall evaluation of the SSOS, including collection of data, meeting timelines, and attendance at meetings, if necessary.</p>
<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Indicates the willingness of the grantee to share success stories and promising initiatives, but does not describe how this might be done.</p>	<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Includes a description of how the grantee will share success stories, but is in one medium only (i.e., speaking at conferences). Targeted populations are not specifically addressed.</p>	<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Includes a description of how the grantee will share success stories and promising initiatives with organizations throughout the state. Targeted populations are specifically addressed.</p>
<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Addresses only one office within MDE, but does not address target populations.</p>	<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Includes a plan for working with various offices within MDE, but does not address specific target populations.</p>	<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Includes a plan for working with various offices within MDE. Offices are listed that may address specific target populations.</p>
<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Includes assurances that the funds will be directed to the appropriate groups of schools, but does not include a process for monitoring.</p>	<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Includes a process for monitoring the funds, but does not include assurances that the appropriate groups are being addressed.</p>	<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Includes a process for monitoring use of funds to assure that they address the Phases and subpopulations that are the focus of this grant.</p>

D. Project Budget

Provide a detailed project budget that includes salaries and/or stipends for all participants to be funded with the grant funds and a detailed description of other resources required for project completion. The application budget should include all activities and services grouped by salaries, benefits, purchased services, supplies and materials, capital outlay and other expenditures, using appropriate function codes from the appendix to the Michigan Public School Accounting Manual.

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

Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
<p>The budget:</p> <p>Is limited in scope and does not provide a detailed plan of how grant funds will be expended; or,</p> <p>The application does not demonstrate a clear understanding or ability to comply with fiduciary responsibilities.</p>	<p>The budget:</p> <p>Is cost-effective, complete and provides information on salaries, and other expenses.</p> <p>The budget demonstrates realistic costs and an understanding of appropriate fiduciary responsibilities.</p>	<p>The budget:</p> <p>Is cost effective to support the project and shows a clear and detailed relationship between budget items, and project objectives.</p> <p>The budget demonstrates realistic costs and an understanding of appropriate fiduciary responsibilities.</p> <p>The budget clearly identifies indirect and administrative expenses.</p>

E. Qualification of Key Personnel

Provide a proposal for key personnel who will implement this grant. A review of each application will be made to determine whether the qualifications of key personnel are appropriate.

1. Describe key personnel in the applicant’s organization and how they can address the targeted populations named in the grant.
2. Describe how key personnel are familiar with the SSOS, SIF, and GLCE/HSCE.

This section is worth a maximum of **20 points**.

Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Provides marginal evidence of the qualifications and experiences for key personnel to ensure completion of the project.</p>	<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Provides evidence that the key personnel are qualified to ensure the completion of the project and attainment of the goals and demonstrates an awareness of the need for dedicated time to the project.</p>	<p>The proposal:</p> <p>Provides ample evidence of the qualifications of the key personnel to ensure the project achieves all goals and objectives and provides the percentage of time each person will commit to the project. Key personnel are experienced in school improvement planning, federal program administration and compliance, program implementation, technical assistance, monitoring and evaluation to assist with a comprehensive approach to assisting local districts, Public School Academies (PSAs) and schools.</p>
<p>The experiences of key personnel are addressed in general, but are not linked to a particular person.</p>	<p>A description of experiences that each of the key personnel have had with the SSOS, SIF and the GLCE/HSCE.</p>	<p>A description of experiences that each of the key personnel has had with the SSOS, SIF and the GLCE/HSCE including conferences, workshops, authorship, etc. and is linked to a particular person.</p>

INFORMATION CONCERNING OTHER REQUIREMENTS

Length of Award

Funding will be effective immediately following the Superintendent of Public Instruction's approval of grant awards with an ending date of September 30, 2009.

Reporting

An interim performance report will be due January 31, 2009 and a final performance report will be due October 31, 2009. A final expenditure report will be required within 60 days of the grant ending date, showing all bills paid in full.

State of Michigan Monitoring Visits

All grant awards are subject to on-site grant review. Project staff must maintain and make available, in the event of a monitoring visit, evidence to support the complete implementation of the proposed project.

Ownership of Materials Produced

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

WHERE TO OBTAIN HELP

Questions regarding proposal content should be directed to Michael Radke, Office of School Improvement, Michigan Department of Education at (517) 373-3921, or by e-mail at RadkeM@michigan.gov.

RESOURCES

Refer to the Office of School Improvement, Field Services Unit website at www.michigan.gov/osi.