



STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
LANSING

RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

SHEILA A. ALLES  
INTERIM STATE SUPERINTENDENT

**MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** July 12, 2018

**TO:** Local and Intermediate School District Superintendents  
Public School Academy Directors  
Local Education Agency Principals

**FROM:** Venessa A. Keesler, Ph.D., Deputy Superintendent *V. Keesler*  
Division of Educator, Student, and School Supports

**SUBJECT:** Request for Proposals – 2018 Title II, Part A Teacher and Leader  
Instruction Support Competitive Grants Program

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) is authorized to award approximately \$2,000,000 for the Title II, Part A, Teacher and Leader Instruction Competitive Grants Program. This grant aligns with Strategic Goal 3 of the Top 10 in 10: Develop, support, and sustain a high-quality, prepared, and collaborative education workforce.

The focus of this request for applications is on the provision of administering high-impact, evidence-based supports for educators to improve instruction and leadership, particularly in districts and other educational settings where there are multiple factors impeding the delivery of effective instruction. These grants are available to local education agencies (LEAs) and public school academies to help develop and sustain a high-quality, prepared, and collaborative education workforce. Please pay special attention to the priorities and funding criteria in the application package.

The purpose of these grants is to (1) increase student achievement consistent with the challenging State academic standards, (2) improve the quality and effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other school leaders, (3) increase the number of teachers, principals, and other school leaders who are effective in improving student academic achievement in schools, and (4) provide low-income and minority students greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders.

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

CASANDRA E. ULBRICH – CO-PRESIDENT • RICHARD ZEILE – CO-PRESIDENT  
MICHELLE FECTION – SECRETARY • TOM MCMILLIN – TREASURER  
LUPE RAMOS-MONTIGNY – NASBE DELEGATE • PAMELA PUGH  
NIKKI SNYDER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909  
[www.michigan.gov/mde](http://www.michigan.gov/mde) • 833-633-5788

Applications will be submitted through MEGS+ system. Guidelines and instructions for the Title II, Part A Teacher and Leader Instruction Support Competitive Grant Program are located on the MDE website at <https://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-5236-315600--,00.html>.

Deadline for Submitting Grant Application: **August 10, 2018, 11:59 p.m.**

Application Available: **July 20, 2018**

Estimated Available Funds: **\$2,200,000**

Estimated Range of Awards: **Up to \$2,000 (average) per educator served**

Estimated Number of Awards: **5-200**

Project Period: **Project period runs from August 30, 2018 through September 30, 2019.**

Budget Period: **Up to 13 months**

A technical assistance webinar will be hosted on July 19, 2018 at 10:00 AM. To participate in the webinar please navigate to: <https://educatortalent.adobeconnect.com/title2a/>.

If you have questions regarding this information or other aspects of this grant program, please contact the Office of Educator Excellence at: [emmerlingr@michigan.gov](mailto:emmerlingr@michigan.gov) or 517-241-3384.

cc: Michigan Education Alliance

## **MICHIGAN STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

### Criteria for Title II, Part A, Teacher and Leader Instruction Support Grant

The State Board of Education has adopted guiding principles and strategic goals for developing Michigan into a top 10 education state in 10 years.

To the extent possible, all grant criteria and grant awards will serve to further attain the above goals.

### **GUIDING PRINCIPLES AND STRATEGIC GOALS THIS CRITERIA SUPPORT**

The Title II, Part A, Teacher and Leader Instruction Support Grant supports the guiding principles and strategic goals of the State Board of Education (SBE) and Michigan Department of Education (MDE) by addressing Goal 3 of the Top 10 in 10: Develop, support, and sustain a high-quality, prepared, and collaborative education workforce.

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

Type of Grant Program: New / Competitive

The purpose of the Title II, Part A, Teacher and Leader Instruction Support Grant is to provide funds to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) and Public School Academies (PSAs) to (1) increase student achievement consistent with challenging the State academic standards, (2) improve the quality and effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other school leaders, (3) increase the number of teachers, principals, and other school leaders who are effective in improving student academic achievement in schools, and (4) provide low-income and minority students greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders.

Michigan's approach to state level activities funded by Title II, Part A, is to focus on high-impact, evidence-based supports for educators to improve instruction and leadership, particularly in districts and other educational settings where there are multiple factors impeding the delivery of effective instruction.

The MDE will provide the opportunity for LEAs and PSAs to compete for Title II, Part A resources to develop and sustain a high-quality, prepared, and collaborative education workforce. The grant identifies professional learning opportunities for teachers and administrators focusing on increased educational support and training, mentoring and coaching, and evaluation and delivery of instruction to maximize student outcomes.

## **CRITERIA**

Date criteria were last approved: June 12, 2018

Source of Criteria:

- Federal Law, Rules or Regulation
- Proposed by Staff

The main criteria upon which subgrantees will be selected are the following:

Defined in Statute:

- Description of the LEA's use of grant funds to develop, implement, and evaluate comprehensive programs and activities, with the use of a grant or contract with a for-profit or nonprofit entity, or in partnership with an institution of higher education or Indian tribe or tribal organization.
- How well an LEA's application for funding to the MDE describes:
  - Activities to be carried out by the LEA and how these activities are aligned with Michigan's academic standards.
  - The LEA's systems of professional growth and improvement.
  - How the LEA will prioritize funds to schools served by the LEA that are implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities under federal requirements.
  - Consultation that occurred in developing the application with numerous stakeholders, leaders, organizations, and partners in coordination with local, other related strategies, programs, and activities.
  - How the LEA will use data and ongoing consultation to continually update and improve activities.
  - The learning needs of all students, including children with disabilities, English learners, and gifted and talented students.
- Programs and activities funded by this grant must include participation by eligible private school teachers and administrators in accordance with Section 8501 of the Every Student Succeeds Act.
- LEAs must coordinate grant-funded professional development activities with professional development activities provided through other Federal, State, and local programs.

Proposed by Staff:

- To what extent programs are developed and implemented to:
  - Leverage teacher expertise and leadership that provides opportunity to exercise increased responsibility and to grow professionally.
  - Develop novice teachers and administrators through induction, mentorship and coaching programs and activities.
  - Support school leaders with training on educator evaluations and providing quality feedback.

- Quality of the description of program, including rationale; clearly specified and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes related to improving student achievement and how they will be achieved; how well the program meets the needs of the student and educator population; how individuals will be selected for the evidence-based professional learning opportunities; and topics of the training(s), including identified professional trainers.
- An evaluation system of the program capturing multiple variables to determine program success, including assessing annual performance data of the schools using qualitative methods.
- A detailed budget describing total request for funding, how funds will be used, and how it aligns to the project plan and identified district needs and goals of the grant.

### **ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS AND TARGET POPULATION SERVED**

Eligible applicants are K-12 Local Educational Agencies and Public School Academies.

The target population served is teachers and administrators who are working to improve student achievement and school culture and climate.

### **TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE**

\$2.2M total allocation to be distributed across multiple participants at an average of not more than \$2000 per educator served.

### **STATUTE**

Sections 2102 and 2013 of Title II, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act.

### **OFFICE ADMINISTERING GRANT / PROGRAM CONTACT**

Office of Educator Excellence:

Rebekah Emmerling, Educator Evaluations Unit Manager  
[emmerlingr@michigan.gov](mailto:emmerlingr@michigan.gov) or 517-241-3384

#### **A. GRANT CATEGORIES**

Funding will be awarded for the following Grant Categories

- 1) Building and District Leader Supports
  - a. Provide training and support for principals or other school and/or district leaders who serve as part of an instructional leadership team (ESEA § 2101(c)(4)(B)(v)(II)). Examples include, but are not limited to: mentoring and induction, coaching, and school/district leadership development.
  
- 2) Teacher Supports
  - a. Provide training and support for teachers and teacher leaders (ESEA § 2101(c)(4)(B)(v)(II)). Examples include, but are not limited to: mentoring and induction, coaching, and teacher leadership development.

### 3) Educator Evaluation System Supports

- a. Invest in teacher and leader evaluation systems; refine and revise these systems to support continuous improvement of instructional practice. (ESEA § 2101(c)(4)(B)(ii))
- b. Provide training for principals, other school leaders, coaches, mentors, and evaluators on how to accurately differentiate performance, provide useful and timely feedback, and use evaluation results to inform decision-making (ESEA § 2101(c)(4)(B)(ii)(II))

## **B. DISTRIBUTION OF GRANT FUNDS**

An allocation of approximately \$2.2 million for competitive grants has been awarded to the State of Michigan. Grant awards will not exceed \$2,000 (average) per educator served. A minimum of 5 and up to 200 awards will be given. The MDE reserves the right to partially fund applications.

## **C. NONPUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION:**

Funds awarded to State Education Agencies (SEA) and LEAs under Title II, Part A are subject to the uniform provisions of Section 8501 of the Every Student Succeeds Act (Participation by Private School Children and Teachers). The statute requires LEAs to provide private school children, their teachers, and other educational personnel with educational services on an equitable basis. Meaning, to a reasonable extent, non-public school teachers, principals, and other educational personnel are eligible to participate in grant activities funded by Title II, Part A, to the extent that the grant recipient uses funds to provide for professional development for teachers and others.

## **D. ASSURANCE OF ACCURACY:**

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

## **APPLICATION INFORMATION**

**2018-2019 TEACHER AND LEADER INSTRUCTION COMPETITIVE GRANTS, TITLE II, PART A of the ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED BY THE EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT P.L. 114-95**

**Statewide Grants to support Teacher and Leader Instruction  
FEDERAL CFDA Number 84.367**

## **PART I - GENERAL INFORMATION AND PROGRAM GUIDELINES**

The enclosed materials provide application information to enable local education agencies (LEA) and public school academies (PSA) to participate in the Teacher and Leader Instruction Support Competitive Grants Program. A LEA or PSA may apply

for funding on behalf of a proposed partnership with a for-profit or nonprofit entity, a partnership with an institution of higher education or an Indian tribe or tribal organization. The purpose of the program is to support the development and implementation of sustained, intensive, evidence-based and high-quality professional development activities to better enable new and experienced teachers, as well as building and district administrators, to enhance student achievement.

The MDE anticipates having approximately \$2.2M available for grants to be awarded by the SBE under Sections 2102 and 2013 of Title II, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act.

Consistent with the priorities and criteria it has announced for selection of grant recipients, the MDE must make awards of Teacher and Leader Instruction Support Competitive Grants funds to support partnership activities to enhance student achievement.

#### **A. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

Eligible applicants are K-12 Local Educational Agencies and Public School Academies.

The target population served is teachers and administrators who are seeking to continuously improve in their instructional and leadership skills to affect higher levels of student achievement.

#### **B. APPLICATION PROCEDURES**

Completed applications must be submitted on the Michigan Electronic Grant System Plus (MEGS+) by 11:59 p.m. on August 10, 2018. The application will be available on MEGS+ beginning July 20, 2018.

Award letters are expected to be issued in August 2018. Although no funds may be expended until official award notices are received, LEAs and PSAs are encouraged to use this time to continue to plan for implementation.

#### **C. REQUIRED COMPONENTS**

In order to justify the funding for the program being proposed, all applications must meet the review criteria outlined in Part II of this application, along with providing an Abstract, Grant Narrative, Project Budget, and Appendices.

#### **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 intensive, evidence-based, high-quality professional development programs, designed to grow a professional educator's instructional and/or leadership capacity through a continuous improvement model.

Grant applications will be reviewed using an internal panel of experts. Because the number and type of applications received may exceed the level of available funding, the review panel will be used to evaluate all eligible applications submitted.

The internal review panel includes MDE consultants, with the intent of assuring attention to national administrator and teacher leadership standards, national standards for quality professional development, elements of legislation around educator evaluation, and SBE policies.

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. Applicants may receive only a portion of their proposed amount.

## **E. FUNDING PRIORITIES**

The grant includes four (4) priority areas established by the MDE. The MDE will attribute points to an application, dependent upon the extent to which the proposal meets one or more of these priorities.

### 1. Partnership districts

These are districts with significant numbers of comprehensive support schools, as well as other districts that the MDE is required to serve through other statutory requirements. Partnership districts were established to assist struggling schools identified as low performing.

### 2. Viability of plan

The applicant must describe the criteria for which individuals will be selected for the professional learning opportunities and the focus of the training. The plan must include the approved vendor/vendors that will be used to provide the training and/or the rationale for how vendors will be selected. If the plan proposes programming provided by an entity not on the pre-approved list, the proposal must include a thorough description of the proposed provider's credentials, the research base supporting their program, and the intended measurement and reporting of implementation and improved outcomes. All plans should include the long-term goals of the training and how it is expected to improve student achievement and/or school culture and climate. In compliance with federal requirements, all programming must be evidence-based.

### 3. Viability of budget and alignment to plan and grant goals

The application must describe, in detail, the total request for funding, how funds will be used, and how it aligns to the project plan, identified district needs and objectives of the grant.



## **F. FINAL REPORT**

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

In addition to the narrative report, 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.

## **G. 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 Statewide Activities Competitive Grant Program. Districts 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 F.

## **H. 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 Rebekah Emmerling, Office Educator Excellence, Michigan Department of Education, 608 W. Allegan, Lansing, Michigan 48933; by telephone at (517) 241-3384; or by e-mail at [emmerlingr@michigan.gov](mailto:emmerlingr@michigan.gov).

## **PART II – REVIEW PROCESS**

All applications will be reviewed and rated by MDE staff. Proposals are required to address all the identified criteria. Each component of the review criteria will be rated using the rubric beginning on page 14. **Proposals that exceed the allowed number of pages will not be reviewed.**

## **REVIEW CRITERIA**

All applications will be evaluated on the basis of the criteria described hereafter. The narrative portion of applications should address the criteria. Applications for funding must address all criteria; the maximum possible number of points is 66. The value assigned for each section follows:

### **A. DEMONSTRATED NEED AND SIGNIFICANCE OF PROJECT (12 POINTS)**

Proposals should represent a constructive and productive approach to the significant challenges facing the target audience to meet the learning needs of all students. All applications must address all criteria. The reviewers will look for:

1. Evidence that the proposed program addresses a documented need to improve the capacity of educators to deliver instruction and improve student achievement as informed and supported by the district's Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA).
2. Evidence that the proposed program(s) and professional development address educators' needs as supported by qualitative and/or quantitative data.
3. Description as to how the proposed activities will address these needs and align with the district's improvement plan and the school improvement plan(s) for each school involved.
4. A description of the actions taken to involve the nonpublic schools located within the geographic region.

### **B. PLAN OF OPERATION (12 POINTS)**

A review of each application will be made to determine the thoroughness of the plan of operation for meeting the needs of the target population. All applications must address all criteria. In making their determination, the reviewers will look for:

1. Extent to which the proposal demonstrates how the planned activities are expected to improve teacher or administrator practice to impact student academic achievement and school/district culture and climate.
2. A clearly described implementation plan (in table or narrative form) including a 13-month timeline, addressing all required components.
3. Description of the external partner and their role. If partner is not on the approved entities list (See Appendix A), provide a rationale describing how those services are appropriate to the grant criteria and the proposed partner's credentials, their program's research base, and a detailed plan for implementation and measurement of progress and outcomes.

4. Detail as to how the LEA or PSA will prioritize funds to schools served by the LEA or PSA that are implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities.

### **C. Sustainability (6 POINTS)**

All applications must address all criteria. A review of each application will be made to determine whether the qualifications of key personnel are appropriate. Each application will be reviewed for information that shows the applicant is committed to, and capable of, the successful implementation and continuation of the project. In making this determination, consideration will be given to:

1. A statement describing the district's plan to continue progression toward stated goals after the grant period ends.
2. Demonstration that applicant has a specified internal evaluator to complete evaluation tasks, including local data collection.

### **D. QUALITY OF PROGRAMMING (15 POINTS)**

Each application should clearly describe planned programming quality. Reviewers will consider the following:

1. Description of how each program being implemented (Teacher Support, Leader Support, Educator Evaluation Training), is designed and implemented to specifically meet respective local and state standards.
2. Clearly stated vision, mission, and set of purposes and goals aligned with evidence-based, highly leveraged leading practices and/or best practice models.
3. Demonstrates a connection and alignment with current evidence-based research on effective district, school, and teacher leadership.
4. Describes how the program provides professional development focused on leading a culture of change, supporting a learning-focused culture, embracing a strengths-based approach to leading, improvement of instructional practices through feedback, and the management of systems and processes.
5. Emphasizes access, equity, diversity, inclusion, and cultural proficiency by encouraging the organization and its members to analyze held assumptions, beliefs, behaviors, practices and policies to create equitable learning opportunities for all learners.

### **E. EVALUATION PLAN (6 POINTS)**

All applications must address all criteria. Review of applications will be based on the extent to which proposals include:

1. A clear list or table of the short-term and long-term goals of the project related to the identified content.

2. A description of a system that captures multiple variables related to the program to determine success, including assessing annual performance data of the schools using qualitative methods.

#### **F. 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. A detailed budget describing total request for funding and how funds will be used.
2. Delineation of expenditures that can include stipends to teachers or administrators for additional time or additional leadership responsibility; reimbursement for the cost of professional learning, including tuition reimbursement; purchased services from an external provider for professional learning, coaching or mentoring.
3. Description of how budget aligns to the project plan, identified district needs and goals of the grant.
4. There is evidence of adherence to federal and state guidelines on allowable costs.
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 are unallowable. Costs of alcoholic beverages are unallowable.

Note: Neither capital nor nonexpendable supply expenditures are allowed.

#### **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 funding of the project will not result in duplication of effort.
- b. The project will serve specific geographic areas, including a preference to partnership districts.

- c. The project will further assist 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.

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

### **A. COMPLETING THE APPLICATION AND REVIEW PROCESS**

All final proposals must be submitted by an LEA or PSA. Applications will be reviewed and rated in accordance with the format and review criteria cited in the general instructions. Up to 66 points will be awarded and distributed, based on the applicable criteria. It is essential that each evaluative criterion be addressed. For any application to be considered, it must include the following components, while adhering to the described guidelines:

1. **Abstract:** On one separate, double-spaced page, applicants must provide up to a 250-word description of the project they propose. Clearly articulated abstracts allow the reader to understand the scope of the project. The abstract will not be counted in the total number of narrative pages (see below).
2. **Grant Narrative:** All pages in the narrative section of the application should have one-inch margins and be collated and numbered consecutively throughout. The narrative is limited to ten (10) double-spaced pages using eleven (11) point Verdana font. Charts, graphs, and bulleted lists may be single-spaced.
3. **Project Budget:** Project budgets are uploaded as a separate function and document in MEGS+. Project budgets are not counted in the narrative page total.
4. **Appendices:** Appendices accompanying applicant proposals should be limited to ten (10) double-spaced pages using eleven (11) point Verdana font. Appendices pages are not factored into the 10-page limit on the narrative section of the application. Charts, graphs, and bulleted lists may be single-spaced.

### **B. SUBMISSION DATE**

Applications are to be submitted to MEGS+ **by August 10, 2018 at 11:59 p.m.** **Late submissions will not be accepted.**

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

Districts applying for the grant are encouraged to participate in this session. Representatives who will be involved in developing and submitting the application may elect to attend the technical assistance webinar on **July 19, 2018 at 10:00 a.m.** The application submission is done electronically, through MEGS+, and this session will include an explanation of how to use MEGS+ to submit the grant application.

Topics of the session will include:

- Changes in application requirements and scoring rubric.
- The MDE categories for priorities in funding.
- Creating and submitting your proposal using the MEGS+ application process.
- Data requirements for the 2018-2019 projects.

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

Participation in this session is highly recommended if you are considering applying for these funds, as criteria may need explanation. The webinar may be accessed at this link: <https://educatortalent.adobeconnect.com/title2a/>.

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 Rebekah Emmerling at 517-241-3384 or by e-mail at [emmerlingr@michigan.gov](mailto:emmerlingr@michigan.gov) for assistance with special needs.

#### **D. Application Evaluation and Scoring**

The following is a description of the scoring mechanism reviewers will use to help proposal writers sufficiently address all required elements of the RFP and to help reviewers score the applications.

Narrative section titles should be consistent with review criteria. Each subsection should begin with the appropriate letter designation as described in the review criteria on pages 8-12 of this document.

## **Title II, Part A Teacher and Leader Instruction Support Grant**

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

1. Required partners:
  - Local Education Agency or Public School Academy
  - A partnership with a for-profit or nonprofit entity, or an institution of higher education or Indian tribe or tribal organization
2. Evidence of participant learning needs as detailed in the district's Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)
3. Application must identify content to be addressed in one of the following areas:
  - Teacher Support
  - Leader Support
  - Educator Evaluation
4. Timeline delineating how professional development will be provided over the grant award period.
5. Evidence of research base or theory of action for the professional development (PD) proposed for teachers, and/or principals, and/or paraprofessionals. An annotated bibliography is included as an attachment to the proposal.
6. Evidence of collaborative planning and commitment to project.
7. Evidence of contact and response of non-public schools.
8. 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 10 pages of narrative.

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

**A. Demonstrated Need (12 Points)**

	<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>	<b>3 Points</b>
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 educators.	Provides general overview of how the program addresses the needs to improve capacity of educators informed by the district's CNA.	Provides clear evidence of how the program addresses the need to improve capacity of educators as informed by the district's CNA.
A-2	Provides little to no evidence that the proposed program(s) and professional development address educators' needs.	Provides vague evidence that the proposed program(s) and professional development address educators' needs.	Provides evidence that the proposed program(s) and professional development address educators' needs as supported by qualitative and/or quantitative data.	Provides clear, substantial evidence that the proposed program(s) and professional development address educators' needs as supported by qualitative and/or quantitative data.
A-3	Does not describe the link between proposed activities and improvement plans.	Vaguely describes how the proposed activities align with the district's improvement plan and the school improvement plan(s) for each school involved.	Generally describes how the proposed activities align with the district's improvement plan and the school improvement plan(s) for each school involved.	Clearly and specifically describes how the proposed activities align with the district's improvement plan and the school improvement plan(s) for each school involved.
A-4	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.	Provides clear and specific description of actions taken to involve nonpublic schools within the geographic region.



**B. Plan of Operation (12 Points)**

	<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>	<b>3 Points</b>
B-1	Proposal does not describe how the planned activities are expected to improve teacher or administrator practice.	Proposal vaguely describes how the planned activities are expected to improve teacher or administrator practice to impact student achievement and school/district culture and climate.	Proposal generally describes how the planned activities are expected to improve teacher or administrator practice to impact student achievement and school/district culture and climate.	Proposal clearly specifies how the planned activities are expected to improve teacher or administrator practice to impact student achievement and school/district culture and climate.
B-2	Does not describe an implementation plan (in table or narrative form) or does not include 13-month timeline.	Vaguely describes an implementation plan with 13-month timeline.	Generally describes implementation plan (in table or narrative form), including a 13-month timeline, addressing all required components.	Clearly and specifically describes implementation plan (in table or narrative form), including a 13-month timeline, addressing all required components.
B-3	Little to no description of external parnters is provided. No non-approved partner rationale is provided (if applicable).	Provides vague description of the external partner and their role. Non-approved partner rationale (if applicable) is vague.	Provides general description of the external partner and their role. If partner is not on approved list, a rationale is provided.	Provides clear and extensive description of the external partner and their role. If partner is not on approved list (see Appendix A), a thorough rationale is provided describing the services, the proposed partner's credentials, program's research base, etc.
B-4	Does not describe how the LEA or PSA will prioritize funds.	Vague description as to how the LEA or PSA will prioritize funds to schools they serve that are implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities.	General description as to how the LEA or PSA will prioritize funds to schools they serve that are implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities.	Clear and specific description as to how the LEA or PSA will prioritize funds to schools they serve that are implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities.

**C. Sustainability (6 Points)**

	<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>	<b>3 Points</b>
C-1	Offers no statement of the district's plan to continue the project when grant period ends.	Offers a vague statement of the district's plan to continue the project when grant period ends.	Offers a general statement of the district's plan to continue the project when grant period ends.	Offers a clear and precise statement of the district's plan to continue the project when grant period ends.
C-2	No description of internal evaluator.	Vague description of internal evaluator.	General description of internal evaluator.	Clear demonstration that applicant (or partner) has a specified internal evaluator to complete evaluation tasks, including local data collection.

**D. Quality of Programming (15 Points)**

	<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>	<b>3 Points</b>
D-1	Vague description of how each program being implemented is designed and implemented to specifically meet respective local and state standards.	Vague description of how each program is designed and implemented to specifically meet respective local and state standards.	General description of how each program being implemented (Teacher Support, Leader Support, Educator Evaluation Training), is designed and implemented to specifically meet respective local and state standards.	Clear description of how each program being implemented (Teacher Support, Leader Support, Educator Evaluation Training), is designed and implemented to specifically meet respective local and state standards.
D-2	No stated vision, mission, and set of purposes and goals aligned with evidence-based leading practices.	Vaguely stated vision, mission, and set of purposes and goals aligned with evidence-based leading practices.	Generally stated vision, mission, and set of purposes and goals aligned with evidence-based leading practices.	Clearly stated vision, mission, and set of purposes and goals well aligned with evidence-based, highly leveraged leading practices and/or best practice models.

D-3	Does not demonstrate a connection and alignment with current evidence-based research on effective leadership.	Vaguely demonstrates a connection and alignment with current evidence-based research on effective leadership.	Generally demonstrates a connection and alignment with current evidence-based research on effective district, school, and teacher leadership.	Clearly demonstrates a connection and alignment with current evidence-based research on effective district, school, and teacher leadership.
D-4	Does not describe how the program provides focused professional development.	Vaguely describes how the program provides focused professional development.	Generally, describes how the program provides professional development focused on leading a culture of change, supporting a learning-focused culture, embracing a strengths-based approach to leading, improvement of instructional practices through feedback, and the management of systems and processes.	Clearly describes how the program provides professional development focused on leading a culture of change, supporting a learning-focused culture, embracing a strengths-based approach to leading, improvement of instructional practices through feedback, and the management of systems and processes.
D-5	Does not emphasize access, equity, diversity, inclusion, and cultural proficiency.	Vaguely emphasizes access, equity, diversity, inclusion, and cultural proficiency.	Generally emphasizes access, equity, diversity, inclusion, and cultural proficiency.	Clearly and specifically emphasizes access, equity, diversity, inclusion, and cultural proficiency by analyzing held assumptions, beliefs, behaviors, practices and policies to create equitable learning opportunities for all learners.

**E. Evaluation Plan (6 Points)**

	<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>	<b>3 Points</b>
E-1	Does not describe short-term and long-term goals.	Vaguely describes short-term and long-term goals.	Generally describes short-term and long-term goals.	Clearly describes both detailed short-term and long-term goals of the project.
E-2	Provides no description of a system that captures multiple variables related to the program to determine success.	Vaguely describes a system that captures multiple variables related to the program to determine success.	Provides general description of a system that captures multiple variables related to the program to determine success, including assessing annual performance data of the schools using qualitative methods.	Clearly describes a system that captures multiple variables related to the program to determine success, including assessing annual performance data of the schools using qualitative methods.

**F. Budget and Cost Effectiveness (15 Points)**

	<b>0 Points</b>	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>	<b>3 Points</b>
F-1	Narrative does not describe relationship between all budget items, project objectives, and anticipated results.	Narrative vaguely describes relationship between all budget items, project objectives, and anticipated results.	Narrative gives general summary describing relationship between all budget items, objectives, and anticipated results.	A detailed budget describing total request for funding and how funds will be used.

F-2	Offers no delineation of expenditures.	Vague delineation of expenditures.	General delineation of expenditures that can include stipends to teachers or administrators for additional time or additional leadership responsibility; reimbursement for the cost of professional learning, etc.	Clear delineation of expenditures that can include stipends to teachers or administrators for additional time or additional leadership responsibility; reimbursement for the cost of professional learning, including purchased services from an external provider.
F-3	No description of how budget aligns to the project plan, identified district needs and/or goals of the grant.	Vague description of how budget aligns to the project plan, identified district needs and/or goals of the grant.	General description of how budget aligns to the project plan, identified district needs and goals of the grant.	Clear and specific description of how budget aligns to the project plan, identified district needs and goals of the grant.
F-4	Provides no description of adherence to allowable costs.	Budget description provides minimal detail addressing adherence to allowable costs.	Budget description provides general summary of adherence to allowable costs.	There is adherence to federal and state guidelines on allowable costs.

F-5	No explanation of how the budget is cost effective.	Vaguely explains how the budget is cost effective and adequate to support the proposed project only.	Generally 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).	Clearly 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).
-----	---	--	---	---

If further information is needed, please contact Rebekah Emmerling at 517-241- 3384 or [emmerlingr@michigan.gov](mailto:emmerlingr@michigan.gov).

Deadline for Submission of Grant Application: August 10, 2018 (11:59 p.m.)

## **Appendix A: List of Approved Partner Entities**

Approved Michigan Educator Preparation Providers – traditional and alternative routes

Michigan Association for the Education of Young Children

Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association

Michigan Association of Public School Academies

Michigan Association of School Administrators

Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals

Michigan Education Association

Michigan Intermediate School Districts or Education Agencies

Michigan School Business Officials

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification

National Charter School Institute

National Network of State Teachers of the Year

Resolute Educational Solutions

Teaching Works

The Institute for Excellence in Education