

Applications may be hand delivered to Grants Administration and Coordination in the Office of Budget, Contracts and Grants on the 4th floor of the John A. Hannah Office Building, 608 West Allegan Street, Lansing. Major portions of I-496 in Lansing currently are closed for reconstruction. The Hannah Office Building is located on Allegan Street between Martin Luther King Boulevard and Pine Street, across from the Michigan Library and Historical Center. If in need of specific driving directions, please call (517) 373-1806. Applications sent by mail should be addressed to:

REGULAR MAIL:

Michigan Department of Education
Office of Budget, Contracts and Grants
TLCF Grant Program
P. O. Box 30008
Lansing, Michigan 48909

EXPRESS/OVERNIGHT MAIL:

Michigan Department of Education
Office of Budget, Contracts and Grants
TLCF Grant Program- 4th Floor-Pillar B-19
608 West Allegan Street
Lansing, MI 48933

APPLICATION PREPARATION, PAGE LIMIT, FONT SIZE AND PACKAGING

Applications should be prepared simply and economically, with the narrative portion of the proposal being **no more than 10 pages in length, double-spaced and with a font no smaller than Times 12 point.** All application pages must be securely stapled. Special bindings and binders should not be used. Applications submitted but not in accordance with application preparation instructions will be penalized.

Part II: Review Process and Review Criteria Information

REVIEW PROCESS

All applications will be evaluated using a peer review system. Award selections will be based on merit and quality, as determined by points awarded for the Review Criteria Section and all relevant information. The following rubrics will be used as a rating instrument in the review process. All funding will be subject to approval by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. All applicants will be notified of the Superintendent's action.

The maximum score for the following criteria is 100 points. In addition to the content of the rubric categories below, the Superintendent of Public Instruction may apply other factors in making funding decisions, such as (1) geographic distribution; (2) duplication of effort; (3) duplication of funding; (4) commitment to improvement of primary level literacy skills; and (5) performance of the fiscal agent on previously funded initiatives.

REVIEW CRITERIA

The Technology Literacy Challenge Fund Grant Program is intended to support the acquisition and use of technology and technology-enhanced curricula, instruction and administrative support resources to improve the delivery of educational services by elementary and secondary schools. The funds are intended to provide assistance to school systems to enable them to carry out activities so that all students are able to become technologically literate. The scoring rubric provided below should be used as a guide when writing the proposal. The reviewers will judge all proposals against the elements described in the rubrics. The proposals most likely to be funded are those that have most completely addressed all of the elements described in the "Exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous" column of the rubrics.

A. Identification of the Need

Provide a description of the need for the project. This section of the proposal is worth a maximum of 10 points.

Poor, incomplete, not comprehensive	Marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Comprehensive, rigorous	Exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
The proposal: provides no description of need and no support for determining the need; and	The proposal: provides a description of need with vague support; and	The proposal: provides a description of need supported by valid evidence; and	The proposal: provides a clear description of need as identified by the data from the STaR Chart Self-Diagnostic Tool; and
provides no link to any plan.	provides a vague link to the district's Strategic Long-Range Technology Plan.	provides a link to the district's School Improvement Plan and the district's Strategic Long-Range Technology Plan.	provides clear links to the need evidenced in the district's School Improvement Plan and to the <i>Michigan's State Technology Plan (1998) Update 2000</i> .

B. Project Design

Provide a description of the methodology, design and strategies to be used to accomplish the project goals. This section of the proposal is worth a maximum of 30 points.

Poor, incomplete, not comprehensive	Marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Comprehensive, rigorous	Exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
The proposal: does not describe research-based, best-practice activities;	The proposal: provides a description of project activities;	The proposal: provides a description of project activities, some of which are research-based;	The proposal: provides a comprehensive description of the research-based activities that will meet the need of the district and lead to the accomplishment of the project goals;
provides goals and objectives that are vague or not measurable;	provides goals and objectives that are not measurable;	provides reasonable goals and objectives but not all are measurable;	provides goals and objectives that are specific, realistic, observable/measurable and that meet the need of the district;
does not include techniques to improve student learning; and	mentions student learning; and	includes a focus on improvement in student learning and includes appropriate expectations; and	focuses on project goals that will improve student learning, including a timeline for accomplishment; and
mentions neither parents nor community members.	mentions parents and community members, but no roles nor responsibilities are defined.	provides opportunities for parents and community members to attend meetings or activities related to the project goals during implementation.	provides clearly defined roles for parents and community members related to the project goals.

C. Use of Project Resources

Depending upon the focus of the project, provide a description of the plan for either using hardware, or communication networks, or software or professional development for the implementation of the project. This section of the proposal is worth a maximum of 30 points.

Poor, incomplete, not comprehensive	Marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Comprehensive, rigorous	Exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
The proposal: <u>For Hardware, Connectivity, Software only:</u> lacks a plan for use of project resources;	The proposal: <u>For Hardware, Connectivity, Software only:</u> provides a vague plan that omits two or more of the following: supports project goals, identifies technical support, shows a clear link to curriculum and describes the expected impact on student learning;	The proposal: <u>For Hardware, Connectivity, Software only:</u> provides a plan for use that includes most of the following: supports project goals, identifies technical support, shows a clear link to curriculum and describes the expected impact on student learning;	The proposal: <u>For Hardware, Connectivity, Software only:</u> provides a well-defined plan for use that supports project goals, identifies technical support, shows a clear link to curriculum and describes the expected impact on student learning;
<u>For Professional Development only:</u> lacks or provides a vague plan of professional development; and	<u>For Professional Development only:</u> provides a vague plan of professional development but either without specific curriculum integration strategies or content examples identified and not linked to project goals; and	<u>For Professional Development only:</u> provides a plan of professional development with some curriculum integration strategies and content examples identified and linked to project goals; and	<u>For Professional Development only:</u> provides a comprehensive plan of professional development with specific curriculum integration strategies and content examples identified and linked to project goals; and
<u>For All Programs:</u> lacks a description of activities that will promote sustainability or increased capacity for technology use.	<u>For All Programs:</u> provides a description of activities that have a limited promise of promoting sustainability or increased capacity for technology use.	<u>For All Programs:</u> provides a description of activities that have a moderate level of promoting sustainability or increased capacity for technology use.	<u>For All Programs:</u> provides a plan for sustaining the activities of this proposal.

D. Project Management

Provide a description of the key personnel and their responsibilities related to the completion of project goals. (See page 18 for a sample Project Management Chart.) This section of the proposal is worth a maximum of 20 points.

Poor, incomplete, not comprehensive	Marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Comprehensive, rigorous	Exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
The proposal: does not identify key personnel; and	The proposal: identifies key personnel but lacks specificity as to project responsibilities; and	The proposal: identifies key personnel, their project responsibilities and the amount of time assigned to the project; and	The proposal: provides a chart detailing key personnel, project responsibilities, percentage of time devoted to the project and a timeline for completion of activities; and
provides no description of a project management design.	provides a description of a limited project management design.	provides a description of a project management design but without clear lines of authority or the oversight necessary to complete project goals.	provides a description of a comprehensive project management design with clear lines of authority and the oversight necessary to complete project goals.

E. Project Evaluation

Provide a description of the evaluation design, including the specific method and instrument that will be used. This section of the proposal is worth a maximum of 10 points.

Poor, incomplete, not comprehensive	Marginally comprehensive, lacks rigor	Comprehensive, rigorous	Exceptionally comprehensive and rigorous
The proposal: lacks an evaluation design; and	The proposal: identifies an evaluation design but does not provide a description of specific methods nor instruments that will be used; and	The proposal: identifies a limited evaluation design with some methods and instruments that will be used; and	The proposal: identifies a comprehensive evaluation design with specific methods and instruments that will be used; and
provides no plan for use of data.	provides a limited description of a regular feedback process for program improvement and/or a plan for collecting and analyzing both the formative and summative data.	provides a description of most of the following: a regular feedback process for program improvement and a plan for collecting and analyzing both the formative and summative data.	provides a comprehensive description of a regular feedback process for program improvement and a plan for collecting and analyzing both the formative and summative data.

Part III: Information Concerning Other Requirements

WAIVERS OF STATUTORY OR REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Applicants for LTIP funding may request a waiver of any statutory or regulatory requirement that may impede their ability to carry out the Local School Improvement Plan. The applicant is required to provide parents, community groups, and advocacy or civil rights groups with the opportunity to comment on the proposed waiver. The statutory or regulatory requirements subject to the waiver authority of the Goals 2000 Act are requirements under the following programs or Acts:

- Title I, IASA, Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards;
- Title II, IASA, Eisenhower Professional Development;
- Title IV, IASA, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities;
- Title VI, IASA, Innovative Education Program Strategies;
- Title VII, Part C, IASA, Emergency Immigrant Education; and
- Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act.

GRANT REVIEWERS

All LTIP applicants, as a part of their application process, are asked to submit a name of a person the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) could consider when selecting grant reviewers. This person should have experience in one or more areas of education and educational technology. Names submitted will be placed in a database to be used by MDE when there is a need for grant reviewers. Readers for Cycle 5 proposals will be selected based on expertise, geographic location and need, as determined by the number of applications received in Cycle 5. All individuals chosen to be grant reviewers will be required to participate in a grant reviewer training session to become familiar with the specifics of the program criteria and funding priorities, prior to beginning the review process. It is anticipated that the training session and grant review will be held in Lansing on June 20, 2001. Specifics of the review session will be mailed to participating reviewers approximately two weeks prior to the training/evaluation session, allowing time for reviewers to become familiar with the content of the proposals. **The person nominated MUST be available for the June 20, 2001 meeting.**