



State of Arizona
Arizona Department of Education

ARRA EETT

21ST CENTURY CLASSROOMS

GRANT COMPETITION

APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

**FOR SCHOOL YEARS 2009-2010 & 2010-2011
COMPETITIVE SUBGRANT AWARDS
TO ELIGIBLE LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES
UNDER ARIZONA'S ARRA ENHANCING EDUCATION THROUGH
TECHNOLOGY (EETT)**

**In Accordance with
Title II, Part D of
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

**– DEADLINE –
Submission of Applications
February 5th, 2010 – 5:00 pm (MST)**

Compliance Checklist

Directions: The Compliance Check List is included in your Packet so that school/charter personnel are informed of actions they are required to take *prior* to having an Application reviewed and scored by Technical Reviewers who represent the Arizona Department of Education (ADE). Members of the school/charter leadership team preparing the application should use the Compliance Check List as a tool to assist in analyzing the quality of the Application being submitted to the ADE.

Applicant school/charter Name _____

All statements will be verified by ADE staff.

- The Applicant school/charter has at least one representative participate in one of the webinars. Proposal Preparation Training provided on the following dates and locations. You must register on-line for the webinar of your choice at the ADE Calendar of Events at <http://www.azed.gov/onlineregistration/calendar/RenderCalendar.asp> Details will be emailed to you.
 - Friday, December 11th, 2009 at 11:00 am
 - Tuesday, December 15th, 2009 at 1:00 pm
 - Thursday, January 7th, 2010 at 3:00 pm
- The school/charter has submitted the ADE Technology survey, available via Common Logon as the Ed Tech Survey application, prior to completion of the application.
- A current Technology Plan is on file with ADE.
- Narrative sections must be in a **12 point type font, 1 ½ inch line-spacing** and **all margins must be 1 inch**. Charts, graphs, and tables may be single spaced with type no smaller than **10 point**. The application, **not including** the Appendices and required forms, shall not exceed **30 pages (not including charts and appendices)**.
- The Application was submitted in electronic form to edtechgrants@azed.gov as well as one (1) Original and three (3) hard copies delivered no later than 5:00 pm (MST) on February 5th, 2010. Failure to submit the Application electronically and ensure arrival at the ADE of an Original and 3 copies of your Application by the deadline constitutes non-compliance and is grounds for excluding your Application from the Technical Review process. **(Please review mailing and hand-delivery options provided on the last page of this Application Packet.)**
- The Applicant school/charter has satisfied any and all apparent violations of ADE procedures regarding required progress or completion reports or other requisite reporting in keeping with its responsibilities for receipt of federal and state funding. NOTE: Schools/charters that are unable to resolve their having been placed on programmatic “hold” and/or having been found to be currently ineligible to receive state or federal funding are **not** eligible to apply for this grant.

INTRODUCTION

ARRA Program Overview/Background

The *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* provides approximately \$100 billion for education with the short-term goal of stimulating the economy and the long-term goal of strengthening education and supporting reform. ARRA provides states with \$650 million for Education Technology State grants, which fall under the statutes of the Title II-D Enhancing Education Through Technology (EETT) program.

“The success of the education part of the *ARRA* will depend on the shared commitment and responsibility of students, parents, teachers, principals, superintendents, education boards, college presidents, state school chiefs, governors, local officials, and federal officials.”

--ARRA of 2009, United States Department of Education (USDOE)

ARRA includes four (4) guiding principles:

- Spend funds quickly to save and create jobs;
- Improve student achievement through school improvement and reform;
- Ensure transparency, reporting and accountability; and
- Invest one-time ARRA funds thoughtfully to minimize the “funding cliff.”

The second guiding principle, “improve student achievement through school improvement and reform” includes four (4) specific assurances requiring states to certify progress in these areas as a condition for receiving ARRA funding. These assurances were authorized under bipartisan education legislation – the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and the America Competes Act of 2007:

1. Making progress toward rigorous college and career-ready standards and high-quality assessments that are valid and reliable for all students, including English language learners and students with disabilities;
2. Establishing pre-K-to college and career data systems that track progress and foster continuous improvement;
3. Making improvements in teacher effectiveness and in the equitable distribution of qualified teachers for all students, particularly students who are most in need;
4. Providing intensive support and effective interventions for the lowest performing schools.

Technology addresses each and every assurance identified above, providing a great opportunity for states and districts to implement 21st Century Learning Environments demonstrating how technology can support school improvement and reform.

Grant Program Purpose

President Obama has consistently highlighted the urgent need to create 21st Century technology rich classrooms for America's students in order to boost the United States' economy in the short term, prepare students for the global workforce and ensuring participating teachers have the skills necessary to effectively use technology as an integral part of the educational experience. The ARRA EETT 21st Century Classrooms competitive grant will provide funding to assist eligible LEAs in **creating and expanding 21st Century technology rich classrooms** to help:

- Leverage technology to improve students' academic performance,
- Accelerate school improvement and reform efforts through the use of technology,
- Assist every student in becoming technologically literate by the end of the 8th grade.

ELIGIBILITY

Local Education Agency (LEA) eligibility to apply for a No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Title II-D competitive grant is defined in the United States Department of Education (USDOE) guidance as follows:

A "high-need local educational agency" is an LEA that –

- (1) Is among those LEAs in the State with the highest numbers or percentages of children from families with incomes below the poverty line; **and***
- (2) Serves one or more schools identified for improvement or corrective action under section 1116 of the ESEA, or has a substantial need for assistance in acquiring and using technology.^[1]*

Entities not eligible for Title I Part A funding **or** that are not among the highest numbers or percentages of children with incomes below the poverty line **may partner** with eligible LEAs, but may not respond independently to the competitive grant request for proposals (more information on eligibility can be found in section F of the USDOE guidance cited below.)

In determining the eligible LEAs for the purpose of this grant competition, the Arizona Department of Education has included the top 25% of Arizona LEAs who have the highest numbers or percentage of children from families with incomes below the poverty line. The poverty information used to generate this list can be found at <http://www.azed.gov/asd/operations/2010TITLEIALLOCATIONS.xls>.

This list of eligible LEAs includes LEAs across the state and represents over 91% of all students in Arizona and over 93% of Arizona students in poverty. For further information please contact Brett Hinton at 602-542-7884 or brett.hinton@azed.gov.

^[1] U.S. Department of Education, *Guidance on the Enhancing Education Through Technology (Ed Tech) Program*, March 11, 2002. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/programs/edtech/guidance.doc> on December 7th, 2009.

Partnerships

United States Department of Education’s guidance on Title II-D competitive grants indicates that a high-need LEA may apply as a part of an “eligible partnership”. An eligible partnership is comprised of a high-need LEA and at least one of the following organizations:

- (1) An LEA that can demonstrate that teachers in its schools are effectively integrating technology and proven teaching practices into instruction, based on a review of relevant research, and that the integration results in improvement in classroom instruction and in helping students meet challenging academic standards.
- (2) An institution of higher education that is in full compliance with the reporting requirements of section 207(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, and that has not been identified by the State as low-performing under that act.
- (3) A for-profit business or organization that develops, designs, manufactures, or produces technology products or services or has substantial expertise in the application of technology in instruction.
- (4) A public or private nonprofit organization with demonstrated expertise in the application of educational technology in instruction.

Due to the nature of this grant Response for Proposal (RFP), eligible partnerships may apply in this current grant opportunity; however, the Arizona Department of Education will **not** be encouraging the creation of partnerships or awarding bonus points for partnership applications.

Private Schools

Since 1965, school districts are required to provide timely and meaningful consultation with private school officials within their boundaries for equitable use of federal funding. This must occur during the design, development, and implementation of the grant proposal. Applicants will be required to include the Affirmation of Consultation document indicating that the LEA and applicable private school(s) have met and reviewed needed services as a part of the grant proposal process. **Indications that consultation occurred prior to this school year or prior to the development of this grant proposal do not meet the private school services requirements as outlined in the documents indicated below. Consultation must also occur during the process of developing the grant RFP.**¹

¹ More information may be found in section L-1 of the Enhancing Education Through Technology (EETT) Guidance Document, found at <http://www.azed.gov/Guidelines/EX-20.pdf> and section G of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act EETT guidance, found at <http://www.ed.gov/programs/edtech/guidance-arra.doc> and <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oi/nonpublic/index.html>.

PROJECT DESIGN

The project design section outlines important or required elements of an ideal grant response. Potential grantees should also review the following documents jointly developed by the State Educational Technology Director's Association (SETDA) and the National Association of State Title I Directors (NASTID) to further inform the development of their grant response:

Leveraging Title I and Title IID Partnerships: Maximizing the Impact of Technology in Education

http://www.setda.org/c/document_library/get_file?folderId=295&name=DLFE-490.pdf

Resource Guide Identifying Technology Tools for Schools

http://www.setda.org/c/document_library/get_file?folderId=295&name=DLFE-487.pdf

These two documents provide guidance on the elements that should be included in 21st Century classrooms as well as effective strategies and project approaches that grantees can incorporate into their project proposal. Please see the List of Resources included as Appendix A in this RFP.

Absolute Priorities

The two (2) absolute priorities for this particular grant competition are as follows:

1. Closing Student Achievement Gaps

Grant projects must target specific achievement gaps within an LEA and provide data that indicates the current achievement levels. Emphasis will be given to proposals that select a school that is in NCLB School Improvement status or has a label of Underperforming or Failing (up to **5 bonus points** are available for including schools in either category.) Given the limits of the funding awards, grant applicants should focus proposals on one or more specific grade levels or subjects at schools of the highest need.

Grant proposals must include:

- How grant expenditures and activities support existing site-level improvement plans and district-level consolidated plan goals.
- Data identifying the student achievement gaps to be addressed, as well as specifying the methods and frequency of assessment for evaluating student achievement during and immediately after the grant award period. Data may include information from AIMS, other standardized tests, benchmark testing, and other relevant diagnostic assessments or other data pertinent to the selected achievement gaps. (Relevant data can be included in Appendix A and referred to as necessary.)
- Data indicating the level of need for selected school sites and grade/subjects.

2. Technology Literacy

Enhancing technology literacy skills of students to prepare for the increasingly competitive and complex workplace is also a priority in this grant RFP. These technology skills are best obtained as **integrated and collaborative learning experiences** within core content areas, as opposed to being isolated as another content area for students. As an absolute priority, applicants are required to plan, develop, train, and deploy core curriculum that **embeds** the 2009 Arizona Educational Technology Standard. This may be represented in many forms such as, but not limited to, site curriculum maps and pacing guides, sample lesson plans, common professional planning/collaboration time, and other methods to ensure that technology standards are embedded in core content learning activities. The focus of these activities should be on students, subjects, or grade levels directly impacted by this grant

Grant proposals must include:

- Plan and budget to assess all impacted students using Learning.com's elementary or middle-school version of the 21st Century Skills Assessment at the beginning and end of the grant award period. **(This will be provided through the 10% evaluation and assessment holdback for each grant award.)**
- Plans to include a minimum of two (2) project-based learning experiences in which students will work with students from other locations as a part of the learning experience and/or share the results with other groups of students or organizations.
- Participation in the 2009 and 2010 Speak-Up survey about technology use for students, teachers, parents, and administrators. All impacted teachers and administrators and at least 50% of impacted students must take the survey in both years. Additional consideration will be given to grant responses that include specific plans for parents to participate in the survey. The survey can be accessed at <http://www.speakup4schools.org/speakup2009/extension/>. The secret password for Arizona (if your LEA does not already have one setup) is su4az.

A separate, smaller *Technology Planning and Standard RFP* will be issued in January to support LEAs' efforts to revise technology plans and embed the new educational technology standard into core content areas. **This Technology Planning and Standard RFP is not directly connected to this 21st Century Classroom grant RFP, but may provide an opportunity to expand efforts to embed the technology standard into core content areas beyond what is possible through the 21st Century Classrooms grant** (more information about this additional RFP opportunity will be given in the grant technical assistance webinars.)

Instructional Strategies

Deployment of 21st Century classroom technology should focus on supporting strategies that will assist an LEA with accomplishing their identified plan goals and the absolute priorities identified in this grant RFP. LEAs are encouraged to review the suggested strategies list at <http://www.ade.az.gov/asd/nclblibrary/StrategiesList.pdf> and focus their use of 21st Century classroom technologies to support one or more of those on the published list.

Listed below are some examples of strategies that 21st Century classrooms can support:

Student Engagement

Online Course/Hybrid Instruction Delivery

Extended Instructional Time/Day

Technology Delivered Instruction

Technology-enhanced RTI

Parent Involvement

Formative Assessments

Differentiated Instruction

Grant applications should clearly identify the pedagogical strategies being supported by the 21st Century classroom, and the professional development program should focus on using technology to support those elements. Additional examples of strategies and corresponding actions steps can be found in the Technology Strategies document at <http://www.azed.gov/technology>.

High Quality Professional Development

A recent research study on the use of technology (Marzano, 2009) indicates that the appropriate pedagogical application of technology significantly accelerates positive learning outcomes. It also indicates that using technology with less than optimal pedagogical approaches can actually decrease student achievement. As a result, it is imperative that grant applications plan for **sustained** professional development that is capable of supporting teachers through the pedagogical adjustments that are required to use technology effectively. Acceptable grant responses must define a rigorous, frequent, and on-going professional development program that lasts throughout the duration of the grant. Just as student technology literacy is best achieved through the hands-on use and application of technology embedded with other content areas, teacher technology literacy occurs when the primary focus is on effective teaching strategies using the technology and are practiced reflectively and consistently with strong and immediate peer support. Technology proficiency for educators will result from this active participation in the provided professional development.

Professional development plans included in responses to the grant RFP must include the following elements:

- Each impacted teacher must complete the **Intel® Teach Essentials** program or **Thinking with Technology** course provided by an Intel Master Trainer. More information about Intel® Teach programs can be found at <http://www.intel.com/education/teach/us/index.htm?iid=teach+us>.
- Each impacted administrator must also complete the **Intel® Leadership Forum**. More information about Intel® Teach programs can be found at <http://www.intel.com/education/teach/us/index.htm?iid=teach+us>.
- Each teacher in a 21st Century classroom must take a teacher technology proficiency assessment (to be indicated by ADE) at the beginning and end of the grant. **(Funding for**

use of this tool will be provided through the 10% evaluation and assessment holdback for each grant award.)

- Each teacher impacted by the grant must have his or her classroom scored on the Technology Integration Matrix rubric (to be provided by ADE) at the beginning and end of the grant.
- Collaborative planning opportunities between grant-impacted teachers within the project.
- Describe how the use of teacher technology proficiency assessment and Technology Integration Matrix rubric data to drive professional development for participating teachers and the methods for delivery of the professional development.

Instructional & Technical Support

Enhancing instructional activities with technology can be challenging for teachers unfamiliar with how to use or effectively integrate technology into the classroom. Grant responses must identify an approach for providing in-classroom support for grant-impacted teachers' use of technology. This may occur through a variety of methods including, but not limited to, providing a site-based technology integration coach, through co-teaching opportunities with colleagues, or by implementing peer coaching or other coaching models at the site. Acceptable grant responses must include plans to train or provide one coaching facilitator in the LEA and one peer coach at each school site participating in the grant.

Additionally, with the increase in availability of technology, additional technical support will be needed to ensure equipment is functioning properly and optimally. **Grant responses must provide details and a budget for how site-level technical support will be provided.**

Hardware

There is a variety of hardware and technology tools that can help enhance the learning experience for students and which help make a classroom a 21st Century classroom. These tools generally help individualize students' learning experiences, increase student engagement and motivation, provide immediate feedback from all students to a teacher, as well as enhancing the learning experience in many other ways.

Below is a list of equipment that a 21st Century classroom would generally include, but is not limited to:

- Teacher Laptop & Software
- Individual Computing Device for Each Student (*see additional information below*)
- Collaborative Learning System (interactive whiteboard, wireless slates, etc)
- Projector (if needed for the presentation device or a collaborative learning system)
- Learner Response Devices for Formative Assessment & Individualize Instruction (i.e. electronic responder or "clickers")
- Document Camera

- Digital Camera
- Video Camera
- Audio Enhancement System
- Robust Software & Digital Content
- Printer

Grant responses must include:

- Amount, types, and cost of equipment provided to each classroom.
- Detail on the instructional strategies that each type of equipment will support and enhance.

Individual Computing Devices

Given the range, capability, and pricing of devices today, the term individual computing device was used instead of one (1) laptop per student. An individual computing device must, as a minimum, be internet-capable and have webcam capability. **Individual computing devices that are internet-capable, but do not have webcams can be purchased as long as the classroom they are deployed in has a computer and a webcam that can be used with it.** Examples of devices that might be considered include netbooks, an iPod touch (or other equivalent device), or other similar devices, including traditional laptops. Potential grant responses are encouraged to consider which individual computing device(s) would provide the greatest learning potential at the best possible price and would be most appropriate for a given age level or content focus.

The new Arizona Educational Technology Plan includes suggestions for programs that distribute an individual computing device to each student. On page 41, the plan suggests LEAs consider a individual computing device for each student beginning in grade four and above, while maintaining a ratio of one computing device per three students at grade three and below (Arizona Department of Education, 2009). Potential grantees are encouraged to consider these suggested guidelines in the development of their grant response. The Arizona Educational Technology Plan can be found at https://www.ade.az.gov/technology/downloads/2009-2013_state_edtech_plan.pdf.

Digital Content

Much of the instructional impact made possible through technology is dependent on the quality of the content it allows students to access. Digital content can provide students access to the most up-to-date information, as well as offering engaging, interactive simulations and demonstrations that can accelerate or reinforce the learning process. Applicants should carefully plan the digital content that students and teachers will have access to and ensure they are leveraging existing digital content resources, such as IDEAL, Thinkfinity, Discovery Streaming, and SAS Curriculum Pathways. Grant responses should also provide details on what additional digital content will be used to address the specified achievement gaps and how those content resources will help individualize a student's learning experience.

Infrastructure

Adequate infrastructure is a vital component for the use of a 21st Century classroom as a reform model. Many of the rich, interactive resources and collaborative technologies require adequate bandwidth and network capacity. Recommendations for adequate bandwidth can be found on page 41 of the Arizona Educational Technology Plan, as well as in the SETDA whitepaper High-Speed Broadband Access for All Kids available at <http://www.setda.org/web/guest/2020/broadband>. Potential grantees should review these recommendations to help guide their project planning, selection of participating sites, and to ensure that project sites have adequate bandwidth to allow the use of robust digital content and collaborative tools. Grant applicants are also encouraged to leverage E-Rate funding to maximize WAN and Internet bandwidth; and should include in their proposal a brief description of their past E-Rate application history and plans for leveraging E-Rate in upcoming years. Applicants need to verify selected classrooms have sufficient electrical capacity for the additional hardware that would be purchased.

Infrastructure improvements are generally not eligible for funding as a part of this grant, **except for** the purchase and installation of a wireless network or to expand or upgrade existing wireless networks to support participating classrooms. Depending on the number of students in each classroom, applicants need to consider the number of wireless access points in each classroom that would be required to adequately support the number of participating students.

Grant responses must include:

- Total (in Mbps) and per-student average (in Kbps) of WAN connectivity (if applicable) for each school site involved in the project.
- Total (Mbps) and per-student average (Kbps) of Internet connectivity for the LEA.
- Total number of wireless access points available to project classrooms in the school.
- Wireless access points installed in each participating classroom.
- Plan for installation/upgrade of wireless networks.
- Plan for monitoring bandwidth utilization by participating classrooms.
- Assurance of sufficient electrical capacity for additional hardware in each grant-impacted classroom or timeline for needed improvements (including non-grant funding source).

Policies

As the use of collaboration and other learning activities through technology are expanded, schools and districts often need to re-examine policies around student and educator use of the technology. With the use of Web 2.0 and other collaborative authoring and learning tools, existing policies may not adequately address the increased levels of access or utilization that will occur in one-to-one learning environments. Applicants should engage local stakeholders and ensure policies and acceptable use agreements are consistent with the learning activities

that will occur in grant-funded classrooms. LEAs must consider creating or updating policy to include how damage or theft of the purchased individual computing devices will be handled. For more information and resources on important policy considerations for one-to-one learning environments, please see the following resources:

Leadership for Web 2.0 in Education: Promise and Reality Report

<http://www.cosn.org/web20/>

Intel K-12 Computing Blueprint

<http://www.k12blueprint.com/>

Grant responses must include:

- Copies of acceptable use agreements and Internet Safety policies.
- Plan for insurance and/or replacement of damaged or lost individual computing devices.

Capacity

Given the requirements for this grant RFP, applicants must provide evidence of prior successful one-to-one projects **or** prior planning for the implementation of one-to-one learning environments. Applicants must also provide evidence that the LEA is capable and has sufficient resources to meet the grant timeline and requirements outlined in this RFP. Up to **five (5) additional** are available for responses to this specific section.

Accountability & Evaluation

Grant awards will have two (2) separate evaluation components. One is an external evaluation that will be funded through a 10% budget holdback for assessment and evaluation (more information is available below in the section on funding). The other evaluation component is an internal grant evaluation and accountability plan. Each grantee must include an internal evaluation and accountability plan to identify baseline data, major strategies being used and actions that will be taken to measure the progress made towards the two (2) absolute priorities. *(See Part 4 and Appendix E in the grant application for additional information.)*

Timeline

All grant responses must provide a timeline indicating when major project milestones will occur and the individuals or groups that will be involved at each milestone. Timelines should incorporate the following considerations:

February 5 th , 2010	Grant applications due
February 22 nd , 2010	Grant awards issued
March 2010	Disbursement of initial funding distributed to grantees
March - July 2010	Purchasing and distribution of teacher laptops Professional development begins Additional hardware/infrastructure/digital content purchased & training
May 2010	1 st Grant Report due Grant Conference Call
August 2010	2 nd Grant Report Grant Conference Call Pre-Test for Student Technology Literacy Pre-Test for Teacher Technology Proficiency
November 2010	3 rd Grant Report Grant Conference Call
February 2011	4 th Grant Report Grant Conference Call
April - May 2011	Post-Test for Student Technology Literacy Post-Test for Teacher Technology Proficiency
June 30, 2011	Grant Conference Call Final obligation of funds
August 2011	End of Grant Report External Evaluation Report
September 2011	Completion Report Due Final Release of Funds

FUNDING

Maximum Award Amounts

It is anticipated that between 15 – 25 grants will be awarded. Grant awards will be limited to a maximum amount of \$1,000 **per student directly impacted** by the grant. The maximum total award amount **per grant** is \$500,000 (with 500 or more students served.) These cost estimates are inclusive of all required hardware, software, professional development, infrastructure and other costs. *(Please see the additional funds requirement section for more information about other required funding. The budget overview spreadsheet may be used to help ensure the grant award amount is calculated properly.)*

Additional Funds Requirement

Grant applicants are required to coordinate funding requests with other federal, state, and local funding sources. LEAs must provide **an additional twenty percent (20%)** of the calculated grant award amount from other funding sources. The LEA will need to indicate on the application the other funding sources, such as federal Title I, Title II-D, Title III, School Improvement, and IDEA, and state or local funding, which will be used in conjunction with this grant application. The other funding sources may reflect 21st Century classroom hardware that ***has been purchased from another funding source during the 2009-2010 school year*** and that will be placed in **classrooms selected for participation in the grant**.

The Explanation of Budget Requirements in Appendix B provides an example of how LEAs could assemble a grant budget that meets the above requirements.

Budget

Grant proposals must ensure project budgets are as follows:

- 25% or more of **EETT funds applied for** must be budgeted for professional development and **instructional** support activities (funds from other funding sources may also be used to increase the amount budgeted for professional development.)
- 10% of **EETT funds applied for** will be set-aside by ADE to provide evaluation and assessment services.
- The remaining EETT funds and the funds from other funding sources can be applied towards project activities and equipment.
- In the case of individual computing devices, applicants should also budget appropriately for a certain number of replacement devices in case of loss, damage, or malfunction to minimize the disruption for the learning environment.

The 10% for evaluation and assessment services will be set-aside by ADE to provide funding for students in all awarded projects to be assessed using the technology literacy assessment, all teachers to be assessed through the teacher technology proficiency assessment, and for external evaluation of each grant.

GRANT APPLICATION

All forms may be downloaded from the Education Technology website at <http://www.azed.gov/technology/downloads.asp>.

NOTE: Narrative sections are **typed, 1 ½ line space** and the font used is **12 point**. All margins are to be **1 inch**. Charts, graphs, and tables may be single spaced with type no smaller than **10 point**. The application, **not including** the Appendices and required forms, shall not exceed **30 pages (not including charts and appendices.)**

Part 1. Cover Page

Use the form provided in the proposal application.

Part 2. Executive Summary (3 page limit) (5 points)

Provide a summary of the proposal that concisely details how your proposed project meets the absolute priorities for this grant competition. The summary will include activities that align with the goals, an overview of approach, expected outcomes by grade level and curriculum focus, timeline, technology infrastructure and technical support needs, professional development approach, and measures of success. Also, the summary will include statements that indicate the school wants this opportunity and what experience the school(s) and LEA have had with implementing technology based grants/projects. The summary has a 3 page limit.

Part 3: Project Design Detail Narrative (50 points)

The purpose of the narrative is to provide a vivid and compelling picture of the project, the process of the project and the outcomes anticipated over the duration of the grant. The narrative may be supported by other documents either in the Appendices or through web links. Applicants are encouraged to involve all stakeholders in the research, planning and design phases of the process of developing the proposal, but determine that one writer/editor is the most logical way to develop the final application. The letters of support and commitment need to be referenced throughout the narrative. The project design narrative must incorporate the guidance and requirements described in the following sections above:

- Absolute Priorities
 - Closing Student Achievement Gaps (five (5) additional bonus points are available in this section for selecting one or more school sites in NCLB School Improvement status or with an AZLearns label of Underperforming or Failing.)
 - Technology Literacy
- Instructional Strategies
- High Quality Professional Development
- Instructional & Technical Support
- Hardware

- Individual Computing Devices
- Digital Content
- Infrastructure
- Policies
- Capacity **(an additional 5 bonus points are available for responses to this item)**
- Timeline

Part 4. Evaluation Matrix and Narrative Explanation (20 points)

Complete the matrix in Appendix E first and then provide a narrative that summarizes the evaluation method used to ensure accountability for this project and how the grantee will use the evaluation methods and data to report on-going progress to ADE (see additional information in Appendix E).

Part 5. Budget Narrative, Budget Detail, and Budget Description (15 points)

Include the following:

- **Part 5. Budget Narrative and Overview** (limit two (2) pages of narrative):
 - Complete the budget overview section including *total project cost, number of students directly impacted, dollar amount of proposed grant funding* (**Note: Proposed grant funding should not exceed \$1,000 per impacted student or \$500,000 total and must not exceed 80% of the total project cost**), and *dollar amount from other funding sources* (**Note: Must represent at least 20% of total project cost**).
 - Explain the overall budget including how grant monies will support the project goals. Describe additional committed funds for the project and include the funding source (EETT formula funds, Title I or other NCLB funds, and local capital or M & O funds.)
- **Part 5a. Budget Detail** (complete form)
 - Indicate each line item total indicating the amount in grant funds and/or other funding sources that will be used
 - **Please note that the 10% Holdback for Assessment should be budgeted in line number 43 on the budget detail form.**
- **Part 5b. Budget Description** (complete form)
 - For each line item from the budget detail form, include specific descriptions describing the services to be delivered or items to be purchased.

Use the forms provided for Parts 5a-b. (included with application)

Appendices

Appendix A: Data Used to Determine Targeted Achievement Gap (School Report URL and any other data)

Appendix B: Staffing Analysis (Fill in chart)

Include all personnel who will be participating and directly impacted by the grant project.

Appendix C: Professional Development (Fill in chart)

Indicate the professional development needed. Professional development needs to focus on teams of teachers over time versus one time training events. Include state and national conferences as applicable. Add rows as needed.

Appendix D: Support and Commitment Letters (10 points)

- Letters of commitment need to be obtained from the following groups:
 - Superintendent or Charter Holder
 - LEA Business Officer or equivalent
 - LEA Federal Programs Director
 - LEA IT Director
 - LEA Curriculum Director or equivalent
 - LEA Educational Technology Director or Trainer or equivalent
 - School Principal(s) from participating school sites
 - All participating teachers from each site
- Letters of Commitment must contain the following information
 - *His or her role in the pilot project.*
 - *His or her commitment to the project activities to achieve defined goals.*
 - *Participation in accountability/evaluation activities.*
 - **Teachers** *commitment must specifically include attendance at Intel® Teach training, completing the pre and post assessment for teacher technology proficiency, and administering the pre and post assessment for student technology literacy.*
 - **Superintendent or Charter Holder** *must commit to provide 20% of project funding from other funding sources.*

Appendix E: Accountability & Evaluation Matrix (Fill in chart)

The successful proposal must produce factual documentation illustrating how the proposal is increasing student achievement and having a positive impact on teaching and learning. The following document will guide you through the process of preparing, implementing, and scientifically evaluating the grant proposal through a comprehensive data-driven process. An excellent resource for evaluating technology projects can be found at the United States

Department of Education site at <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/EdTechGuide/> or www.neirtec.org/evaluation. These guides will take you through designing a scientifically based and measurable technology evaluation process. **Baseline data must be included.**
Add rows as needed.

- STEP 1.** The **baseline data** should provide information prior to the start of a program. This data will be used to set benchmarks to determine the amount of change you need to achieve throughout the stages of your project. Baseline data is collected **at the beginning** of the 2010-2011 school year. There are many sources of data that can be collected and utilized effectively when implementing the project goals, benchmarks and expected outcomes. Examples of data that can be used include surveys, interviews, school records, standardized test scores, observations, technology documents and portfolios, student retention, discipline referrals, attendance, etc. Baseline minimal data includes AIMS, the teacher technology proficiency assessment, and the student technology literacy assessment data. Other concrete measures may be quantified, displayed in summative format and used.
- STEP 2.** Analyze your technology needs through the baseline data and evaluate how it fits with the program goals.
- STEP 3.** Dissect each goal and determine realistic **strategies** that will lead to the achievement of the overall goal(s). Choose strategies that can be measured and have the ability to prove implementation. Some goals will require more strategies than others. Add rows as needed. This section outlines the step-by-step processes for reaching the end of program expected outcomes. It also provides a guide for staying on track with your project.
- STEP 4.** Set **benchmarks and target** dates that will define the progress the district/charter expects to make at specified points in time with respect to each indicator. These benchmarks should show the process for ongoing evaluation of the technology project.
- STEP 5.** List the **data sources that will be used to continuously measure progress.** These can include test scores, surveys, interviews, graduation rates and portfolios (based on a common rubric.) Every project will be monitored by the Arizona Department of Education and data that demonstrates ongoing evaluation of projects needs to be readily accessible. Examples of data sources will be required during the on-site monitoring of the program.
- STEP 6.** Describe the expected **outcomes/results** of each goal. Student achievement, student technology literacy, teacher technology proficiency, and/or parental/community involvement needs to be integral in your expected outcomes.

Sample Matrix

Project Goals	Sources of Baseline Data	Strategies for Achieving the Goal	Target Benchmarks	Proposed Process for Ongoing Evaluation	Data Sources for Ongoing Evaluation and End-of-Program Report	Desired Outcomes
<p>Sample Goal 2 Ensure every student becomes technologically literate by the 8th grade.</p>	<p>1 The TechLiteracy Assessment will be administered to targeted students to determine needs and skill levels.</p> <p>Student Technology Portfolios for 2010</p>	<p>1.1 Students will be trained to use the technology available with the Curriculum Integration Cart. Student will use the technology to create projects and store projects weekly to their portfolios</p> <p>1.2 Professional development for teachers to focus on integration of technology into authentic content related activities.</p>	<p>1.1.1.1 The percentage of technology proficient students will increase from 30% in 2010 to 50% in 2011.</p> <p>1.1.2.1 Student technology portfolios will indicate an increase in student's proficiency in district programs. 50% in 2010 to 70% in 2011. (You can move through the grant month by month, semester by semester or year by year.)</p>	<p>1. Annual participation in TLA with proficiency results obtained by the State Dept.</p> <p>2. Monthly examinations of Student Technology Portfolios including activities, student work, research, etc.</p>	<p>1. TLA Scores available shortly after assessments are administered.</p> <p>2. Student Portfolios</p> <p>3. Student Surveys</p> <p>4. Classroom Observation Walkthroughs</p> <p>5. Lab sign-in sheets for students to work independently on projects.</p>	<p>By the year 2011, a gain of 10% will be evident in student technology proficiency scores. Student projects will reflect high quality based on district rubrics.</p>

Submission

Provide an original and three (3) hard-copies of the proposals to ADE prior to 5:00 pm (MST) on **February 5, 2010** (see below for mailing or in-person delivery location). The application and Appendices **must also be submitted in electronic form to edtechgrants@azed.gov** no later than 5:00 pm (MST) on **February 5, 2010**. The three (3) hard copies will be made available to ADE Technical Reviewers. Applications will be available to download from the ADE website on <http://www.azed.gov/technology/downloads.asp>.

The application contains **Parts 1- 5 and Appendices A-E** and must be submitted in this order. Narrative sections must **be in a 12 point type font, 1 ½ inch line-spacing and all margins must be 1 inch.** Charts, graphs, and tables may be single spaced with type no smaller than **10 point.** The application, **not including** the Appendices and required forms, shall not exceed **30 pages excluding charts and appendices.**

Submission Information

<u>U.S. Postal Service Delivery, FedEx, UPS, or any delivery service</u> (Return-receipt-requested) Must be received at ADE by the closing date of February 5, 2010 at 5:00 pm (MST). To: Arizona Department of Education Educational Technology Unit 1535 W. Jefferson Street, Bin 8 Phoenix, AZ 85007	<u>Hand-delivered with Receipt Issued</u> Hand to: Brett Hinton – Fourth Floor 1535 W. Jefferson Phoenix, AZ 85007 May also be handed to other Education Technology staff
Deadline: 5:00 pm on February 5, 2010	

Proposal Preparation

You must register on-line for one (1) of the webinars of your choice at the ADE Calendar of Events: <http://www.azed.gov/onlineregistration/calendar/RenderCalendar.asp> Detailed instructions will be emailed to you.

Webinar Training Schedule

- Friday, December 11th, 2009 at 11:00 am
- Tuesday, December 15th, 2009 at 1:00 pm
- Thursday, January 7th, 2010 at 3:00 pm

Appendix A: List of Resources

1-to-1 Learning: Laptop Programs that Work. ISTE, 2009, ISBN 978-1-56484-254-1

Intel's Blueprint Solutions for K-12 One to One Ubiquitous Computing Initiatives

www.k12blueprint.com

ARRA Enhancing Education Through Technology Program Guidance (especially Appendix A)

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/edtech/guidance-arra.doc>

Enhancing Education Through Technology Program Guidance

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/edtech/guidance.doc>

2009-2013 Arizona Educational Technology Plan

https://www.ade.az.gov/technology/downloads/2009-2013_state_edtech_plan.pdf

SETDA Class of 2020 Whitepapers

<http://www.setda.org/web/guest/2020>

CoSN Leadership for Web 2.0 in Education: Promise and Reality Report

<http://www.cosn.org/web20/>

Intel Teach to the Future

<http://www.intel.com/education/teach/us/index.htm?iid=teach+us>

Arizona NCLB Consolidated Plan Strategies

<http://www.ade.az.gov/asd/nclblibrary/StrategiesList.pdf>

SETDA Leveraging Title I and Title IID Partnerships: Maximizing the Impact of Technology in Education

http://www.setda.org/c/document_library/get_file?folderId=295&name=DLFE-490.pdf

SETDA Resource Guide Identifying Technology Tools for Schools

http://www.setda.org/c/document_library/get_file?folderId=295&name=DLFE-487.pdf

CoSN Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) Resources & Tools

Case Studies - http://www.classroomtco.org/gartner_intro.html

TCO Tool - <https://k12tco.gartner.com/home/default.aspx>

TCO Checklist - <http://www.classroomtco.org/checklist/index.html>

Puget Sound Center Peer Coaching Program

<http://www.psctl.org/tl/index.html>

Florida Technology Integration Matrix

(provided as an example of what the technology integration matrix may look like)

<http://fcit.usf.edu/matrix/>

Appendix B: Explanation of Budget Requirements

The following examples are two methods that an LEA may use for putting together a budget that meets the requirements of the grant.

<u>Per Eligible Student</u>	<u>Cost v. Award/Allocation</u>
\$1,000 max per eligible student	200 eligible students
- <u>\$ 100</u> (10%) for required set-aside for evaluations	\$200,000 cost of project
- <u>\$ 250</u> (25%) for required PD	- <u>\$20,000</u> (10%) for required set-aside for evaluations
+ <u>\$ 200</u> (20%) LEA responsibility from other funding sources (Title I, Title II-D, Title III, M&O, etc. ~ excluding E-rate)	- <u>\$50,000</u> (25%) for required PD
\$ 850 per eligible student for other costs	+ <u>\$40,000</u> (20%) LEA responsibility from other funding sources (Title I, Title II-D, Title III, M&O, etc.~ excluding E-rate)
	\$ 170,000 total for other costs