

**ARRA/Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology
COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM – 2009-10 SCHOOL YEAR**

**REGIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR
TECHNOLOGY-RICH CLASSROOMS GRANT**

GENERAL INFORMATION:

The purpose of the Title II, Part D (Enhancing Education Through Technology) competitive grant program is to provide modest financial assistance to schools with high poverty and the greatest need for technology support and/or schools identified for improvement.

The American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) signed by President Obama in February of 2009 provides substantial assistance under the Enhancing Education Through Technology program for schools. This grant program is utilizing 100% ARRA funding and is to address one or more of the four assurances listed in Appendix B.

TIMELINE FOR REGIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR TECHNOLOGY-RICH CLASSROOMS GRANT APPLICATION	
Application Release	June 5, 2009
Submission Deadline (Received in VT DOE)	July 15, 2009 4:00 PM
Award Announcements	July 31, 2009
Project Implementation	September 1, 2009 - September 30, 2010

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TO IMPACT LEARNING IN TECHNOLOGY-RICH CLASSROOMS:

The focus of this grant is to select a *regionally-based* entity to organize, manage and lead an initiative to support Vermont schools that are considering or implementing models of technology use that include 1:1 computing, laptop carts, or student-owned technology. This grant supports the work of the Vermont Department of Education and in particular, supports the efforts being made by the Transformation of Education in the realization of student-centered learning with technology. This grant also addresses concepts in flexible learning environments by supporting schools that are placing technology in the hands of students and allowing them to access the web for learning beyond the school day. One grant award of up to \$200,000 will be released to an entity that can detail their capacity to provide a robust professional development experience that impacts teaching practice in technology rich learning environments.

BACKGROUND:

Over the past 5-7 years there have been a number of national efforts, both large and small scale, to have schools provide 1:1 laptop computing for students. 1:1 laptop computing implies 1 computer for 1 student. A well-known effort that has garnered national press coverage has been the Maine Learning Technology Initiative (<http://www.state.me.us/mlte/>). The Maine program has met with remarkable success and much of that success is due in part to the level of professional development that has been available to schools and teachers taking part in the program. There have also been many of these efforts, large and small, that have met with failure, usually in large part due to a lack of professional development that prepares teachers for the role

change that they experience when students have increased access to technology.

Vermont initiated its own pilot program in 1:1 computing in 2004-2007 and 3 schools made great strides in learning all that they could about what works, what is effective and how teachers change their teacher practice when their students have these tools for learning. There are still lessons to be learned and valuable data to be shared as more schools begin to develop technology programs that provide increased access for all students.

In 2009, we see opportunities that provide many schools with the chance to experiment and/or implement 1:1 or increasingly rich technology access for their students:

- The advent of Netbooks, small compact laptops with a low price tag, are widely available and many schools have implemented or are ready to implement 1:1 computing using these devices in individual classrooms as well as grade level clusters.
- The Vermont Modernization Project is in the planning stages. This project represents the possibility of developing state-wide support for 1:1 computing and building technology-rich classrooms. This grant could be used to further support the mission of that project.
- Hand-held devices that can access the Internet are readily available to many students and schools. Educators need to understand how to take advantage of these tools while assuring that students use them safely and judiciously.
- The “opening” of school networks to allow student-owned devices within the school building. As we move into the 21st Century, and prices on technology devices decrease, we will see more demand from parents that we allow, in a meaningful way, the advent of student-owned equipment and access to the Internet on that device.

This grant is not intended to purchase hardware for schools to build a 1:1 computing program, but instead seeks to develop a strong foundation for those schools and teachers willing to give their students full time or substantially increased access to authentic resources via the web. This grant also seeks to develop exemplar models that can be showcased for other schools that may be considering a move to a more technology-rich environment. Strong grant applications should reflect a thorough understanding of the research base that is currently available around the idea of 1:1 computing and technology-rich classrooms.

To make the most of this funding opportunity, a potential grant applicant should have a regionally based presence that would allow for increased exposure in all corners of the state. A regionally based entity has the most potential for tailoring training and professional development opportunities to the populations they serve. Strong applications will describe models that can be successful in each of the regions served.

ELIGIBILITY:

For purposes of this grant, a high need LEA must be selected to receive the funding. If the LEA is not directly involved with completing the work, there must be a clear relationship, (contract, memorandum of understanding, etc.) between the LEA and the entity doing the actual work. As long as the LEA is “high need”, the work can be carried out with *any* Vermont school. One grant award will be made to an eligible local partnership on behalf of eligible high-need Vermont schools, or school districts/ supervisory unions (LEA’s).

For purposes of this competition, a “high-need local educational agency” is an LEA that:

- Includes one or more schools with the highest numbers or percentages in the state of children from low-income families, or

- Serves one or more schools identified for improvement or corrective action under NCLB (§1116), or
- Has a substantial need for assistance in acquiring and using technology.

For more details on eligibility refer to Appendix A.

GRANT PROGRAM AREA

NOTE: APPLICATIONS MUST FOLLOW THE FORMAT AND CONTENT REQUIREMENTS AS FOUND ON PAGE 6.

1. SCOPE OF WORK:

Technology-rich classrooms are ones in which students have substantial access to technology. This can include computer carts, multiple computer stations regularly used in the classroom, or handheld devices that are employed for regular classroom activities, (iPods, PDA's, graphics tablets, etc.) These technology-rich environments represent many challenges for today's educator, but they also represent an exciting learning opportunity for students. Many research based models of instruction can thrive in this environment, including:

- a. Project based learning
- b. Differentiation of Instruction
- c. Formative Assessment practices

The most substantial piece of the work involved in this grant program is the development of a comprehensive professional development offering that can address the changes in teacher practice that are necessary when students have substantial access to technology. This professional development should not focus solely on the use of technology for teachers, but also address the teaching skills that teachers must develop in order to best take advantage of technology employed in the hands of students. Grant applications that focus on teacher expertise in using computer applications and software will be rejected. This work should be more encompassing and seek to build strong classroom teaching that can fully utilize technology. This should include:

- a. The fostering of a true understanding of student-centered learning;
- b. Building and sharing models of facilitation that allow the teacher to move most control of the learning to the student;
- c. Developing good models of leadership that will support a student-centered learning environment.
- d. Models developed by the recent report from the National Staff Development Council on what constitutes quality professional development practices
<http://www.nsd.org/news/NSDCstudytechnicalreport2009.pdf>

B. Expectations/Outcomes:

- a. The Vermont Department of Education would like to see this grant program be used as a support and resource for those schools and districts that are considering a more robust technology program such as 1:1 computing (on large or small scale). A successful outcome will be more schools implementing such a plan knowing that

- there is a mechanism available to them to support their schools and teachers in this endeavor.
- b. Grantee should plan for the development of a suitable medium from which to share successes of the program. Web page, portal, use of VTcite or Riverdeep Learning Village, any of which could be used to showcase work being done *and* provide short video and audio examples that illustrate successful practices.
 - c. While this is a professional development grant, and by its nature, mostly devoted to the above endeavors, Title IID requires that at least 25% of funds be dedicated to professional development.
 - d. Visits by grantee individuals or groups associated, to successful implementations or models of technology rich classrooms may be necessary.. These visits should be clearly indicated and outcomes associated with them should be apparent in the application. (example: Visiting Maine classrooms to see 1:1 computing at work. Outcome to be successful duplication of seen model).
 - e. Publicity, both web and printed materials should be made available to the Vermont Dept. of Education for purposes of sharing the experiences and showcasing successes for Title IID/ARRA expenditures.
 - f. A highly desired outcome of this work is sustainability. The entity involved in this endeavor should strive to develop a model that will move this initiative beyond grant funding for long term success.
 - g. A minimum of 5% of the grant funds must be devoted to evaluation of the program.

C. Collaborations: Grant reviewers will look favorably upon grants that develop collaborative relationships with other entities across Vermont's education landscape. Collaborations need not involve the sharing of funds, but simply a willingness to include other entities in developing the best models for schools.

D. Development of programs: Programs developed for support in technology rich environments should seek to use technology in every possible way to enhance the overall objectives and to model for participants best practices in the use of technology. All professional development opportunities should be based on research-based implementations and follow guidelines put forth by the International Society of Technology in Education (ISTE), specifically the National Education Technology Standards for Students and Teachers 2007, 2008 respectively. Multiple forms of learning are desired for teachers to learn best in the modality they choose. Grantee should not limit learning opportunities to only face to face, but allow for online courses, or hybrid models that incorporate videoconferencing and the use of the Learning Network of Vermont. Best applications will outline a plan that encompasses components set forth in both the:

- i. Vermont Transformation of Education
<http://education.vermont.gov/new/html/dept/transformation.html> and the;
- ii. Vermont 2009-2012 Vermont Educational Technology Plan
http://education.vermont.gov/new/pdfdoc/pgm_edtech/edtech_plan_2012/edtech_plan_2012_complete.pdf.

E. The grant will support the following:

- i. Mileage, lodging, travel expenses, stipends, coordinator expenses for individuals or entities involved in the work;
- ii. Stipends, incentives and credit for participants in professional development activities;
- iii. This is NOT a hardware grant, though some limited hardware purchases will be

- allowed for each region;
- iv. Books, materials, supplies, coffee and food for meetings or activities.

F. Grant Amount: The maximum amount of funds for which a school, district or supervisory union may apply is not to exceed \$200,000. These funds will be from the 2009 ARRA funding provided to Vermont. There is a possibility, depending on funds available, to provide a second year funding award. Said award would be limited to half the first year funding amount, (\$100,000). *This is at the discretion of the VT Department of Education and is not a guarantee of Year Two funding!*

G. Timeline: Award in end of July 2009, funds available after September 1, 2009 and grant expiration September 30, 2010.

Please see the “Format and Content” section for information on how to structure the application starting on Page 6.

Application Format & Content

Total application should be **NO MORE THAN FIVE (12) PAGES**, single-spaced, font sizes 10-12.

- 1. Abstract:** Please provide a one paragraph abstract that describes the grant program.
- 2. Program Description** (no more than 4 pages): Describe what entity will do to coordinate regions, develop a professional development plan, and carry through the task. **(50 Points)**
 - Goals - Clear articulation of the Expectations described in this RFP.
 - Scope of Work – Specific, bulleted list of the work to be performed and the products or outcomes of the project clearly articulated.
 - Timeline – What will be completed, when?
- 3. Capacity for Success** (no more than 3 pages): This particular aspect is crucial. Entities must clearly indicate how their group can meet the regional need described in this grant application. Describe why this is the right kind and size of project for your entity. Include such items as: **(20 Points)**
 - Who (describe roles, not individual names please) will be responsible for conducting the work;
 - What structures and procedures are already in place or proposed that will support this project and/or enhance its sustainability;
 - Evidence that this plan is realistic and that the grantee has the capacity to achieve the objectives;
 - Evidence that the regional structure is equitable in nature and that all regions of the state will be served.
- 4. Evaluation** (no more than 2 page): Upon completion of the project, there will be an evaluation required for final reporting. A minimum of 5% of the grant award **must** be devoted to evaluation of the grant program. There are also ARRA guidelines in Appendix B that address specific ARRA evaluation. Proposals should articulate the following:
 - The critical questions that will need to be addressed over time;
 - What mechanisms will be in place to evaluate and adjust as the project moves forward?
- 5. Budget Narrative (no more than 2 pages.): You must also complete the ****SEPARATE BUDGET PAGE****.** The budget narrative should demonstrate a logical connection to the expectations described (above), and should be specific enough to give reviewers an idea of your priorities and focus for funding. The narrative should include: **(10 Points)**
 - Justification for the major expenditures proposed, especially salaries;
 - Explanation of any items on the budget sheet that might not be completely clear to a reader.

Submission Process

All proposals must include an Original plus TWO (2) copies (Faxed or e-mailed applications will NOT be accepted) with:

- Proposal Cover Page with superintendent's signature and DUNS#
- Abstract: A brief paragraph describing the overall grant program.
- Content of Application as noted on page 6
- Budget Page and Narrative

Application Deadline: Original plus two (2) copies of proposals must be received by the Vermont Department of Education no later than **4:00 p.m. on July 15, 2009**. Mail to:

Title II, Part D Technology Grants - c/o Peter Drescher
Vermont State Department of Education
120 State Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05620-2501

Selection Process: All proposals will be read and reviewed by an independent review panel. This panel will rate the quality of the proposal (See Scoring Guide below) and the capacity of the applicant to successfully implement what has been proposed. Proposals will be scored in each of the four areas described above.

Scoring Rubric: Enhancing Education Through Technology

Criteria	Poor	Average	Excellent
<p>Program Description – Describe what grantee will do with the funds if received. In addition to a clear description of the activities to be undertaken, points will be assigned for: (50 Points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Are goals around the expectations clearly articulated?</i> • <i>Is there a bulleted Scope of Work that supports those goals?</i> • <i>Are needs & process for identifying them clearly identified?</i> 	0 – 17	18 – 35	36 – 50
Program Description – Total Score (MAX is 50):			
<p>Capacity for Success - Describe why this is the right kind and size of plan for your entity, and what structures are in place to support it?: (20 Points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Have the parties responsible for conducting the work been identified?</i> • <i>Are structures, resources, policies, and procedures in place or proposed?</i> • <i>Has the equitable regional nature of this grant been addressed?</i> • <i>Is the plan realistic? Does capacity exist to achieve objectives?</i> 	0 – 6	7 – 13	14 – 20
Capacity for Success – Total Score (MAX is 20):			
<p>Evaluation - Describe the process you will follow to focus and possibly adjust to meet the expectations: (20 Points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Are the primary focus areas and specific measurements identified?</i> • <i>Are mechanisms in place to evaluate as the work progresses?</i> 	0 – 6	7 – 13	14 – 20
Evaluation – Total Score (MAX is 20):			
<p>Budget Narrative and Page – The budget should demonstrate a logical connection to the areas described above, and should be specific enough to give reviewers an idea of your priorities and focus for funding. (10 Points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Is justification for major expenditures (especially salaries) reasonable?</i> • <i>Explanation of items that won't be immediately obvious to someone reading your proposal for the first time</i> 	0 – 3	4 – 7	8 – 10
Budget – Total Score (MAX is 10):			
TOTAL SCORE (MAX IS 100)	_____		

Budget Page

Grant Area

Professional Development for Technology-rich Classrooms

Budget (Describe as appropriate)	TOTAL
Professional Development (25% minimum)	
Evaluation (5%)	
Salary & Wages	
Infrastructure	
Hardware	
Software	
Travel	
Consultants & Contracts	
Teacher Stipends	
Equipment	
Website development	
Other (equipment rental, printing)	
TOTAL	

- Please use Budget Narrative page to elaborate and/or describe further

**ARRA/Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology
Competitive Grant Program – 2009-10**

PROPOSAL COVER PAGE

School District or SU			
DUNS (Data Universal Numbering System) #			
Contact Person			
Phone			
Fax			
E-mail			
Grant Program Area	Professional Development Technology Rich Classrooms <input type="checkbox"/>		
List all schools for which this proposal applies	<u>Schools</u> This is a statewide focus	<u>Grade Spans</u>	<u>Enrollment</u> (To be completed by VT DOE)
Total Funds Requested			
CIPA Certification	Superintendent has certified CIPA compliance (Check one or more): ___ on school technology plans ___ on last E-Rate application ___ on 2008 Consolidated E-Application		
Superintendent's Signature			
Date			

APPENDIX A

Additional Details on Eligibility for Title IID

An “eligible local partnership” is a partnership that includes at least one high-need LEA *and* at least one of the following –

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- A public or private nonprofit organization with demonstrated expertise in the application of educational technology in instruction.
- An individual with demonstrated expertise and capacity to lead the initiative and address expectations listed below.

REQUIREMENTS: For an LEA to receive funding under this program:

- All schools in the LEA *must* have a current “Educational Technology Plan” approved by the Department of Education through June 30, 2009, and be developing a new plan for the upcoming 2009-2012 plan period.
- Must participate in the annual “Technology Indicators Data Collection” conducted by the Department of Education.
- Must certify that all “high-needs” schools in the LEA meet requirements under the Children’s Internet Protection Act.

Must use a minimum of twenty-five percent (25%) of these funds for ongoing, sustained, intensive, high-quality professional development in integrating and using advanced technologies in instruction and in new learning environments to:

- a. Educate regional groups on current theories and practices in education technology.
- b. Build capacity in regions around current best practices in skill sets required of students in 21st Century schools.
- c. Lead to better awareness and practice on said methods of instruction.

*Note: This grant has inherent professional development encompassing most of the project.

Private School Participation - LEAs or partnerships must engage private school officials with whom they consult for Title I purposes during the development and implementation of competitive Title II-D programs. If this grant application is applicable to these circumstances, be prepared to supply documentation.

APPENDIX B

American Reinvestment and Recovery Act---4 Assurances

One of the guiding principles behind the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act is, “improve student achievement through school improvement and reform” and addresses the four specific assurances included in ARRA 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 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.

Evaluation and Reporting Requirements

An additional expectation for use of ARRA funds is full transparency in reporting on use of funds. All sub-recipients will be required to report to the Vermont Department of Education of Education for federal reporting purposes on a quarterly basis at minimum, the amount of funds expended, how they were expended and the number of jobs created or retained with use of these funds. Be aware also, that additional reporting requirements may be forthcoming.