

**MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (MDE)**

**Office of Education Improvement and Innovation (OEII)  
Educational Technology and Data Coordination**

**2015-16 Technology Readiness Infrastructure Grant (TRIG)  
Request for Proposal (RFP)**

**DISTRICT PARTICIPATION and STATEWIDE ACTIVITIES  
GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS**

**DISCLAIMER:**

**THE FOLLOWING COMPETITIVE GRANT IS ANNOUNCED AND AWARDS ARE CONTINGENT ON THE AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS. GRANT APPLICATIONS WILL BE COLLECTED USING THE MICHIGAN ELECTRONIC GRANTS SYSTEM *PLUS* (MEGS+).**

The 2015-16 TRIG District Participation RFP General Instructions include:

- Part I            General Information
- Part II           Funding Information
- Part III          Review Process Information
- Part IV          Application Information and Instructions and Review Criteria
- Part V           Statewide Activity Rubrics  
                    Grant Application Checklist

**Part I: General Information**

**INTRODUCTION:**

Section 22i of Public Act 85 of 2015 provides \$23.5 million in funding for competitive grants for the development or improvement of districts' technology hard infrastructure, the shared services consolidation of technology and data and for the coordination and strategic purchasing of hardware and software in preparation for the delivery of assessments through online models.

As defined in legislation "hard infrastructure" means technology hardware necessary to move to an online learning and testing environment, including, but not limited to, fiber, servers, wireless computing networks, and necessary peripherals.

"Shared services consolidation of technology and data" means projects that support the move to a collaborative multiple organizational approach to managing hardware, software, peripherals, and data integration and display of appropriate information for parents, teachers, administrators, and this state".

The legislation calls for the MDE, under the direction of the State Board of Education, in consultation with the Michigan Department of Technology, Management, and Budget (MDTMB), to establish competitive grant criteria for awarding grants. Public school districts, public school academies, and intermediate school districts are eligible to apply.

For the purpose of the application, public school districts and public school academies will be referred to commonly as “districts.” Intermediate school districts will be referred to as “ISDs.”

### **PURPOSE OF THE GRANT:**

The Technology Readiness Infrastructure Grant Program will fund the following activities:

1. Developing and implementing collaborative purchasing arrangements for statewide network services, and personal learning and assessment devices.
2. Establishing sustainable, cost-effective collaborations of technology and data related services to assist schools and districts to become “test ready.”
3. Building the capacity of educators at ISDs, public school districts, and public school academies to effectively plan and implement online assessments and “Any Time, Any Place, Any Way, Any Pace” learning.

### **PROGRAM DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS:**

The MDE seeks sustainable and collaborative statewide applications to help every district develop a technology readiness plan and make the best investments for delivering online assessments and “Any Time, Any Place, Any Way, Any Pace” learning. The MDE seeks to support districts and ISDs in moving from building technology infrastructure to implementing technology infused instruction.

### **GRANT STRUCTURE:**

The grant has been divided into two components, District Participation and Statewide Activities to streamline the application process:

#### ***District Participation***

In order to receive funding for District Participation, districts must complete a Michigan Electronic Grant *Plus* (MEGS+) grant application. The application requires districts to agree to all current funding requirements (see page nine). ISDs must also agree to the District Participation requirements in order for their constituent districts to receive funds. Grants awarded under this subsection shall be distributed on an equal per pupil basis, not to exceed ten dollars per pupil. A grant narrative and budget are not a requirement of the District Participation application process.

## ***Statewide Activities***

The Statewide Activity funding is available to all districts and ISDs. There are four available statewide activity awards. They are Device Purchasing, Data Integration, E-Rate, and Administration. The Device Purchasing activity will continue to develop, issue, and administer statewide bids for mobile learning devices and desktop computers to support online testing and the “Any Time, Any Place, Any Way, Any Pace” initiative. This activity will begin to work on developing best practices for districts to build sustainable device purchasing cycles. The Data Integration activity will continue to develop and implement a Standards-Based Enterprise Data Architecture that facilitates the exchange of information among the stakeholders in Michigan who work to improve student achievements. This activity will further its work to streamline the transfer of state level data between local districts, ISDs, and regional, back to the state. The E-Rate activity will continue to improve upon the efficiencies and effectiveness of the E-Rate process. This activity will begin to further the cost effectiveness of the process by integrating with continued and sustained TRIG Statewide activities. The Administration award will continue to fund an operations office to coordinate communication, and evaluate the work of TRIG as a whole. The operations office will begin to implement a sustainability plan to provide continuity of continued TRIG efforts, which build a foundation for continued technology initiatives.

Applicants may partner with external partners to provide services. Applicants will propose a means by which they will carry out, or continue to carry out, the work and the external partnerships necessary to complete it. To build and ensure statewide collaboration the MDE will not award multiple activities to a single applicant.

### **ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS:**

All individual districts and ISDs are eligible to receive TRIG funds if they satisfy the following requirements:

- Individual districts and ISDs must demonstrate need by completing the Michigan Technology Readiness Assessment tool (MTRAx) by December 18, 2015.
- Individual districts and ISDs must agree to complete an updated technology readiness planning process designated by the MDE by June 30, 2016.
- For an ISD to be eligible, the ISD must demonstrate that funds awarded on behalf of constituent districts will enable cost savings.
- Added consideration will be given to applicants that propose external partnerships and articulate plans for sustainability beyond grant funding.

## **NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION:**

Section 22.i specifically limits the use of funds to districts, ISDs, and “constituent districts.” The generic term “district” refers to both public school districts and public school academies. State law does not provide for non-public schools to directly receive state aid funds. There are several ways non-public schools can benefit from the technology infrastructure investments and programs established through this grant program:

1. Non-public schools can ask the state to include this location in the statewide bid related to establishing the State Master Contract (SMC) for network services. This should lower connectivity costs and provide a mechanism for access to the State Education Network (SEN).
2. Non-public schools will be permitted to participate in the statewide collaborative device purchasing program. Participating non-public schools will not be eligible to receive any financial incentives or rebates, but will benefit from the volume discounts that result.
3. Non-public schools can participate in the technology readiness planning process through the consortia formed to carry out the work. The MDE will provide interested non-public schools with consortia contact information to facilitate their involvement.
4. Non-public schools can participate in the classroom readiness professional development program “at cost.” This means a limited number of non-public schools, determined by the awardee, can purchase seats in the program for the cost of program delivery. The MDE anticipates providing non-public schools with a lower cost/high quality educational technology professional development opportunity.

**TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE: \$23,500,000**

The legislation limits individual districts to be awarded no more than \$2 million. ISD awards are also limited to no more than \$2 million per constituent district. These funds are part of 2015-16 State School Aid Act and are available for award after October 1, 2015. These funds must be obligated to eligible recipients by the MDE no later than September 30, 2016.

## **CATEGORY FUNDING RANGES:**

***District Participation* \$11,250,000**

District participation funds will be calculated at an equal per pupil basis, not to exceed ten dollars per pupil.

**Statewide Activities**

**\$12,250,000**

- Device Purchasing Incentives approx. \$9,250,000
- E-rate approx. \$300,000
- Data Systems Integration approx. \$2,200,000
- Administration approx. \$500,000

**LENGTH OF AWARD:**

Funding will be made available following approval of the grant awards by the State Superintendent, with an ending date of June 30, 2017.

**REJECTION OF PROPOSALS:**

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

**OPENING AND CLOSING DATES:**

The MDE released the general instructions, scoring rubric, and supporting information for the TRIG on Thursday, October 15, 2015, on the [www.michigan.gov/mde](http://www.michigan.gov/mde) website and the [www.TechPlan.org](http://www.TechPlan.org) website. Applications must be submitted in MEGS+. Dates are subject to change.

**PROCESS FOR THE GRANT COMPETITION:**

Applications will be received and reviewed according to the timeline below. The tentative time frame for the operation of this grant program includes these major milestones: \*

October 15, 2015	Request for Proposal (RFP) Instructions released
October 15, 2015	District Participation and Statewide Activity MEGS+ Application opened
December 18, 2015	MTRAx reporting due for all applicants District Participation and Statewide Activity MEGS+ applications due at 11:59PM ET
January 22, 2016	Participation awardees announced and funds awarded via the Cash Management System (CMS)
June 30, 2016	2015-2016 participation requirements complete

August 31, 2016	Statewide Activity Progress Performance Report due
June 30, 2017	All grant activities completed and all award funds spent
August 29, 2017	Statewide Activity Final Performance Report and Final Expenditure Report due
January 1, 2017	Legislative Report Due

\*All dates are subject to change

### **PREPARING THE NARRATIVE AND UPLOADS:**

Only the Statewide Activity applications are required to prepare and upload a narrative. Statewide Activity application narratives should be prepared simply and economically with the narrative portion of the proposal **no more than 20 double-spaced pages in length, with a font no smaller than Verdana 11 point; page numbers must be included on the lower right corner of the narrative pages.** All pages in attachments should have one-inch margins and be collated and numbered consecutively throughout. Appendices of charts and graphs should be limited to 4 pages per participating ISD. Addenda accompanying applicant proposals should be limited to **10 double-spaced pages using 11 point Verdana font.** District Participation applications do not require a narrative or budget.

### **ACKNOWLEDGMENT:**

All publications, including reports, films, brochures, and any project materials developed with funding from this program, must contain the following statement: "These materials were developed under a grant awarded by the Michigan Department of Education."

### **OWNERSHIP OF MATERIALS PRODUCED:**

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

### **QUESTIONS**

Questions regarding TRIG applications should be directed to the MDE-OEII, telephone: (517) 241-3629. You may also e-mail Amanda Stoel at [stoela@michigan.gov](mailto:stoela@michigan.gov).

## **Part II: Funding Information**

### **FUNDING PROCESS:**

The MDE will make the funds for both categories available through a competitive application process and method of grant distribution to eligible districts and intermediate districts.

### **PAYMENT SCHEDULE:**

All grantees are required to request funds, as needed, to reimburse for expenditures incurred by the program. Requests for funds can be made by selecting "Requesting Funds for a Project (DS-4492)" in the CMS at <https://mdoe.state.mi.us/cms/>. Payment to the grantee is made through the Michigan Department of Education, Office of Financial Management.

### **INDIRECT CHARGES:**

State law does not allow indirect charges on State School Aid funds.

### **FINANCIAL REPORTING:**

A final expenditure report will be required within 60 days of the grant ending date, showing all bills paid in full.

### **FINAL REPORTING:**

The grantee will provide a report of the project to include measurable outcomes based on grant objectives. The report shall include a summary of compiled data for each statewide activity as a means to evaluate the participation in and the effectiveness of the grant activity. The report will include a detailed PowerPoint presentation. PowerPoint reports will be posted on the MDE website, as received. The intent of the PowerPoint is to share the project outcomes with interested educators. The grantee will also be required to compile data to provide a means to evaluate the effectiveness of the grant project.

### **ASSURANCE OF ACCURACY:**

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

## **Part III: Review Process Information**

### **REVIEW PROCESS:**

The MDE utilizes a review panel when reviewing its competitive grants. For this grant program, review teams will be composed of people from within and outside the MDE, with expertise in technology readiness planning and implementation. The MDE's OEII staff will supervise the review process. When reviewing continuation grants the MDE utilizes an internal administrative review process.

Award selections for both competitive and continuation will be based on merit and quality, as determined by the review criteria provided in each TRIG category. All funding is subject to approval by the State Superintendent. All applicants will be notified of the Superintendent's action regarding their application.

### **REVIEW CRITERIA:**

The rubrics identified for each of the Statewide Activities must be addressed when writing the application narrative and developing a budget. The reviewers will judge proposals against the elements described in the rubric.

## **Part IV: Application Information and Instructions and Review Criteria for the Technology Readiness Infrastructure Grant**

### **DISTRICT PARTICIPATION APPLICATIONS:**

To receive funding allocated for this section, districts must agree to all four of the following requirements. Once applicants have agreed to the requirements, the MDE anticipates awarding funds to districts in January 2016 through the CMS, calculated at an equal per pupil basis, not to exceed ten dollars per pupil. If all four requirements are not met by June 30, 2016, the MDE may take action to recapture awarded funds.

To be eligible for participation funding, districts must agree by December 18, 2015, in MEGS+ to meet the following requirements:

1. *The district agrees to limit participation funds spending for technology readiness efforts.*
  - *Online/Digital Assessment, including universal diagnostic screening tools*
  - *In-building wireless connectivity*
  - *Network services (e.g. additional bandwidth, content filtering)*
  - *Computer/device purchasing*
  - *Technology readiness for instruction and data collaborations that support online assessment readiness*
2. *The district agrees to be represented in TRIG sponsored statewide 470 bids for E-rate funding and consider using the awarded vendors, although districts will not be bound to purchase from the bid. The district agrees to apply for all of its eligible E-rate Priority 1 service(s) where such participation is economically advantageous to the district.*
3. *The district agrees to participate in any surveys or data collection processes sent out by the MDE or the TRIG Operations Office to inform the work of the various activities (maximum of three total per fiscal year).*
4. *The district understands that its ISD must also agree to these requirements for the district to receive participation funds.*

## **Part IV: Statewide Activity Rubrics**

### **STATEWIDE ACTIVITIES GRANT APPLICATIONS:**

Grant funds released through the TRIG RFP will be used for the purpose of coordinating statewide activities designed to increase the technology readiness of every district to deliver online assessments and provide every student with opportunities for “Any Time, Any Place, Any Way, Any Pace” learning. To accomplish this, the following statewide activities are identified as necessary to meet the purpose and design of TRIG. These applications must be in conjunction with external partners to provide one or more of the statewide activities that carry out the grant work. Applicants will propose a means by which they will carry out and improve upon the work already established in the state.

Expectations of grantees will be to:

- Participate in the statewide evaluation process for the purpose of developing and delivering annual reports
- Link to past work
- Coordinate with ongoing MDE initiatives
- Coordinate and reinforce local technology related efforts
- Collaborate between all TRIG Statewide Activities
- Follow TRIG Process and Procedures
- Maintain current project management

### ***Administration – up to \$500,000 100 Points Possible***

The MDE continues to seek sustainable, cost-effective statewide and regional collaborations that will organize ISDs and districts into manageable groups to help every district develop a technology readiness plan and make the best investments for delivering online assessments and “Any Time, Any Place, Any Way, Any Pace” learning. For maximized efficiencies the MDE recognizes the need for an operations office that oversees all TRIG related activities, keeps the work focused on statewide programs, develops a communications plan that will keep all stakeholders abreast of the progress of the grant, and fosters sustainability of technology initiatives through shared leadership. The TRIG Operations Office will also leverage all statewide activities for the purpose of ensuring every district is “test-ready.” They will also continue to oversee the completion of the statewide evaluation for TRIG.

**Administration - Objectives/Deliverables (40 pts.)**

Not Recommended for Funding (0 points per box)	Recommended for Funding with Revisions (1-4 points per box)	Recommended for Funding (5-8 points per box)	Highly Recommended for Funding (9-10 points per box)
<p>The proposal: does not include a description of new or continued program goals, objectives, deliverables, activities, and outcomes; does not address the grant expectations.</p>	<p>The proposal: includes a description of continued program goals, objectives, deliverables, activities, and outcomes, but does not include new activities and the outcomes are not clear and measurable; vaguely addresses the grant expectations.</p>	<p>The proposal: includes a description of new and continued program goals, objectives, deliverables, activities, and outcomes but they are not clear or measurable; addresses the grant expectations.</p>	<p>The proposal: includes a detailed description that concisely articulates new and continued program goals, objectives, deliverables, activities, and outcomes that are clear and measurable; addresses the grant expectations in great detail.</p>
<p>does not include a comprehensive TRIG communication plan.</p>	<p>includes a vague description of a TRIG communication plan.</p>	<p>includes a detailed description of a TRIG communication plan, but does not include key audiences or means to evaluate the plan.</p>	<p>includes a comprehensive TRIG communication plan that includes key audiences, key messaging, and a plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the plan.</p>
<p>does not include strategies for coordination of TRIG at a statewide level.</p>	<p>includes unrealistic strategies for coordination of TRIG at a statewide level.</p>	<p>includes strategies for coordination of TRIG at a statewide level, but does not detail how they will be executed.</p>	<p>includes comprehensive strategies for coordination of TRIG at a statewide level, including how, when and by whom they will be executed, as well as how the strategies will be evaluated.</p>
<p>does not include a description that states how the activity leadership will work with the MDE to ensure support, evaluation, coordination, and monitoring of TRIG as a whole.</p>	<p>includes a description that vaguely describes how activity leadership will work with the MDE to ensure support, evaluation, coordination, and monitoring of TRIG as a whole.</p>	<p>includes a description that states how activity leadership will work with the MDE to ensure support, evaluation, coordination, and monitoring of TRIG as a whole.</p>	<p>provides a detailed description that states exactly how activity leadership will work with the MDE to ensure support, evaluation, coordination, and monitoring of TRIG as a whole.</p>

**Administration - Partnerships (15 pts.)**

Not Recommended for Funding (0 points per box)	Recommended for Funding with Revisions (1-2 points per box)	Recommended for Funding (3-4 points per box)	Highly Recommended for Funding (5 points per box)
The proposal:	The proposal:	The proposal:	The proposal:
does not identify strategies to continue the TRIG Consortia Model.	identifies strategies to continue the TRIG Consortia Model, but it doesn't appear to maximize the value of the consortia model or does not include an implementation plan for the identified strategies.	identifies strategies to continue maximizing the value of the TRIG Consortia Model, as well as an implementation plan for the identified strategies.	clearly details strategies that continue to maximize the value of the TRIG Consortia Model, as well as an implementation plan for the identified strategies.
has no identified partnerships.	provides a description of proposed external partnerships.	provides a detailed plan for proposed external partnerships and mentions established external partners.	clearly details established external partners (MDE, DTMB, and other state level partners), which provides evidence of historical experience, high qualified skills, shared resources, knowledge and expertise; and a detailed plan for outreach to proposed new partners.
provides no evidence of the nature of the partnerships.	provides little detail to the nature of the partnership.	provides some detail to the nature of the partnership.	provides evidence and clearly detail of the nature of each partnership. The partnerships support the sustainability of TRIG.

**Administration - Project Leadership (10 pts.)**

Not Recommended for Funding (0 points per box)	Recommended for Funding with Revisions (1-2 points per box)	Recommended for Funding (3-4 points per box)	Highly Recommended for Funding (5 points per box)
The proposal: does not define the leadership roles and responsibilities.	The proposal: includes a brief description of the leadership roles and responsibilities.	The proposal: includes a description of the leadership roles and responsibilities.	The proposal: explicitly defines the leadership roles and responsibilities.
does not describe past work experience.	includes a brief description of past work experience.	includes a description of past work experience.	explicitly defines past work experience with examples, such as other large statewide projects.

**Administration - Budget (15 pts.)**

Not Recommended for Funding (0 points per box)	Recommended for Funding with Revisions (1-2 points per box)	Recommended for Funding (3-4 points per box)	Highly Recommended for Funding (5 points per box)
The proposal: does not include a budget narrative or the budget narrative does not related to the deliverables address in the objectives/deliverables section.	The proposal: provides a budget narrative with minimal detail.	The proposal: provides a detailed budget narrative.	The proposal: provides a clearly detailed budget narrative that links budget line items to deliverables and outcomes.
does not includes a complete MEGS+ budget summary form and budget detail.	N/A	N/A	includes a MEGS+ budget summary and detail that is allowable, necessary, and reasonable.
includes administrative fees within the budget higher than ten percent.	includes administrative fees between five and ten percent.	includes minimal administrative fees providing for maximum funds to be directed primarily for project deliverables.	includes no administrative fees.

**Administration - Commitment, Capacity, and Sustainability (20 pts.)**

Not Recommended for Funding (0 points per box)	Recommended for Funding with Revisions (1-4 points per box)	Recommended for Funding (5-8 points per box)	Highly Recommended for Funding (9-10 points per box)
The proposal:	The proposal:	The proposal:	The proposal:
does not include a sustainability plan.	includes an unrealistic sustainability plan.	includes a sustainability plan, but is missing a component of the plan, such as vision, action steps, supporting evidence or evaluation methods.	includes a detailed plan for sustainability, which includes a vision, an action plan, and supporting evidence that ensures the plan can and will be executed through evaluation methods; a statement of commitment to sustaining the project is also identified.
is not convincing that the applicant and partners will be able to fulfill the outlined program expectations/ requirements.	is promising, but does not contain enough information to judge the capacity of the applicant and partners to fulfill the outlined program expectations/ requirement.	includes sufficient information to judge that the applicant and partners have the capacity and will be able to fulfill the outlined program expectations/ requirements.	includes a clear description and sufficient information to judge that the applicant and partners have the capacity and will be able to fulfill the outlined program expectations/ requirements.

**E-Rate – \$300,000**  
**100 Points Possible**

The MDE recognizes the importance of continuing to fund the E-Rate statewide activity to ensure continued support to local districts of the local E-Rate processes. This activity will leverage the cumulative purchasing power for all qualifying schools in Michigan on a common, statewide network while increasing the federal E-Rate discounts on services. It is critical that in year four of funding the E-Rate activity will coordinate high levels of integration with the SEN and E-Rate Modernization Orders.

**E-Rate – Objectives/Deliverables (40 pts.)**

Not Recommended for Funding (0 points per box)	Recommended for Funding with Revisions (1-4 points per box)	Recommended for Funding (5-8 points per box)	Highly Recommended for Funding (9-10 points per box)
<p>The proposal: does not include a description of new or continued program goals, objectives, deliverables, activities, and outcomes; does not address the grant expectations.</p>	<p>The proposal: includes a description of continued program goals, objectives, deliverables, activities, and outcomes, but does not include new activities and the outcomes are not clear and measurable; vaguely addresses the grant expectations.</p>	<p>The proposal: includes a description of new and continued program goals, objectives, deliverables, activities, and outcomes but they are not clear or measurable; addresses the grant expectations.</p>	<p>The proposal: includes a detailed description that concisely articulates new and continued program goals, objectives, deliverables, activities, and outcomes that are clear and measurable; addresses the grant expectations in great detail.</p>
<p>does not include a description that states how the activity leadership will work with the MDE E-Rate consultant.</p>	<p>includes a description that vaguely describes how activity leadership will work with the MDE E-Rate consultant.</p>	<p>includes a description that states how activity leadership will work with the MDE E-Rate consultant.</p>	<p>provides a detailed description that states exactly how activity leadership will work with the MDE E-Rate consultant, as well as any other MDE E-Rate staff.</p>
<p>does not include a description that states how the activity leadership will work with E-Rate stakeholders.</p>	<p>includes a description that vaguely describes how activity leadership will work with E-Rate stakeholders.</p>	<p>includes a description that states how activity leadership will work with E-Rate stakeholders.</p>	<p>provides a detailed description that identifies E-Rate stakeholders and states exactly how activity leadership will work with those stakeholders.</p>

**E-Rate – Objectives/Deliverables, continued**

does not include a description of how districts will be surveyed regarding their E-Rate status or how they will receive supports to file for E-Rate.	includes a description of how districts will be surveyed, but does not articulate how the data will be used to provide supports for districts to file for E-Rate.	includes a description of how districts will be surveyed regarding their E-Rate status and how status data will be used to provide supports; however, the supports are unrealistic.	provides a detailed description that articulates how districts will be surveyed regarding their E-Rate status and receive supports based on district E-Rate status survey responses that are realistic.
--	---	---	---

**E-Rate – Partnerships (10 pts.)**

Not Recommended for Funding (0 points per box)	Recommended for Funding with Revisions (1-2 points per box)	Recommended for Funding (3-4 points per box)	Highly Recommended for Funding (5 points per box)
The proposal: has no identified partnerships.	The proposal: provides a description of proposed external partnerships.	The proposal: provides a detailed plan for proposed external partnerships and mentions established external partners.	The proposal: details established external partners, which provides evidence of historical experience, including resumes from external partners (directly involved in the work), as well as high qualified skills, shared resources, knowledge and expertise in E-Rate; and a detailed plan for outreach to proposed partners.
provides no evidence of the nature of the partnerships.	provides little detail to the nature of the partnership.	provides some detail to the nature of the partnership.	provides evidence and clearly detail of the nature of each partnership. The partnerships support the sustainability of TRIG.

**E-Rate – Project Leadership (15 pts.)**

Not Recommended for Funding (0 points per box)	Recommended for Funding with Revisions (1-2 points per box)	Recommended for Funding (3-4 points per box)	Highly Recommended for Funding (5 points per box)
The proposal: does not provide evidence of Michigan's state level coordination and successful programming.	The proposal: includes a description of, but not evidence that supports Michigan's state level coordination; details of successful programming are missing.	The proposal: includes a description of Michigan's state level coordination and successful programming, but doesn't provide actual evidence to support the claim.	The proposal: provides evidence of Michigan's state level coordination and successful programming.
does not define the leadership roles and responsibilities.	includes a brief description of the leadership roles and responsibilities.	includes a description of the leadership roles and responsibilities.	explicitly defines the leadership roles and responsibilities.
does not describe past work experience.	includes a brief description of past work experience.	includes a description of past work experience.	explicitly defines past work experience with examples, such as other large statewide projects.

**E-Rate – Budget (15 pts.)**

Not Recommended for Funding (0 points per box)	Recommended for Funding with Revisions (1-2 points per box)	Recommended for Funding (3-4 points per box)	Highly Recommended for Funding (5 points per box)
The proposal: does not include a budget narrative or the budget narrative does not relate to the deliverables addressed in the objectives/deliverables section.	The proposal: provides a budget narrative with minimal detail.	The proposal: provides a detailed budget narrative.	The proposal: provides a clearly detailed budget narrative that links budget line items to deliverables and outcomes.
does not include a complete MEGS+ budget summary form and budget detail.	N/A	N/A	includes a MEGS+ budget summary and detail that is allowable, necessary, and reasonable.

**E-Rate – Budget, continued**

includes administrative fees within the budget higher than ten percent.	includes administrative fees between five and ten percent.	includes minimal administrative fees providing for maximum funds to be directed primarily for project deliverables.	includes no administrative fees.
---	--	---	----------------------------------

**E-Rate – Commitment, Capacity, and Sustainability (20 pts.)**

Not Recommended for Funding (0 points per box)	Recommended for Funding with Revisions (1-4 points per box)	Recommended for Funding (5-8 points per box)	Highly Recommended for Funding (9-10 points per box)
The proposal: does not include a sustainability plan.	The proposal: includes an unrealistic sustainability plan.	The proposal: includes a sustainability plan, but is missing a component of the plan, such as vision, action steps, supporting evidence, or evaluation methods.	The proposal: includes a detailed plan for sustainability, which includes a vision, an action plan, and supporting evidence that ensures the plan can and will be executed through evaluation methods; a statement of commitment to sustaining the project is also identified.
is not convincing that the applicant and partners will be able to fulfill the outlined program expectations/ requirements.	is promising, but does not contain enough information to judge the capacity of the applicant and partners to fulfill the outlined program expectations/ requirement.	includes sufficient information to judge that the applicant and partners have the capacity and will be able to fulfill the outlined program expectations/ requirements.	includes a clear description and sufficient information to judge that the applicant and partners have the capacity and will be able to fulfill the outlined program expectations/ requirements.

**Device Purchasing Incentives –\$9,250,000**  
**100 Points Possible**

The MDE has funded a volume-based purchasing program that provided statewide bids for mobile learning devices and desktop computers. This activity will continue to administer an annual statewide bid that meets the MDE online testing requirements, as well as continue to focus the incentive funds for TRIG participating districts and buildings that purchase from the statewide SPOT bid. The goal is to aggregate statewide demand in order to obtain significant discounts and value-add services from the vendors in order to support online testing and the “Any Time, Any Place, Any Way, Any Pace” initiative.

**Device Purchasing Incentives - Objectives/Deliverables (40 pts.)**

Not Recommended for Funding (0 points per box)	Recommended for Funding with Revisions (1-4 points per box)	Recommended for Funding (5-8 points per box)	Highly Recommended for Funding (9-10 points per box)
The proposal:	The proposal:	The proposal:	The proposal:
does not include a description of new or continued program goals, objectives, deliverables, activities, and outcomes; does not address the grant expectations.	includes a description of continued program goals, objectives, deliverables, activities, and outcomes, but does not include new activities and the outcomes are not clear and measurable; vaguely addresses the grant expectations.	includes a description of new and continued program goals, objectives, deliverables, activities, and outcomes but they are not clear or measurable; addresses the grant expectations.	includes a detailed description that concisely articulates new and continued program goals, objectives, deliverables, activities, and outcomes that are clear and measurable; addresses the grant expectations in great detail.
does not include a comprehensive device purchasing marketing plan.	includes a vague description of a device purchasing marketing plan.	includes a detailed description of a device purchasing marketing plan, but does not include key audiences or means to evaluate the plan.	includes a comprehensive device purchasing marketing plan that includes key audiences, key messaging, and a plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the plan.

**Device Purchasing Incentives - Objectives/Deliverables, continued**

does not include a description that states how the activity leadership will work with the MDE to identify linkages between vendor value adds and MDE initiatives.	includes a description that vaguely describes how activity leadership will work with the MDE to identify linkages between vendor value adds and MDE initiatives.	includes a description that states how activity leadership will work with the MDE to identify linkages between vendor value adds and MDE initiatives.	provides a detailed description that states exactly how activity leadership will work with the MDE to identify linkages between vendor value adds and MDE initiatives.
does not include steps for working with districts to identify best practices for creating district-wide device purchasing plans.	includes a list of steps for working with districts to identify best practices for creating district-wide device purchasing plans	includes a detailed list of steps for working with districts to identify best practices for creating district-wide device purchasing plans.	provides a detailed list of steps for working with districts to identify best practices for creating district-wide device purchasing plans which met both the specification of the proposed Michigan State Education Technology Plan and the districts school improvement plan.

**Device Purchasing Incentives – Partnerships (10 pts.)**

Not Recommended for Funding (0 points per box)	Recommended for Funding with Revisions (1-2 points per box)	Recommended for Funding (3-4 points per box)	Highly Recommended for Funding (5 points per box)
The proposal: has no identified partnerships.	The proposal: provides a description of proposed external partnerships.	The proposal: provides a detailed plan for proposed external partnerships and mentions established external partners.	The proposal: details established external partners, which provides evidence of historical experience, including resumes from external partners (directly involved in the work), as well as high qualified skills, shared resources, knowledge and expertise in bid processes; and a detailed plan for outreach to proposed partners.

**Device Purchasing Incentives – Partnerships, continued**

provides no evidence of the nature of the partnerships.	provides little detail to the nature of the partnership.	provides some detail to the nature of the partnership.	provides evidence and clear detail of the nature of each partnership. The partnerships support the sustainability of TRIG.
---	--	--	--

**Device Purchasing Incentives - Project Leadership (15 pts.)**

Not Recommended for Funding (0 points per box)	Recommended for Funding with Revisions (1-2 points per box)	Recommended for Funding (3-4 points per box)	Highly Recommended for Funding (5 points per box)
The proposal:	The proposal:	The proposal:	The proposal:
does not provide evidence of Michigan's state level coordination and successful programming.	includes a description of, but not evidence that supports Michigan's state level coordination; successful programming is missing.	includes a description of Michigan's state level coordination and successful programming, but doesn't provide actual evidence to support the claim.	provides evidence of Michigan's state level coordination and successful programming.
does not define the leadership roles and responsibilities.	includes a brief description of the leadership roles and responsibilities.	includes a description of the leadership roles and responsibilities.	explicitly defines the leadership roles and responsibilities.
does not describe past work experience.	includes a brief description of past work experience.	includes a description of past work experience.	explicitly defines past work experience with examples, such as other large statewide projects.

**Device Purchasing Incentives – Budget (15 pts.)**

Not Recommended for Funding (0 points per box)	Recommended for Funding with Revisions (1-2 points per box)	Recommended for Funding (3-4 points per box)	Highly Recommended for Funding (5 points per box)
The proposal:	The proposal:	The proposal:	The proposal:
does not include a budget narrative or the budget narrative does not relate to the deliverables addressed in the objectives/deliverables section.	provides a budget narrative with minimal detail.	provides a detailed budget narrative.	provides a clearly detailed budget narrative that links budget line items to deliverables and outcomes.

**Device Purchasing Incentives – Budget, continued**

does not include a complete MEGS+ budget summary form and budget detail.	N/A	N/A	includes a MEGS+ budget summary that is allowable, necessary, and reasonable.
includes administrative fees within the budget higher than ten percent.	includes administrative fees between five and ten percent.	includes minimal administrative fees providing for maximum funds to be directed primarily for project deliverables.	includes no administrative fees.

**Device Purchasing Incentives - Commitment, Capacity, and Sustainability (20 pts.)**

Not Recommended for Funding (0 points per box)	Recommended for Funding with Revisions (1-4 points per box)	Recommended for Funding (5-8 points per box)	Highly Recommended for Funding (9-10 points per box)
The proposal:	The proposal:	The proposal:	The proposal:
does not include a sustainability plan.	includes an unrealistic sustainability plan.	includes a sustainability plan, but is missing a component of the plan, such as vision, action steps, supporting evidence or evaluation methods.	includes a detailed plan for sustainability, which includes a vision, an action plan, and supporting evidence that ensures the plan can and will be executed through evaluation methods; a statement of commitment to sustaining the project is also identified.
is not convincing that the applicant and partners will be able to fulfill the outlined program expectations/ requirements.	is promising, but does not contain enough information to judge the capacity of the applicant and partners to fulfill the outlined program expectations/ requirement.	includes sufficient information to judge that the applicant and partners have the capacity and will be able to fulfill the outlined program expectations/ requirements.	includes a clear description and sufficient information to judge that the applicant and partners have the capacity and will be able to fulfill the outlined program expectations/ requirements.

**Data Integration System – \$2,200,000**

The purpose of the Data Integration System is to develop a mean of achieving a common, limited set of statewide, interconnected Student Information System (SIS) programs. The continuation grant will provide additional funding for forming and improving the “data hub” technology and improving connectivity beyond the piloted 20 percent of districts.

**Data Integration System - Objectives/Deliverables (40 pts.)**

Not Recommended for Funding (0 points per box)	Recommended for Funding with Revisions (1-4 points per box)	Recommended for Funding (5-8 points per box)	Highly Recommended for Funding (9-10 points per box)
<p>The proposal: does not include a description of new or continued program goals, objectives, deliverables, activities, and outcomes; does not address the grant expectations.</p>	<p>The proposal: includes a description of continued program goals, objectives, deliverables, activities, and outcomes, but does not include new activities and the outcomes are not clear and measurable; vaguely addresses the grant expectations.</p>	<p>The proposal: includes a description of new and continued program goals, objectives, deliverables, activities, and outcomes but they are not clear or measureable; addresses the grant expectations.</p>	<p>The proposal: includes a detailed description that concisely articulates new and continued program goals, objectives, deliverables, activities, and outcomes that are clear and measurable; addresses the grant expectations in great detail.</p>
<p>does not include a Standards-Based Enterprise Data Architecture that facilitates the exchange of information among the stakeholders in Michigan who work to improve student achievements.</p>	<p>includes a vague description of Standards-Based Enterprise Data Architecture that facilitates the exchange of information among the stakeholders in Michigan who work to improve student achievements</p>	<p>includes a description of Standards-Based Enterprise Data Architecture that facilitates the exchange of information among the stakeholders in Michigan who work to improve student achievements</p>	<p>includes a detailed description of the Standards-Based Enterprise Data Architecture that facilitates the exchange of information among the stakeholders in Michigan who work to improve student achievements</p>

**Data Integration System - Objectives/Deliverables, continued**

does not include a plan to further its work to streamline the transfer of state level data between local districts, ISDs, and regional, back to the state	includes a vague plan to further its work to streamline the transfer of state level data between local districts, ISDs, and regional, back to the state.	includes a plan to further its work to streamline the transfer of state level data between local districts, ISDs, and regional, back to the state, but it is not detailed.	includes a detailed plan to further its work to streamline the transfer of state level data between local districts, ISDs, and regional, back to the state.
does not include a description that states how the activity leadership will work with the MDE to ensure leveraging and integration of other MDE initiatives is accomplished.	includes a description that vaguely describes how activity leadership will work with the MDE to ensure leveraging and integration of other MDE initiatives is accomplished.	includes a description that states how activity leadership will work with the MDE leveraging and integration of other MDE initiatives is accomplished.	provides a detailed description that states exactly how activity leadership will work with the MDE leveraging and integration of other MDE initiatives is accomplished.

**Data Integration System – Partnerships (10 pts.)**

Not Recommended for Funding (0 points per box)	Recommended for Funding with Revisions (1-2 points per box)	Recommended for Funding (3-4 points per box)	Highly Recommended for Funding (5 points per box)
The proposal: has no identified partnerships.	The proposal: provides a description of proposed external partnerships.	The proposal: provides a detailed plan for proposed external partnerships and mentions established external partners.	The proposal: details established external partners, which provides evidence of historical experience, including resumes from external partners (directly involved in the work), as well as high qualified skills, shared resources, knowledge and expertise in bid processes; and a detailed plan for outreach to proposed partners.

**Data Integration System – Partnerships, continued**

provides no evidence of the nature of the partnerships.	provides little detail to the nature of the partnership.	provides some detail to the nature of the partnership.	provides evidence and clear detail of the nature of each partnership. The partnerships support the sustainability of TRIG.
---	--	--	--

**Data Integration System - Project Leadership (15 pts.)**

Not Recommended for Funding (0 points per box)	Recommended for Funding with Revisions (1-2 points per box)	Recommended for Funding (3-4 points per box)	Highly Recommended for Funding (5 points per box)
The proposal:	The proposal:	The proposal:	The proposal:
does not provide evidence of Michigan's state level coordination and successful programming.	includes a description of, but not evidence that supports Michigan's state level coordination; successful programming is missing.	includes a description of Michigan's state level coordination and successful programming, but doesn't provide actual evidence to support the claim.	provides evidence of Michigan's state level coordination and successful programming.
does not define the leadership roles and responsibilities.	includes a brief description of the leadership roles and responsibilities.	includes a description of the leadership roles and responsibilities.	explicitly defines the leadership roles and responsibilities.
does not describe past work experience.	includes a brief description of past work experience.	includes a description of past work experience.	explicitly defines past work experience with examples, such as other large statewide projects.

**Data Integration System – Budget (15 pts.)**

Not Recommended for Funding (0 points per box)	Recommended for Funding with Revisions (1-2 points per box)	Recommended for Funding (3-4 points per box)	Highly Recommended for Funding (5 points per box)
The proposal:	The proposal:	The proposal:	The proposal:
does not include a budget narrative or the budget narrative does not relate to the deliverables addressed in the objectives/deliverables section.	provides a budget narrative with minimal detail.	provides a detailed budget narratives.	provides a clearly detailed budget narrative that links budget line items to deliverables and outcomes.

**Data Integration System – Budget, continued**

does not includes a complete MEGS+ budget summary form and budget detail.	N/A	N/A	includes a MEGS+ budget summary that is allowable, necessary, and reasonable.
includes administrative fees within the budget higher than ten percent.	includes administrative fees between five and ten percent.	includes minimal administrative fees providing for maximum funds to be directed primarily for project deliverables.	includes no administrative fees.

**Data Integration System - Commitment, Capacity, and Sustainability (20 Points)**

Not Recommended for Funding (0 points per box)	Recommended for Funding with Revisions (1-4 points per box)	Recommended for Funding (5-8 points per box)	Highly Recommended for Funding (9-10 points per box)
The proposal:	The proposal:	The proposal:	The proposal:
does not include a sustainability plan.	includes an unrealistic sustainability plan.	includes a sustainability plan, but is missing a component of the plan, such as vision, action steps, supporting evidence or evaluation methods.	includes a detailed plan for sustainability, which includes a vision, an action plan, and supporting evidence that ensures the plan can and will be executed, as well as evaluation methods.
is not convincing that the applicant and partners will be able to fulfill the outlined program expectations/ requirements.	is promising, but does not contain enough information to judge the capacity of the applicant and partners to fulfill the outlined program expectations/ requirement.	includes sufficient information to judge that the applicant and partners have the capacity and will be able to fulfill the outlined program expectations/ requirements.	includes a clear description and sufficient information to judge that the applicant and partners have the capacity and will be able to fulfill the outlined program expectations/ requirements.

## **APPLICATION CHECKLIST FOR GRANT APPLICANTS**

### ***District Participation:***

- Complete or update the MTRAx technology readiness survey by December 18, 2015.
- Complete the MEGS+ District Participation application (available October 15, 2015) and agree to the requirements by submitting the application by December 18, 2015.

### ***Statewide Activities:***

- Satisfy the MEGS+ District Participation application requirements prior to initiating the MEGS+ Statewide Activity application.
- Submit the Statewide Activity application, which includes a narrative and budget aligned to the rubric requirements, in MEGS+ by December 18, 2015.