

New Hampshire NCLB Title II-D Enhancing Education Through Technology Program

COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR A STATEWIDE EVALUATION OF ARRA/TITLE II, PART D GRANT PROGRAMS

GENERAL INFORMATION

The purpose of the NCLB Title II-D (Enhancing Education through Technology) competitive grant program is to provide 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 supplemental assistance to schools this year under the Title II-D program.

Federal guidelines for the program require that districts have a means of evaluating the extent to which Title II-D activities are effective in (1) integrating technology into curricula and instruction; (2) increasing the ability of teachers to teach; and (3) enabling students to meet challenging state standards. Since Title II-D is a state-administered program, NHDOE is responsible for ensuring that districts comply with statutory requirements. Therefore, districts are required to submit updated budgets, data for performance reports, and other reasonable data to the NHDOE before being awarded funds in subsequent years.

The purpose of this RFP is to identify an entity that is well versed in education technology programs and experienced in evaluation in order to conduct a statewide evaluation of the New Hampshire Title II-D Program. The successful entity will be responsible for working with school districts that received NCLB Title II-D grants beginning in 2009-10, as listed in Appendix A. With assistance from the New Hampshire Department of Education, this RFP is being issued by the Nashua School District, acting as fiscal agent on behalf of all district grant awardees. The successful bidder will be responsible for managing the statewide evaluation program for the period of January 2010 through June 2011. For more information on the district grants, please see the links at www.nheon.org/oet/nclb.

TIMELINE FOR THIS TITLE II-D/ARRA RFI	
Request For Proposals Released	January 13, 2010
Submission Deadline (via email)	January 22, 2010 by 9 AM
Evaluator Award Notification	Anticipated January 27, 2010
Project Implementation	Anticipated January 2010 – June 2011

FOR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THIS RFP PLEASE CONTACT:

Dr. Cathy Higgins
State Educational Technology Director
Office of Educational Technology
New Hampshire Department of Education
101 Pleasant Street, Concord, NH 03301
chiggins@ed.state.nh.us or 603-271-2453

OR Dr. Brian Cochrane
Director of Accountability & Assessment
Nashua School District
141 Ledge Street,
Nashua, NH 03060-3071
cochrane@nashua.edu or 603-966-1016

CHOOSING AN EVALUATOR FOR ARRA/TITLE II-D GRANTS

The entity will be chosen in a collaborative effort with the Nashua School District, the New Hampshire Department of Education, and representatives from additional district grantees, with the Nashua School District serving as fiscal agent for the evaluation process. Interested bidders should submit a proposal that indicates past successful evaluation programs and illustrates their capacity to develop a comprehensive evaluation program that meets the need for ARRA reporting and the need for strong reliable data in terms of illustrating the impact of education technology programs. Respondents are asked to include a proposed budget, not to exceed \$250,000. A subcommittee representing district awardees will review all responses and select the successful bidder.

All Title II-D grantees are required to participate in a common evaluation of their grant activities. The successful bidder will coordinate and implement this common evaluation effort, working with the Nashua School District, the NH DOE and district awardees. Bidders are advised to review the proposals of all district awardees and, in particular, the ARRA proposals which specify a general local evaluation plan, plus any data and benchmarks that would be meaningful to their particular district projects. Bidders should propose a conceptual model to be used for the evaluation plan, with the expectation that the chosen evaluator will work collaboratively with grantees and the NHDOE to understand the impact of the projects at each grant site. The creation of a single evaluation is desired in order to maximize the potential for a larger and more meaningful evaluation across all projects and because one coordinated evaluation plan will be less taxing on each individual grantee.

SCOPE OF WORK

Evaluation encompasses many aspects in the education technology realm, the most desired aspect being the realization of evaluative components that signify the positive impact that technology can have on teaching and learning. With the increased emphasis nationally on 21st century skills and the acquisition of those skills for students to become successful in the working world, there is some urgency for developing tools and resources for measuring the impact of technology tools in the classroom.

The evaluator engaged in this work will be required to:

1. Present a conceptual model that considers both collective and district-specific evaluation outcomes.
2. Develop a schedule of visitations to gather data via focus groups, interviews, student observations, and other qualitative and quantitative measures with the grant programs running in New Hampshire schools.
3. Develop other evaluation measures as appropriate to effectively evaluate the grant outcomes.
4. Develop and or adapt survey tools and instruments for regular dissemination to Administrators, Teachers, and Students. This may also involve some survey tools for Parents. These survey tools should be setup online and will need to address pre- and post- program aspects. The following data collections are anticipated for all grantees receiving Title II-D ARRA funds:
 - a) NH School Technology Survey – This annual survey is typically collected from each building in the district as well as the district as a whole. State data from previous tech surveys may be viewed at www.nheon.org/oet/survey. The evaluator will be expected to adapt this survey as appropriate to align it to the statewide evaluation plan.
 - b) Administrator, Teacher, and Student Surveys – Grantees will work with the evaluator to come to consensus to finalize these instruments for use as pre and post surveys.

- c) NH School Technology and Readiness (STaR) Chart – All districts receiving ARRA grants submitted their self-assessment with their proposals for funding. Districts receiving only mini-grants or TLC grants were not required to submit this chart prior to funding. The chart is available at www.nheon.org/oet/tpguide.
 - d) Case Studies Report – This is a short form to report progress on district project activities midway through the project and again after the project is completed. The case studies form is available as a downloadable Word document and an online survey at www.nheon.org/oet. Previously submitted case studies are available at www.nheon.org/ictliteracy. The evaluator should propose the best use of this report within the development of the statewide evaluation plan.
- 5. Work with the New Hampshire Department of Education and their ongoing partnership with the SETDA Collaborative, a national evaluation tool being constructed across states to measure successes of the national Title II-D program. (SETDA = State Education Technology Directors Association, <http://www.setda.org>). This work would include regular phone call conferences with the SETDA Collaborative.
 - 6. Work with the New Hampshire Department of Education to develop measurements and reports that fulfill the obligation of the increased reporting required by the USDOE around ARRA funds, including the creation of interim and final evaluation reports. Additional anticipated data collection includes a quarterly budget and performance outcomes report (see ARRA assurances section below) which will be handled through the MyNHDOE Access online system. Visit <http://mydoe.nh.gov>.
 - 7. Develop a long-term process for regularly scheduled (and brief) reporting on those participants who have left programs and are using the skills acquired in their classrooms.
 - 8. Formalize reporting needs that are required by NHDOE.
 - 9. Formalize the sharing of results of programs with program participants and the public.
 - 10. Become familiar and adept at navigating around funding and planning deadlines that are inherent in Title II-D federal funds.
 - 11. There is a possibility that the evaluation entity will be asked to accompany the New Hampshire Department of Education to Washington, DC for meetings with USDOE staff. Cost for evaluation entity travel will be the responsibility of said entity.

It is expected that the entity will work closely with grantees and with the New Hampshire Department of Education, while still operating in a fairly independent manner to oversee the evaluation process. The New Hampshire Department of Education will assist in developing a schedule for regular reporting on each of the grant programs.

AMERICAN REINVESTMENT AND RECOVERY ACT 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.

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 New Hampshire Department 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.

SUBMISSION PROCESS

All proposals should be submitted **by no later than 9 AM on Friday, January 22, 2010 as an email attachment** to chiggins@ed.state.nh.us AND cochrane@nashua.edu. The attachment must include the contents indicated in “Format and Content of Proposal” below.

Review of the materials will take place on Monday, January 25, 2010 by a subcommittee that will include representation from the grantees. Submissions will be scored according to the rubric criteria within this document.

The **anticipated** announcement date for the successful bidder is January 27, 2010, with work commencing by no later than February 1, 2010 and continuing through June 30, 2011.

This process is open to any entity that can provide the required materials and services and has a desire to serve in the role. This is not limited to New Hampshire-based entities. Selection will be based on the review panel’s perception of the ability of the entity to provide a comprehensive evaluation that meets the rubric criteria listed at the end of this document. In brief, these include:

1. Ability of the entity to provide a comprehensive evaluation that will be assistive to the New Hampshire Department of Education in their reporting and evaluation requirements for the US Department of Education.
2. Ability of the entity to provide a comprehensive evaluation that will be informative to the field at large about the successes and areas for improvement in each of the grants evaluated.

FORMAT & CONTENT OF PROPOSALS

All of the following elements are required:

1. Cover Page – Complete contact information including your web page URL and identification of the project manager who will act as the point of contact for districts.
2. Experience - Complete resumes, company documentation, website, and other relevant materials that can convey the work experience of the entity and its ability to begin implementing an evaluation plan quickly after being selected as New Hampshire's Title II-D Program Evaluator. Please include a description of your knowledge of education technology and its relation to research around positive outcomes for students and learning in K-12 classrooms.
3. Detailed Scope of Work – This section should include:
 - a. Title II-D Reporting - Conveyance of a thorough understanding of ARRA expectations for reporting on Title II-D and some indication of understanding on reporting requirements through EDFacts within the US Department of Education.
 - b. Data Collection – Description of how the entity will work with all districts to collect qualitative and quantitative data resulting in a comprehensive program evaluation. Data collection should include online tools created for such purpose.
 - c. Dissemination - Description of how entity will publicize and exhibit the evaluation results and analysis for the field. This must include making results publicly available in a user-friendly interface online at a dedicated website maintained by the evaluator and edit-accessible for other key personnel at the districts and NHDOE.
4. Capacity for Success – See review rubric.
5. Statement of Projected Budget – Bidders should indicate a detailed budget associated with their submission. The following areas can be supported in the contract for evaluation services:
 - a. Mileage, lodging, travel expenses, coordination expenses for individuals or entities involved in the work;
 - b. Any fees or costs associated with dissemination of information (i.e., web page development, print materials for grantees, final reporting packets, etc.)
 - c. A **limited** amount of hardware to complete the evaluation work.
 - d. Books, materials, supplies, and refreshments for meetings or activities.
6. Letters of Support - Up to four letters from entities or organizations familiar with the work and capability of your entity.
7. Example - At least one example of a completed evaluation from another education related project. This example should show both short-term and long-term aspects of evaluation (e.g., how a program was evaluated as it was delivered, and how the participants used this expertise in 6 months, 9 months, and 12 months out).

SCORING RUBRIC: STATEWIDE EVALUATION FOR TITLE II-D GRANTS

Criteria	Poor	Average	Excellent
Experience with Evaluation – This area will look at the submission materials that deal with the experience of the entity in doing and completing quality evaluations for K-12 technology programs (30 Points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Is there sufficient experience for this work?</i> <i>Is there sufficient expertise in the K-12 environment?</i> <i>Is there clear indication of expertise in education technology?</i> <i>Understanding and documented experience in qualitative and quantitative collection and analysis?</i> 	0 – 10	11 – 20	21 - 30
Experience with Evaluation – Total Score (MAX is 30):			
Scope of Work Response – This area will look at the submission materials that deal with the Scope of Work Section. Has the entity exhibited materials that address these points? (40 Points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Is a detailed work plan submitted, beginning with a conceptual model that considers both collective and grantee specific evaluation outcomes?</i> <i>Does the work plan include tasks, timelines, and persons responsible?</i> <i>Is the work plan aligned well to the implementation activities that will occur within each participating district?</i> <i>Have areas in the scope of work been addressed?</i> <i>Is there indication that the entity can meet those areas in the Scope of Work?</i> <i>Are key staff identified to indicate the percentage of time dedicated to this program?</i> <i>Is there adequate evidence that entity can quickly implement an overall plan for the work ahead?</i> 	0 – 17	18 - 35	36 - 50
Scope of Work – Total Score (MAX is 50):			
Capacity for Success – This area looks at the understanding and ability of the entity to address specific ARRA and II-D requirements in reporting on grant programs. (20 Points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Is there indication of how entity will continue to gather information on collecting and analyzing data for reporting?</i> <i>Is it clear that ARRA and Title II-D resources have been studied in preparation for this work?</i> <i>Does the entity have the resources to complete a statewide and multi-faceted evaluation program?</i> 	0 – 6	7 – 13	14 – 20
Capacity for Success – Total Score (MAX is 20):			
TOTAL SCORE (MAX IS 100)	_____		

Appendix A

Districts Awarded NCLB Title II-D ARRA Competitive Funds:

Alton	Oyster River
Bartlett	Pembroke / SAU 53
Chester	Pittsfield
Claremont / SAU 6	Portsmouth
Laconia	Profile
Lafayette Regional	Raymond
Manchester	Somersworth
Milton	Timberlane Regional
Nashua	White Mountains Regional

Districts Awarded NCLB Title II-D Regular Competitive Funds for Tech Leader Program:

Tech Leader Consortium Awards Lead District <i># of schools and positions represented -></i>	# School Teams	# Teachers	# Principals	# NML Early Adopters	Intel Principal Leaders
Exeter Regional School District / Seacoast Professional Development Center	15	27	16	3	1
Keene School District / Southwestern NH Educational Support Center	8	16	6	0	0
Merrimack Valley School District / Capital Area Center for Education Support	10	17	9	4	5
Milan School District / North Country Education Services	11	23	12	0	0
TOTALS	54	83	43	7	6

Districts Awarded NCLB Title II-D Regular Competitive Funds for Classroom Technology Mini-Grants:

Alton	Epping	Litchfield	Prospect Mountain
Amherst	Fall Mountain	Littleton	Raymond
Ashland	Farmington	Merrimack Valley	Rollinsford
Barrington	Hampstead	Milan	Shaker Regional
Bartlett	Interlakes	Northumberland	Somersworth
Chester	Jaffrey Rindge	Oyster River	White Mtn Regional
Concord	Keene	Pittsfield	Winnacunnet
Derry	Laconia	Portsmouth	Winnisquam
Dover	Lebanon	Profile	