



STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
101 Pleasant Street, Concord, NH 03301
Citizens Services Line 1-800-339-9900 FAX 603-271-1953

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

No Child Left Behind, Title II-D

Enhancing Education Through Technology (E2T2)

5th Round Competitive Grants to Districts for Local Educational Support Centers

Proposal Release Date: January 4, 2007

Deadline for Receipt of Proposals: 4:00 PM, March 15, 2006

Proposal Inquiries:

All questions about this Request for Proposal (RFP) should be directed to the NHDOE Program Officer for this project:

Cathy Higgins at (603) 271-2453 or email at chiggins@ed.state.nh.us

This document may be downloaded from www.nheon.org/oet/nclb

Application Guidance

Introduction: With the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, Congress has appropriated funds for NCLB Title II Part D, the Enhancing Education Through Technology (Ed Tech) Program. New Hampshire has a total of approximately \$900,000 in Ed Tech Local Educational Support Center Competitive Grants funding available in 2006-07.

In New Hampshire, the Follow the Child initiative expands upon the spirit of No Child Left Behind by focusing on measuring growth in the personal, social, physical, and academic facets of each student's life and defining the necessary support systems needed for each student's success. Applicants for LESCEN grants are encouraged to propose programs and services that support the Follow the Child Initiative and that will help to outfit teachers and administrators with the tools and techniques necessary to create classrooms and schools focused on the success, aspirations, and well-being of each child. No Child Left Behind has made academic proficiency a national conversation. It is essential that New Hampshire captures this urgency and directs it into a whole-child approach that exceeds the national standard. Through the personalization of learning and the measuring of progress in all aspects of a student's life, New Hampshire can provide an education that helps students to increase their aspirations and reach their fullest potential.

Purpose: The federal Ed Tech Program aims to (a) improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary and secondary schools, (b) assist every student to become technologically literate by the end of eighth grade, regardless of race, ethnicity, income, geographical location, or disability, and (c) encourage effective integration of technology with curriculum development and high quality professional development to promote research-based instructional methods.¹

Project Dates:

- Project applications must be submitted by March 15, 2007. (*Signature pages should be postmarked by that date and applications emailed by that date.*)
- Grant awards will be announced on or before April 15, 2007.
- Project **period** begins April 15, 2007 and ends March 31, 2008.

Contact: Cathy Higgins (603) 271-2453 or chiggins@ed.state.nh.us
Office of Educational Technology at the NH Department of Education
This document will be available online at www.nheon.org/oet/nclb.

¹ Text of federal legislation beginning with section 2401 is available at:
<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg34.html>.

Eligibility: Two Types of Competitive Grants

Ed Tech competitive funds are distributed to high need districts as (a) Basic Competitive Grants and (b) Local Educational Support Center Grants (LESC). This document provides guidance for districts to apply for LESC Grants. [Appendix A](#) contains a list of high need school districts as defined within the federal program guidelines. This list should be utilized by centers when planning their project activities with area districts. Proposals should meet the criteria described in the “Use of Funds” section below.

Consortium Applications

Eligible districts applying for Center grants should submit **consortium** applications that include **at least three other high need districts** as active consortium partners. Applicants are strongly encouraged to set a participation goal of serving at least 700 educators per center during the grant period in order for the statewide target of serving at least 3,750 educators to be met through high quality technology-enhanced professional development programs.² Also encouraged is targeting of services toward high need districts listed in Appendix A that did not receive Round 5 Title II-D awards.

Additional consortium partners may include institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, libraries, or other educational entities appropriate to provide local programs. The fiscal agent for such consortium applications must be a high need school district listed in Appendix A. At a district’s request, the NHDOE may assist the district in the formation of a consortium to provide services for the teachers and students served by the district. A letter of support from each consortium partner should be included in the proposal appendices. Letters from each participating district should show evidence of significant discussion of support and capacity for your center’s ability to meet the needs of the NH districts they serve.

Technology Plans

- Applicant districts and all district consortium members must have a new or updated long-range strategic technology plan on file that aligns with the guidance contained in the New Hampshire Technology Planning Guide (www.nheon.org/oet/tpguide) and is consistent with the objectives of the State Educational Technology Plan. Districts are required to inform the NHDOE whenever significant modifications are made to a local technology plan. Check the Tech Plan List at <http://nheon.org/oet/erate/TPStatus.htm> to ensure that your plans are current.
- Applications for Title II-D funds must have budgets and planned activities that are consistent with the technology plan goals of all consortium districts. Refer to the Technology Planning Guide, which has planning

² This target is described within Goal Set #2 in Appendix D.

resources and a current Plan Approval Status List. When updating plans, districts should refer to the elements described in the current Technology Plan Approval Rubric, available from the home page of the Guide.

CIPA Compliance

Districts must certify on the application cover page the conditions that are met by their district relative to the Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA) requirements.

Professional Development

25% Requirement – Districts must use at least 25% of the grant funds for ongoing, sustained, intensive, high-quality professional development. Such professional development should be focused on the integration of advanced technologies, including emerging technologies, into curriculum and instruction and in using those technologies to create new learning environments. For a more extensive description of high quality professional development, visit the NHDOE Title IIA program website at: www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/boip/TitleII-A.htm

Program Reporting Requirements :

NCLB requires that districts have a means of evaluating the extent to which Ed Tech 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.

Because the Ed Tech program is a State-administered program, NHDOE is responsible for ensuring that districts comply with Ed Tech statutory requirements. Therefore, all districts within the proposed consortium are required to submit the data reports listed below, as well as other reasonable data to the NHDOE as a part of accepting a grant from this program. In addition, such reports are required of districts who wish to be eligible for NHDOE administered technology grants in the subsequent grant year.

The following data reports are required by districts receiving Title II-D funds:

- [NH School Technology Survey](#) – A survey must be submitted **for each building in the district** in order for the district to be eligible for funding. This online survey will be available for data entry from 1/5/2007 through 2/28/2007. State data from previous tech surveys may be viewed at www.nheon.org/oet/survey.
- [LoTi Survey](#) – This online survey is to be completed annually by at least 75% of district staff. District technology coordinators in need of updated LoTi login information should contact the Office of Educational Technology by sending an email to chiggins@ed.state.nh.us.
- Budget Forms – An OBM Form 1 from the district proposed as the fiscal agent for the grant should be submitted with the proposal.

- Evaluation Report – An updated version of the annual grant progress report applicable to this new grant will be made available to grantees in Spring 2007 through participation in the collaborative evaluation process. Evaluation reports from each center will be due on 9/30/07 and again on 3/31/08.

Obligation and Disbursement Reports

FY 2007 Ed Tech projects may remain open until 3/31/08. Funding obligations for awarded projects must be reported by a school district no later than the quarterly report which ends March 2008, with expenditures reported by the June 2008 quarterly report. Budget OBM Forms 3 and 4 from the NHDOE are used for these reports. **Failure to submit obligation and disbursement reports to the NHDOE Office of Business Management by July 10, 2008 will result in the forfeiture of any outstanding obligations.**

Use of Funds for Center Grants:

Supplement, Not Supplant

Districts applying for technology funding must supply an assurance that financial resources provided under the Ed Tech program will *supplement* and *not supplant* state and/or local funds that would otherwise be used for the proposed activities.

CENTER COMPETITIVE GRANTS

Focus Areas – The focus of grant applications must be on addressing technology improvements within consortium districts that advance one or more of the following focus areas. All three focus areas are linked to the goals and indicators listed within the Federal Performance Report submitted by New Hampshire each year.³

Focus Area: INTEGRATION – Professional development services aimed at assisting local educators to integrate technology and information literacy skills into core curriculum areas (see Appendix D, Goal Sets 1 & 2).

Focus Area: ICT LITERACY – Professional development services in support of digital portfolio assessment (see Appendix D, Goal Sets 2 & 3).

Focus Area: DATA SYSTEMS – Professional development services in support of local data collection, warehousing, or analysis systems (see Appendix D, Goal Sets 1, 2, & 3).

Grant Amounts – Applicants may apply on behalf of their consortium for awards of \$150,000 per Center, inclusive of indirect costs.

Proposal Details

- Your proposal must make **specific** reference to goals from the consortium district local technology plans upon which this application is based. The specific goals of this project must be listed and described, and the scope of

³ See Appendix D for all Goals.

work must clearly describe the work to be performed and the products or outcomes expected. The application must clearly and convincingly articulate the ways that achieving the project goals will lead to the Center and its consortium members making progress on one or more of the three focus areas described above.

- Your proposal must provide details about the particular grade levels and/or content areas that will be the focus of programs described in the application, and any particular ways they will link to NH Standards.
- A significant component of any proposal must include the required professional development of NH educators that will be part of this grant (a minimum 25% of funds must be used for this purpose). A description of the type of professional development services planned, quantity, focus, target audience, target districts, and follow-up of the professional development should be included.
- Your proposal should be written to convince the reviewers that the applying Center and its consortium members have the capacity to support this project and that the size and/or scope of the grant are appropriate.
- An outline of the grant evaluation plan aligned to the project goals must be included in the application. Applicants should refer to the resource “Collaborative Evaluation led by Local Educators” (<http://www.neirtec.org/evaluation/>) for help in developing their evaluation plan. The application should include responses to the six Guiding Questions in the “Gathering Together and Planning” section of this resource. Applicants for Center grants are reminded that they will also have an opportunity to work with all other Centers on a network-wide evaluation plan, which would build from evaluation plans of individual proposals.
- Finally, an itemized budget must be included.

OBM Form 1

- When completing this federal projects budget form, it is important that you check all entries before submitting to the NHD OE. Frequently, we receive forms with errors, which result in delays in processing and usually require you to resubmit a new form. Common errors include missing or incorrect project start and end dates, missing fiscal agent name in “make checks payable to” box, or incorrectly calculated indirect cost amounts. For detailed instructions on indirect cost calculations and other instructions related to OBM Forms, visit the NHD OE Integrated Programs website at: www.ed.state.nh.us/education/doe/organization/instruction/boip.htm
- The Form 1 should list a project start date of 4/15/07 and project end date of 3/31/08.

Allowable

Federal guidelines for this program describe the following general types of activities that the funds may be used to support. Applicants should consider

Activities: these within the context of their chosen focus area.

Access to Technology Resources

1. Increasing accessibility to technology, particularly through public-private partnerships, with special emphasis on accessibility for high-need schools.
2. Enhancing existing technology and acquiring new technology to support education reforms and to improve student achievement.
3. Acquiring connectivity linkages, resources, and services for use by students and school personnel to improve academic achievement.

Technology Literacy for Students

4. Adapting or expanding applications of technology to enable teachers to increase student academic achievement, including technology literacy, through teaching practices that are based on the review of relevant research and through use of innovative distance learning strategies.
5. Implementing proven and effective courses and curricula that include integrated technology and that are designed to help students reach challenging academic standards.
6. Developing, enhancing, or implementing information technology courses.

Professional Development

7. Supporting ongoing, sustained, intensive, high-quality professional development focused on the integration of advanced technologies, including emerging technologies, into curriculum and instruction and in using those technologies to create new learning environments.
8. Preparing one or more teachers in schools as technology leaders who will assist other teachers, and providing bonus payments to the technology leaders.

Community Involvement

9. Using technology to promote parental involvement and foster communication among students, parents, and teachers about curricula, assignments, and assessments.

Program Evaluation

10. Using technologies to collect, manage, and analyze data to inform and enhance teaching and school improvement efforts.
11. Implementing enhanced performance measurement systems to determine the effectiveness of education technology programs funded with Ed Tech funds.

Equitable Participation: Federal guidelines require districts to engage in timely and meaningful consultation with appropriate private school officials during the design and development of programs and continue the consultation throughout the

implementation of these programs. One way to address this is to notify all non-public schools within a district's boundaries by letter, using text similar to the following:

XYZ School District is in the process of preparing and submitting an application to the New Hampshire Department of Education under the Ed Tech portion of No Child Left Behind. This is a federally funded program. We would like to know if you are interested in participating in this program. Regardless of whether you want to participate, we ask that you respond to this letter by (___date___) so that we will know how to proceed.

Equipment purchased as a result of an Ed Tech Grant remains the property of a public school district even though on loan to a non-public school.

**Submission
Instructions:**

1. Download the application form and submission guidelines from the website at: www.nheon.org/oet/nclb.
2. EMAIL the complete application form (cover page, narrative, budget page, and OBM Form 1) **electronically** as attachments to an email to chiggins@ed.state.nh.us. The subject line of the email should read: *NCLB Title IID Competitive Grant Application for <Your District Name>*
3. Mail ONE ORIGINAL and THREE paper copies of the signed application cover page, narrative, budget page, and OBM Form 1 by 3/31/07 to:

Cathy Higgins
Office of Educational Technology
Division of Instruction
New Hampshire Department of Education
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301

**Additional
Information:**

- NHDOE Office of Educational Technology – www.nheon.org/oet
- NH Local Educational Support Center Network – www.nheon.org/centers
- NHEON Professional Development Resources – www.nheon.org/prof_dev
- Information about the Ed Tech Program on the U.S. Department of Education website at <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/os/technology/index.html>
- Federal legislation - www.ed.gov/programs/edtech/legislation.html

APPENDIX A: REPORT of CURRENT U.S. CENSUS DATA New Hampshire “High Need” School Districts

According to NCLB Title IID federal program guidelines dated March 11, 2002 (p.12) (see www.ed.gov/programs/edtech/legislation.html), funding should be targeted toward “high need districts” which are those districts whose percentages of children from families with incomes below the poverty line are above the state median (see www.census.gov/hhes/www/saige/) AND who have either one or more “schools in need of improvement” or a substantial need for assistance in acquiring and using technology. *The following districts were eligible to apply for the 5th round of NCLB Title II-D Basic Competitive funds. Districts not listed here were not eligible to apply. The last column indicates whether districts applied for a 5th round grant and whether they received a resulting award in December 2006.*

SCHOOL DISTRICTS ABOVE THE MEDIAN	Population	5-17 Kids	5-17 Poor	Percent Poverty	District Competitive Grant Application
ALTON	4,864	790	72	9.11%	Awarded
ANDOVER	2,253	381	34	8.92%	
ASHLAND	2,024	215	16	7.44%	Awarded
BARNSTEAD	4,199	774	66	8.53%	
BARRINGTON	7,874	1,571	122	7.77%	Applied
BARTLETT	2,897	444	44	9.91%	Awarded
BERLIN	10,456	1,525	175	11.48%	Applied as Consortium
BETHLEHEM	2,264	189	25	13.23%	Applied as Consortium
CAMPTON	2,800	329	29	8.81%	Applied
CLAREMONT	13,804	2,237	200	8.94%	Applied
COLEBROOK*	2,349	371	51	13.75%	Applied as Consortium
CONCORD	38,975	6,173	464	7.52%	Applied
CONTOOCOOK VALLEY	18,571	3,830	301	7.86%	Applied
CONWAY*	9,214	1,427	147	10.30%	
CROYDON	694	115	7	6.09%	
DOVER	28,317	4,049	336	8.30%	Applied
EAST KINGSTON	1,882	220	13	5.91%	Awarded as Consortium
ERROL*	302	36	5	13.89%	
EXETER	14,827	1,261	80	6.34%	Awarded as Consortium
FALL MOUNTAIN REG'L	12,245	2,149	209	9.73%	
FARMINGTON	6,082	1,242	69	5.56%	
FRANKLIN	8,980	1,546	246	15.91%	Awarded
GILMANTON	3,304	578	39	6.75%	
GORHAM	2,930	467	40	8.57%	
GOSHEN LEMPSTER COOP	1,797	326	31	9.51%	Applied
GOVERNOR WENTWORTH REG'L	17,672	2,967	232	7.82%	
GREENLAND	3,383	634	49	7.73%	
HAMPTON	15,754	1,741	108	6.20%	Awarded
HINSDALE	4,250	795	64	8.05%	
HOLDERNESS	1,987	234	18	7.69%	Applied
HOOKSETT	12,523	2,074	118	5.69%	
INTER LAKES	8,873	1,428	103	7.21%	
JAFFREY-RINDGE COOPERATIVE	11,378	1,966	172	8.75%	Awarded
KEENE	23,495	3,267	186	5.69%	Awarded
LACONIA	17,731	2,764	281	10.17%	Awarded
LAFAYETTE REG'L	1,795	138	9	6.52%	Applied as Consortium

SCHOOL DISTRICTS ABOVE THE MEDIAN	Population	5-17 Kids	5-17 Poor	Percent Poverty	District Competitive Grant Application
LEBANON	12,941	1,917	176	9.18%	Applied
LISBON REG'L	2,136	367	25	6.81%	Applied as Consortium
LITTLETON	6,018	1,035	90	8.70%	
MADISON	2,125	390	21	5.38%	Applied as Consortium
MANCHESTER	111,988	18,450	1,901	10.30%	Awarded
MARLOW	778	126	7	5.56%	
MASCENIC REG'L	8,017	1,792	123	6.86%	
MASCOMA VALLEY REG'L	10,016	1,643	86	5.23%	
MERRIMACK VALLEY	16,107	2,893	212	7.33%	Awarded
MILAN	1,347	249	20	8.03%	
MILFORD	14,165	2,810	139	4.95%	Awarded
MILTON	4,118	818	86	10.51%	
NASHUA	90,638	15,930	992	6.23%	Awarded
NELSON	660	120	9	7.50%	
NEW BOSTON	4,331	955	53	5.55%	
NEWFOUND AREA	9,688	1,653	89	5.38%	Applied
NEWMARKET	8,466	1,288	99	7.69%	Applied
NEWPORT	6,581	1,230	195	15.85%	
NORTHUMBERLAND	2,467	473	60	12.68%	Awarded as Consortium
OYSTER RIVER COOPERATIVE	19,295	2,584	130	5.03%	
PEMI-BAKER REG'L	17,110	750	42	5.60%	Applied
PITTSBURG	877	118	13	11.02%	Applied as Consortium
PITTSFIELD	4,200	837	64	7.65%	Applied
PLYMOUTH	6,056	478	44	9.21%	Awarded
PORTSMOUTH	21,921	2,575	238	9.24%	Applied
PROFILE	4,059	316	35	11.08%	Awarded
RAYMOND	10,203	2,156	136	6.31%	Applied
ROCHESTER	29,979	5,231	527	10.07%	Awarded
ROLLINSFORD	2,789	485	33	6.80%	Applied as Consortium
RUMNEY	1,524	204	27	13.24%	
SEABROOK	8,368	891	82	9.20%	Awarded
SHAKER REG'L	9,373	1,678	106	6.32%	Awarded
SOMERSWORTH	12,089	2,168	174	8.03%	Applied as Consortium
STEWARTSTOWN	1,024	163	11	6.75%	Applied as Consortium
STODDARD	966	139	12	8.63%	
STRATFORD	953	158	29	18.35%	Awarded as Consortium
THORNTON	1,898	219	18	8.22%	Applied
UNITY	1,606	222	28	12.61%	Applied
WAKEFIELD	4,553	815	62	7.61%	
WARREN	899	159	17	10.69%	Applied
WASHINGTON	939	148	9	6.08%	
WATERVILLE VALLEY	265	41	3	7.32%	
WENTWORTH	822	120	11	9.17%	Applied
WHITE MOUNTAIN REG'L	8,010	1,328	113	8.51%	Applied as Consortium
WINCHESTER	4,315	751	93	12.38%	Awarded

APPENDIX B: APPLICATION FORMAT & CONTENT

PROVIDE A NARRATIVE OF **NO MORE THAN TWENTY (20) PAGES**, DOUBLE-SPACED, FONT SIZES 10-12.

Proposal Abstract (*Limit to 1 page – 5 points*)

Describe the overall proposal for your center. Be sure to include your district's plans for improving both your individual Center, and your participation in the Local Educational Support Center Network (LESCN). Describe your Center philosophy and mission, in terms of both your individual center and as a dedicated member of the Local Educational Support Center Network. Summarize what you will do with the level of funding you are requesting.

Mission, Goals, and Oversight (*Limit to 2 pages – 5 points*)

The Center Network was created to promote excellence in leadership, teaching, and learning, supported by technology. Its central aim is to *ensure access for all educators to high quality professional development that results in improved student learning*. Your proposal should clearly articulate the mission statement and *measurable* goals of your center.⁴ Describe how you have improved your mission, goals, and objectives, to promote improving the center network philosophy.

Include information about your Oversight Committee, such as membership, committee discussions and decisions, meeting frequency, and how your committee has helped to shape your center's current and future plans. Describe how the committee identifies local needs to be addressed by center programs. Indicate the topics and priorities that you anticipate your committee will focus on during the coming year. Designate 1-2 members from your committee who would be willing to serve on the NH State Technology Council. This council will be reconvened in 2007 to assist in developing the next State Technology Plan.

General Responsibilities and Scope of Work (*Limit to 6½ pages – 30 Points*)

Use this section to describe your planned programs and services for the coming year.

Background Information

The Enhancing Education through Technology program focuses using technology to enhance the professional development opportunities available to teachers. One of the program goals is to provide 25% of the teachers in the state with high quality, technology-enhanced professional development by 2008. High quality professional development should support at least one of the following focus areas:

- The integration of technology and information literacy skills into the core curriculum areas.
- The use of digital portfolios to support ICT literacy in students by the end of eighth grade.
- The use of technology to support local data collection, warehousing, or analysis systems.

High quality professional development was identified by the Education Commission of the States as one of the five key strategies for improving the recruitment and retention of quality educators.⁵ Your proposed scope of center work should insure that all programming enable teachers to participate in high-quality professional development that improves their practice and enhances the learning of their students.⁶ More

⁴ See the Professional Development Task Force Report, page 8, for a more detailed description of the vision and goals for a professional development center network.

⁵ Read the complete document, *In Pursuit of Quality Teaching: Five Key Strategies for Policymakers*, available at <http://www.ecs.org/initiatives/geringer/Geringer%20Initiative%20Final.doc>.

⁶ See the Professional Development Task Force Report, page 4.

specifically, as recommended by the PD Center Task Force, Centers should model their services upon the professional development standards promulgated by the National Staff Development Council.⁷

Your proposed activities should demonstrate that the work to be performed and the products and outcomes of the center are clearly articulated and align with not only the goals of the center, but also the goals of LESCEN.

The Enhancing Education through Technology fund requires that state-administered grants are awarded to school districts on a competitive basis. The New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) uses these competitive grants to create and maintain the Local Educational Support System in order to accomplish the following goals:

- Centers will assist school districts with achieving the goals of the New Hampshire Ed Tech Program.
- Centers will assist school districts in reaching the goals of the New Hampshire Statewide Educational Technology Plan.
- Centers will offer school districts a comprehensive statewide system for sharing high-quality educational practices, based upon scientific research, that meet the needs of all learners in NH.
- Centers will provide resources and a supportive environment responsive to local school district needs.
- Centers will facilitate communication between the state and local school district levels.

In order for each Center to be able to respond to the needs of the school districts it serves, the specific form of services should remain, to an extent, the prerogative of the individual centers.⁸

Individual Center Scope of Work

The primary scope of work for your individual center should be the improvement of student learning through professional development aimed at enhancing curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Your individual center should foster and facilitate collaboration and coordination across districts/schools in the provision of professional development such that funds are used effectively and efficiently. Centers should not only directly provide professional development, but also assist districts/schools in developing their own professional development opportunities. Your scope of work should identify the individual strengths your center has and describe how your proposed scope of work supports the improvement of your center and the expansion of your strengths.

Individual center programs should:

- Demonstrate commitment to high-need school districts and indicate that they are given priority.
- Demonstrate that technology leaders in high-need school districts have been trained as turnkey trainers for their LEA using train the trainer or similar models.
- Deliver services equitably across hardware platforms. Programs that include access to several multiplatform lab(s) with minimum of 15 workstations, projectors, and access to multiple videoconference sites are preferred.
- Provide state of the art technology resources for educators to work with. A base of common assistive technology options such as may include, but are not limited to Palm Pilot program, video editing equipment, web page design, graphics, online reading, assessments, specialized software for subject areas, Intel microscopes, Lego robotics.
- Develop strategies for obtaining teacher time commitment for ongoing sustained professional development activities. Preferred strategies include, but are not limited to programs that utilize job embedded, student engaging, action research oriented teaching applications, not just after school, evening, or one time workshops.

⁷ See http://www.nheon.org/prof_dev/hqpd.php

⁸ See Professional Development Center Task Force Report page 8 for a list of services that individual centers should include but not be limited to.

- Actively work with high need districts to provide help and support with their District in Need of Improvement Plans and the implementation of those plans.

Center Network Scope of Work

The primary scope of work of the center network should be to provide a means for educators to find quality professional development opportunities offered in the state that match their professional growth plans and learning needs. The network should provide a vehicle through which teachers from different districts across New Hampshire could get together to share their ideas and reflect on their practices with a wide array of colleagues. Centers should be staffed by people who have an understanding of the needs of New Hampshire educators and the New Hampshire recertification process; and are willing to provide increased opportunities for extended professional development programs across New Hampshire (more than “one-shot” workshops). Your scope of work should identify the commitment your center has to the network and describe how your proposed scope of work supports improvement and strengthening of the Local Area Educational Support Center Network.

In order to help resolve the limitations of resources, lack of structure, context, and means for sharing and dialogue felt by New Hampshire educators, a statewide Center Network creates a vehicle for a more effective and efficient use of resources that will result in greater equity of access to professional development for all educators and by providing a formal structure and context for collegial sharing and dialogue. In applying for Title II-D technology funds, your collaborative Center Network programs should:

- Provide access and introductory training for professional development programs funded through federal technology programs to school districts, as well as assist with statewide initiatives. Programs that are comprehensive in scope, addressing statewide needs of administrators and all educational staff enhance, and complement services provided through other Local Education Support Centers are preferred.
- Coordinate training to school districts in the use of the resources provided from the NH OET, including those available through the NHEON web portal. Programs that encourage building principals to build appropriate educational technology uses that are fully integrated into the K-12 curriculum into building goals are preferred.
- Provide easy access to meeting sites where equipment and experts for a variety of technologies, including synchronous, multi-point video conferencing are located.
- Provide assistance to educators with initial steps to take advantage of distance learning opportunities. Programs that fully support OPEN NH and the e-Learning for Educators Initiative are preferred.
- Provide professional development trainers including those with significant and diverse expertise in areas of technology integration, with the capacity to offer on-going job embedded practice and support. Preferred programs include:
 - Those that have staff available for the development and teaching of online courses specific to New Hampshire needs, such as OPEN NH.
 - Those in which trainers have commitment and experience with K-12, Special Education, English Speakers of Other Languages, and adult learners.
 - Those that contain ongoing, sustained follow up, resulting in measurable increases in student learning.
- Define procedures to assist regional school districts with creating or updating their district technology plan, according to the state technology plan approval rubric. Programs that proactively offer school districts initial technology planning assistance for free, followed by an opportunity for supplemental assistance at reasonable cost are preferred.
- Develop a process to provide assistance to districts applying for grant opportunities and submitting E-rate applications. Programs which are proactive in outreach to districts in need of assistance are preferred.
- Provide technology assistance to districts, such as data warehousing services, file servers, and filtering solutions as determined by local needs. Programs which are proactive in outreach to districts in need of assistance are preferred.

- Provide assistance with state and federal assessments and evaluations, facilitated by technology tools, offering data to inform decision making by all stakeholders. Programs that offer training and support in the use of the “[Collaborative Evaluation Led by Local Evaluators](http://www.neirtec.org/evaluation)” (www.neirtec.org/evaluation) are preferred.
- Maintain a LESCEN collaborative, updated, online calendar of dates and events for both LESCEN and individual center programming to insure statewide awareness of center/LESCEN offerings.
- Work with the DOE Center Coordinator to acquire additional funding and support by providing DOE programs and professional development opportunities for their constituents.

Capacity for Success and Site Requirements (Limit to 6½ pages – 30 Points)

Use this section to describe your current capacity to function as an individual center and as part of the center network. The data within this section will help the NHDOE to understand the extent to which your center as a site within the center network is sustainable in the event that funding from federal or state programs is not available in subsequent years.

Include details that support your district as having the philosophy, size, and staff to support a center that is an individual branch of a larger center network. Describe the programming and work your center already offers that demonstrates continued capacity to be successful in maintaining your center, both as an individual entity, and as part of a network of centers.

Include the following items in your description:

- Who (please describe roles, and provide individual names, when appropriate) is responsible for conducting the work.
- What structures, resources, policies, and procedures are already in place or proposed that support this project and/or enhance the sustainability of the individual center and the network.
- Evidence that this plan is realistic and that the school or organization has the capacity to achieve its mission through attainment of its goals and objectives.
- A letter of intent from each participating district in your consortium showing evidence of significant discussion of support for the proposal and evidence that your center has capacity to meet the needs of consortium districts to be served.
- Demonstration of capacity for success as an individual center.

Checklist of preferred characteristics:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates commitment to high-need school districts and that they are given priority.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Demonstrates that technology leaders in high-need school districts have been trained as turnkey trainers for their LEA (i.e., train the trainer model).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Delivers services equitably across hardware platforms.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provides state of the art technology resources for educators to work with.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Develops strategies for obtaining teacher time commitment for ongoing sustained professional development programs that utilize job embedded, student engaging, action research oriented teaching applications, not just after school or evening, one time workshops.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Actively works with high need districts to provide help and support with their District in Need of Improvement Plans and the implementation of those plans.

- Demonstration of capacity for success as part of the center network.

Checklist of preferred characteristics:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Provides access and introductory training for professional development programs funded through federal technology programs to school districts and assists with statewide initiatives.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Coordinates training to school districts in the use of the resources provided from the NHDOE Office of Educational Technology, including those available through the NH Educators Online (NHEON) web portal.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Defines procedures to assist regional school districts to develop or update their district technology plan and submit it electronically to the NHDOE.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Develops a process to provide assistance to districts applying for grant opportunities and submitting E-rate applications.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provides technology assistance to districts, such as data warehousing services, file servers, and filtering solutions as determined by local needs.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provides professional development trainers including those with significant and diverse expertise in areas of technology integration, with the capacity to offer on-going job embedded practice and support.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provides assistance to educators with initial steps to take advantage of distance learning opportunities, such as OPEN NH and the e-Learning for Educators Initiative.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provides easy access to meeting sites where equipment and experts for a variety of technologies, including synchronous, multi-point video conferencing are located. This specifically includes bandwidth availability to host websites that mirror state initiatives such as on-line testing/surveys.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provides assistance with state and federal assessments and evaluations, facilitated by technology tools, offering data to inform decision making by all stakeholders, using the "Collaborative Evaluation Led by Local Evaluators" (www.neirtec.org/evaluation).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Maintains a LESCEN collaborative, updated, online calendar of dates and events for both LESCEN and individual center programming to insure statewide awareness of center/LESCEN offerings.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Works with the DOE to acquire additional funding and support by providing DOE programs and professional development opportunities for their constituents.

Evaluation (Limit to 2 pages – 15 points)

Describe the process you will follow to evaluate the effectiveness of your center. Please use "Collaborative Evaluation led by Local Educators" (<http://www.neirtec.org/evaluation/>) to develop your plan. Evaluation plans should include the following items:

- The critical questions you want to answer about the impact of your center.
- Who you will involve or work with (within your organization or outside) in order to complete the evaluation.
- Who within your district/center community needs to learn about your evaluation findings and what difference the knowledge might make.

Staff time should be planned to work collaboratively with LESCEN to develop and carry out a common evaluation procedure that all members of LESCEN can use to evaluate their effectiveness as a center network in providing high quality professional development to New Hampshire educators. Your plan should describe the following steps:

- How you will develop your evaluation team and select your questions.
- How you will prepare your team to select appropriate data, and procedures to collect it.
- How you will collect the data.
- How you will make sense of your findings.
- How you will make sense of your results and use them to make improvements.

Budget Narrative (Limit to 2 pages – 15 points)

Your proposal should include **both** a budget narrative and a budget table using the categories listed in the table below.

Budget narrative should be in paragraph form, demonstrate a logical connection to your project goals as described, and should be specific enough to give reviewers an idea of your priorities and focus of your funding, both as an individual center and as one of the LESCEN sites. Please include:

- Justification for major expenditures proposed, especially salaries and programming costs. For each center staff member, please indicate the approximate percentage of time to be spent on administration vs. training or facilitation;
- Explanation of any items or costs on the budget sheet that might not be considered completely clear or obvious by a reader; and
- Description of funding needs that support achieving your individual center goals and objectives, as well as the LESCEN goals and objectives.

Budget table should be listed with brief item descriptions and amounts according to the categories below. Please indicate the amounts of funds being requested in this grant, as well as any in-kind contributions from the sponsoring district or other partners. While in-kind contributions are not a federal requirement for awarding these funds, this data helps the NHDOE to understand levels of support for your center and the center network concept.

Budget Page

Budget (Describe as appropriate)	Amount Requested	In-Kind Contributions
Personnel (Please specify salaries, benefits, travel, etc.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full Time Center Staff • Part Time Center Staff • Educator Stipends • Professional Development Consultants • Other 		
Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hardware • Software • Connectivity • Other 		
Facilities and Office Expenses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refreshments • Phone, electric, maintenance, etc. • Furniture • Office supplies, printing, etc. 		
Evaluation		
Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Website Development • Other 		
Indirect Cost		
TOTAL		

APPENDIX C: REVIEW 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 five areas described above. Proposals must score at least 60 points for awards to be granted.

Scoring Rubric: Enhancing Education Through Technology – Center Grants

CRITERIA	Insufficient	Sufficient	Average	Excellent
Proposal Abstract (Limit to 1 page 5 points)				
▪ Abstract describes both individual center and participation within the center network in terms of improvements to be made.	1/2	1.5	2	2.5
▪ Abstract describes the philosophy of the Center and relates to funding requested.	1/2	1.5	2	2.5
Center Mission and Oversight Committee (Limit to 2 pages – 5 points)				
▪ Goals are clear, measurable, are linked to the Professional Development Task Force and promote a network philosophy.	1/2	1.5	2	2.5
▪ Oversight committee indicates active involvement of consortium members.	1/2	1.5	2	2.5
General Responsibilities and Scope of Work (Limit to 6 ½ pages - 30 points)				
Scope of Work includes a substantial amount of individual center preferred programming activity plans and outcomes.	1	3	4	5
Scope of Work includes identification of individual programming strengths and plans to improve and increase the effectiveness of the individual center are evident.	1	3	4	5
Scope of Work identifies individual focus areas for the center which are connected to the individual goals of the center.	1	3	4	5
Scope of Work includes a substantial amount of LESCEN preferred programming activity plans and outcomes.	1	3	4	5
Scope of Work includes identification of LESCEN partnership strengths and plans to improvement and increase the effectiveness of the network are evident.	1	3	4	5
Scope of Work identifies LESCEN programming areas which are connected to the overall LESCEN goals.	1	3	4	5

Capacity for Success (Limit to 6 ½ pages – 30 points)				
The staff members who will be responsible for conducting the work are described in detail, including title, role, or name when available or appropriate.	1	3	4	5
The center/district resources, policies, and procedures already in place to support the individual center and network are described in detail.	1	3	4	5
Evidence that the plan is realistic and that the district has the capacity to achieve its plan is provided.	1	3	4	5
Letters of intent from each participating district in the consortium are included and show evidence that significant discussion of support and capacity for the ability to meet the needs of the NH districts has taken place.	1	3	4	5
Evidence of capacity for success as an individual center is significant, and includes a majority of the preferred characteristics.	1	3	4	5
Evidence of capacity for success as an integral member of the center network is significant, and includes a majority of the preferred characteristics.	1	3	4	5
Evaluation (Limit to 2 pages – 15 points)				
Collaborative Evaluation Guide is used to develop the evaluation plan.	1	3	4	5
Details of the evaluation plan (i.e., who, what, when, data to be measured) are clear and supportive of proposal activities.	1	3	4	5
Plans for collaborative design of common evaluation strategy are clear.	1	3	4	5
Budget Narrative and Page (Limit to 2 pages – 15 points)				
Justification is reasonable and connected to goals.	1	3	4	5
Explanation of items not completed obvious is made.	1	3	4	5
Funding is separated into individual and LESCEN categories.	1	3	4	5
Total Score (Maximum is 100)				

APPENDIX D: FEDERAL REPORTING GOALS & INDICATORS

The following three sets of goals and indicators are excerpted from the Federal Performance Report for New Hampshire's NCLB Title II-D Program, which is a required annual submission to the U.S. Department of Education.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, TARGETS	NARRATIVE FOR GOAL SET #1
Program Goal	New Hampshire State Tech Plan Goal 2: All teachers will use technology effectively to help students achieve high academic standards.
Statutory Goal (Statutory Goals relate to the Goals submitted in your State Consolidated Application.)	Federal NCLB Title II-D Goal 1: Improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary schools and secondary schools. Federal NCLB Title II-D Goal 3: To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development to establish research-based instructional methods that can be widely implemented as best practices by State educational agencies and local educational agencies.
Program Objective	By 2007-08, 50% of K-12 educators will employ instructional practices consistent with effective integration of technology into instruction.
Indicator	Percentage of K-12 educators who meet Levels 3 or 4 (Infusion or Integration) on the Levels of Technology Implementation (LoTi) Framework
Target: <i>BASELINE DATA</i> <i>Status of data in 2002-03</i>	23% of LoTi survey respondents (1,321 out of 5,774) met Levels 3 or 4
Target: <i>Status of data in 2003-04</i>	29% of LoTi survey respondents (2,228 out of 7,583) met Levels 3 or 4
Target: <i>Status of data in 2004-05</i>	35% of LoTi survey respondents (3,325 out of 9,520) met Levels 3 or 4
Target: <i>Status of data in 2005-06</i>	42% of LoTi survey respondents (3,543 out of 8,350) met Levels 3 or 4
Target for 2006-07	45% of LoTi survey respondents will meet Levels 3 or 4
Target for 2007-08	50% of LoTi survey respondents will meet Levels 3 or 4
Assessment of Progress: <i>Status of progress on indicator (1= Target met; 2 = Target not met)</i>	1 = The target was met in 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05, and 2005-06.
Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.	Annual statewide LoTi reports

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, TARGETS	NARRATIVE FOR GOAL SET #2
Program Goal	New Hampshire State Tech Plan Goal 2: All teachers will use technology effectively to help students achieve high academic standards.
Statutory Goal (Statutory Goals relate to the Goals submitted in your State Consolidated Application.)	Federal NCLB Title II-D Goal 1: Improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary schools and secondary schools. Federal NCLB Title II-D Goal 3: To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development to establish research-based instructional methods that can be widely implemented as best practices by State educational agencies and local educational agencies.
Program Objective	By 2007-08, programs delivered by district sponsored Educational Support Centers will provide high quality technology-enhanced professional development services to a minimum of 25% of New Hampshire educators.
Indicator	Percentage of educators served by high quality technology-enhanced professional development programs
Target: <i>BASELINE DATA</i> <i>Status of data in 2002-03</i>	During the first year, districts were engaged in forming consortia of districts within each region of the state and articulating services and specific programs to be delivered. Therefore, no data was collected during 2002-03. Baseline data is indicated in 2003-04 below.
Target: <i>Status of data in 2003-04</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,053 educators participated in one or more Center programs • 596 out of 1,053 participants (57%) were from 50 high need districts • 503 out of 1,053 participants (48%) participated in multi-day sessions such as Intel training, online courses, or summer institutes
Target: <i>Status of data in 2004-05</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,795 educators participated in one or more Center programs • 1,419 out of 1,795 participants (79%) were from 54 high need schools • 926 out of 1,795 participants (52%) participated in multi-day sessions such as Intel training, online courses, or summer institutes
Target for 2005-06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over 2,500 educators will participate in one or more Center programs
Target for 2006-07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over 3,000 educators will participate in one or more Center programs
Target for 2007-08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over 3,750 educators will participate in one or more Center programs
Assessment of Progress: <i>Status of progress on indicator (1= Target met; 2 = Target not met)</i>	1 = The target was met in 2003-04 and 2004-05.
Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual progress reports from support centers • Annual participant evaluation surveys

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, TARGETS	NARRATIVE FOR GOAL SET #3
Program Goal	New Hampshire State Tech Plan Goal 3: All students will have technology and information literacy skills.
Statutory Goal (Statutory Goals relate to the Goals submitted in your State Consolidated Application.)	Federal NCLB Title II-D Goal 2: To assist every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every student is technologically literate by the time the student finishes the eighth grade, regardless of the student's race, ethnicity, gender, family income, geographic location, or disability.
Program Objective	By 2007-08, all districts will provide technology tools and instruction to ensure that their students are technologically literate by the end of 8 th grade, consistent with New Hampshire's Ed 306.42 ICT Literacy Program Standards.
Indicator	All 8th grade students in all districts will demonstrate that they are technologically literate by the end of 8th grade through successful completion of a digital portfolio, as defined in state standards.
Target: BASELINE DATA <i>Status of data in 2002-03</i>	18% of all districts (30 out of 163) indicated that they had a program of instruction AND assessment of technology literacy in 8 th grade, aligned to the state standards for technology literacy.
Target: <i>Status of data in 2003-04</i>	No further data pertinent to this target was gathered this year, so the status of the target remained the same as 2002-03.
Target: <i>Status of data in 2004-05</i>	No further data pertinent to this target was gathered this year, so the status of the target remained the same as 2002-03.
Target: <i>Status of data in 2005-06</i>	37% of all districts (61 out of 163) indicated that they had a program of instruction AND assessment of technology literacy in 8 th grade, aligned to the state standards for technology literacy.
Target for 2006-07	50% of all districts (82 out of 163) will indicate that they have a program of instruction AND assessment of technology literacy in 8 th grade, aligned to the state standards for technology literacy.
Target for 2007-08	75% of all districts (163) will indicate that they have a program of instruction AND assessment of technology literacy in 8 th grade, aligned to the state standards for technology literacy.
Assessment of Progress: <i>Status of progress on indicator (1= Target met; 2 = Target not met)</i>	1 – Target was met and exceeded by 12% in 2005-06.
Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual school technology survey from all schools • District technology plans

SUBMISSION PROCESS

Submission is a TWO-STEP process. BOTH steps are required. Submissions must include the Proposal Cover Page with superintendent's signature, narrative section, budget page, and signed OBM Form 1.

Step One: E-mailed copy:

Send an electronic version of the application attached as a Word document with cover page, narrative, and budget, and with OBM Form 1 as an Excel document, to chiggins@ed.state.nh.us.

Step Two: Hard copy:

One original plus three paper copies of the application cover page, narrative, budget, and OBM Form 1 must be mailed or hand-delivered to:

Cathy Higgins
Office of Educational Technology
Division of Instruction
New Hampshire Department of Education
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301

NOTE: E-mailed copies must be received by 4:00 PM on March 15, 2007 and hard copies must be postmarked by March 15, 2007.
