

FY10 Title II.D (Ed Tech) Programs

Following is a listing of the applications receiving tentative approval for FY10 Title II.D Enhancing Education through Technology grants. Note “tentative approval” indicates the application is approvable and should be funded when the Department receives its Title II.D and ARRA awards. *To receive final approval, applicants must complete grant negotiations – during which time the final approved amount will be determined. Tentatively approved applicants will be contacted by Instructional Technology and/or eMINTS staffs (if appropriate) for next step instructions.*

Tentatively-Approved Applications by Funding Source

Title II.D – Continuation eMINTS grants (8)

East Newton Co. R-VI (Granby)
Fulton 58
Hancock Place
Putnam Co. R-I (Unionville)
Richmond R-XVI
School of the Osage R-II
Sullivan
Westran R-I (Huntsville)

Title II.D – New eMINTS grants (2)

Gasconade Co. R-I (Hermann)
Jefferson City

ARRA – New eMINTS grants (8)

Cameron R-I
Cassville R-IV
Lebanon R-III
North Kansas City 74
Sedalia 200
Sikeston R-6
St. Louis City
Wellston

ARRA – New Other (non-eMINTS) grants (6)

Arcadia Valley R-II (Ironton)
Blue Springs R-IV
Columbia 93
Eldon R-I
Ferguson-Florissant R-II and Ritenour (partnership project)
Nixa R-II

See information below for scoring and approval decision details.

FY10 Title II.D Competitive Sub-Grant Programs

Following are descriptions and data tables that detail the scoring and approval processes for the competitive sub-grant programs funded under the FY10 Title II.D Enhancing Education through Technology (EETT) program. For school-year 2009-10, program funding includes the regular Title II.D funds and one-time funding made available to Title II.D through the 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). *For additional information about these programs, see the website at: <http://dese.mo.gov/divimprove/instrtech/federalfunded/TitleIID/>.*

Program Purpose

The purpose of the Title II.D program is to help districts improve student academic achievement (including technology literacy) through the integration of technology in curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development. Program funding is typically distributed to districts via Formula and Competitive grants. Formula allocations are based on districts' Title I.A allocations. Competitive grants are intended to be of sufficient size and scope to result in significant impact. By law, competitive Title II.D grants must target "high-need" districts, defined as schools serving the highest numbers and/or percentages of children living in poverty based on U.S. Census data.

Competitive Grants

In Missouri, competitive funds are earmarked to support schoolwide implementation of the research-based eMINTS instructional model, based on intensive professional development programs that inspire educators to use instructional strategies powered by technology to enrich teaching, engage students in the excitement of learning, and improve student performance. The Comprehensive eMINTS for Teachers, as well as the MINTS for All Teachers and the eMINTS for Ed-Tech Specialists, are two-year programs, so a second year of non-competitive (continuation) funding is provided for projects that make sufficient progress in year one.

In regards to the additional ARRA competitive funding, Missouri decided to allocate 75% of the EETT-ARRA competitive grant funds to support implementation of the eMINTS instructional model, and allocate the remaining 25% for other projects that aim to improve teaching strategies and student achievement through other research-based, technology-infused instructional models.

Funds Distribution

For equity purposes, competitive grant funds are distributed across four geographic quadrants. The percentage of program funds designated per quadrant is equal in proportion to the percentage of districts located in the quadrant.

Quadrant	eMINTS Model	Other Models
NE = 16%	\$ 676,012	\$ 180,491
NW = 24%	1,014,018	270,736
SE = 28%	1,183,021	315,859
SW = 32%	1,352,024	360,981
	\$4,225,075	\$1,128,067

Applications Submission

A total of 75 applications were submitted for funding under the FY10 Title II.D and the ARRA-funded Title II.D competitive sub-grant programs, requesting nearly \$20 million.

Area	Continuation	Competitive Applications		Totals
	eMINTS Model	eMINTS Model	Other Models	
NE	2	3	4	9
NW	2	12	1	15
SE	2	10	7	19
SW	2	21	9	32
Totals	8	46	21	75
	\$963,505	\$15,274,307	\$3,674,902	\$19,912,714

Continuation Application Review Process

Continuation grants receive funding priority. Department staff review projects' Year 1 progress and their Year 2 applications to finalize goals, objectives, and budgets. Following is a list of the eight Year 2 eMINTS grant applicants and the amounts they requested. *[Note that budgets are subject to negotiation and may change.]*

Title II.D eMINTS Continuation Grants

Applicant	Request	Applicant	Request
East Newton Co. R-VI	\$ 118,122	Richmond R-XVI	67,818
Fulton 58	136,346	School of the Osage	119,925
Hancock Place	149,944	Sullivan	106,175
Putnam Co. R-I	135,000	Westran R-I	130,175
			Total = \$963,505

Competitive Application Review Process

Grant application narratives are reviewed by panels of Missouri educators, with the FY10 applications reviewed April 20-23, 2009. Readers used established criteria to assign scores for the project narratives, as detailed below.

- Applications for implementing the eMINTS instructional model are evaluated by five reviewers. Narratives could receive up to 180 points. The high and low reader scores are eliminated and the three remaining scores are averaged.
- Applications for implementing other instructional models are evaluated by three readers. Narratives could receive up to 100 points. The two scores closest to one another are used to determine the score average.

In addition to the narrative reviews, applications could receive an additional 20 points based on need. Department staff assigned these additional scores, as detailed below.

- Economic Need scores are based on the percentage rate of students eligible for the Free and Reduced Lunch Program (1 to 5 points possible) and previous funding history (1 to 5 points possible)
- Technology Need scores are based on AYP status (1 to 5 points possible) and the ratio of students per Internet-connected computer (1 to 5 points possible).

Tentative Approval Decisions

Approval decisions are based on the total score (narrative score plus need points) and the amount of funds available for each program type and geographic quadrant. A total score of 200 points is possible for projects implementing the eMINTS instructional model, and 120 points is possible for projects implementing other instructional models. The first grants to receive tentative approval are those that score the highest in their competition. The next level of approval is based on quadrant balances, followed by next highest score, then quadrant balance, then score, etc. – as funding allows. The tables below indicate the applicants to receive tentative approval and the basis for their tentative approval status.

FIRST CUT: TOP-SCORING GRANTS

eMINTS Model Grants

Applicant	Quad	Score	Request
St. Louis City	NE	158	\$ 393,734
Wellston	NE	135	184,000
North Kansas City 74	NW	166	396,956
Cameron R-I	NW	154	398,307
Sikeston R-6	SE	161	399,488
Gasconade Co. R-I	SE	147	387,429
Jefferson City	SW	162	399,416
Sedalia 200	SW	160	399,876
Sub-Total = 8			\$2,959,206

Other Model Grants

Applicant	Quad	Score	Request
Columbia 93	NE	89	\$ 199,989
Blue Springs R-IV	NW	89	184,346
Arcadia Valley R-II	SE	85	200,000
Eldon R-I	SW	91	192,192
Sub-Total = 4			\$776,527

NEXT CUTS: QUADRANT BALANCE, then NEXT HIGHEST SCORE

eMINTS Model Grants

Applicant	Quad	Score	Request
Quadrant balance and Next highest score (tie)			
Lebanon R-III	SW	153	307,190
Cassville R-IV	SW	153	399,392
Sub-Total = 2			\$706,582

Other Model grants

Applicant	Quad	Score	Request
Quadrant balance			
Nixa R-II	SW	85	196,465
Next highest score and best budget fit **			
Ferguson-Florissant	NE	88	199,692
Sub-Total = 2			\$396,157

** Decision made to add one more non-eMINTS grant in full, rather than a partial eMINTS grant.

Total = 10	\$3,665,788
-------------------	--------------------

Total = 6	\$1,172,684
------------------	--------------------

Nonpublic School Participation

Students enrolled in Missouri private and independent schools located in districts that participate in federal programs and receiving Title II.D grant funds may also receive Title II.D program benefits. Funding for nonpublic school participation is based on districts' Title II.D Formula allocations (as applicable) and Competitive grant awards (if applicable). These funds bypass the Department and are administered by the Missouri Independent & Private Schools Education Technology Center (MIPS-ET), a service organization developed by PAL Services Inc. and Practical Concepts Consulting, L.L.C. [<http://www.mips-et.org/index.html>].

The table below summarizes the *estimated* FY10 Title II.D and ARRA-funded competitive grant funding earmarked for both public and nonpublic schools. These *estimations* are based on the amounts requested by the applications. In June, program and district staffs participate in grant negotiations to determine the "final approval" grant amounts, which may result in changes to public school grant amounts which, in turn, will impact nonpublic school amounts.

SUMMARY OF TENTATIVELY APPROVED FY10 TITLE II.D COMPETITIVE GRANTS

Tentative Awards, by Grant Type	District Grant Requests	Nonpublic Estimation	Total
Continuation eMINTS Grants = 8	\$ 963,505	\$ 38,679	\$1,002,184
Competitive eMINTS Model Grants = 10	3,665,788	379,709	4,045,497
Competitive Other Model Grants = 6	1,172,684	48,463	1,221,147
Total = 24	\$5,801,977	\$466,851	\$6,268,828