The following information must be completed and submitted with the other required documents in order for the grant application to be considered complete and eligible for ESE review.

30 Page Maximum including attachments.

**Priorities**
Describe how your proposal aligns with the District Standards, ESE Priorities, and RFP Priorities outlined in the RFP (3 paragraph maximum).

**Eligibility Part I**
Participation Requirements

1. Lead District:
   a. Is the lead district implementing the new Educator Evaluation Regulations during the 2012-2013 school year?  
      ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   
   b. Does the lead district have a ratified teacher agreement that has been submitted to ESE for review or has the district notified ESE of the decision to adopt the Massachusetts Model System of Educator Evaluation?  
      ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   
      ☐ Yes  ☐ No

2. List Additional District/Collaborative Partners:
   a. Are all additional partnering districts planning to implement the new Educator Evaluation Regulations no later than the 2013-2014 school year?  
      ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   
   b. Will all partnering districts finalize and publish training schedules prior to implementation?  
      ☐ Yes  ☐ No
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility Part II Technology Requirements</th>
<th>1. Adherence to the Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Will the technology application adhere to the Educator Evaluation Regulations (603 CMR 35.00)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. In particular, will the technology adhere to evaluation ratings privacy requirements described in 603 CMR 35.11 (6)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Will the technology application comply with locally bargained teacher contracts of all participating districts and is it consistent with any parameters regarding the use of technology?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Will the technology application support implementation of the 5-Step Cycle?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes   No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Will the technology application include the ability for evaluators and educators to collect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3. If the applicant is not partnering with additional districts and/or collaboratives, please provide justification for this decision: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Partnering Vendor:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Is the chosen vendor aware of the requirement that a vendor can only participate in one partnership associated with this funding opportunity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes   No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Is the chosen vendor included on any other grant applications for this funding opportunity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes   No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Have all participating districts/collaboratives/vendor agreed to and signed the MOU?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes   No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| c. If partnering with districts/collaboratives, please describe how partner district(s)/collaborative(s) were identified and the reasoning behind establishing this partnership. |

| 3. If partnering with districts/collaboratives, please describe how partner district(s)/collaborative(s) were identified and the reasoning behind establishing this partnership. |

| 3. If partnering with districts/collaboratives, please describe how partner district(s)/collaborative(s) were identified and the reasoning behind establishing this partnership. |

| 3. If partnering with districts/collaboratives, please describe how partner district(s)/collaborative(s) were identified and the reasoning behind establishing this partnership. |
and upload evidence and artifacts (in multiple formats, such as pdf, wav, jpeg, etc.) consistent with the 5-Step Cycle and recommendations within the Massachusetts Model System for Educator Evaluation?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

Please list the available formats:

5. Will the technology application support the implementation of DDMs?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

If so, please describe how it will address roster verification/teacher attribution, student performance on DDMs, and district’s ability to match identified DDMs to appropriate educators:

6. Will the technology application include a method for communicating evaluation data (evidence, observations, ratings, student performance on DDMs, feedback, etc.) between evaluators and educators and/or providing educators access to their personal evaluation data?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Please briefly describe the communication methods and capabilities of the technology application, and how educators will be able to access their personal evaluation data:

7. Please describe the professional development that will be provided on the use of the technology application. In particular, indicate who will be delivering the professional development (district/vendor) and if the professional development will be available in self-directed formats.

Note: Applicants should include planned professional development opportunities in the submitted timeline.

8. Will the technology application and content comply with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts accessibility standards and a, b, and c below?
### Eligibility Part III

#### Reporting Requirements

1. **Will the lead district provide written project updates throughout the duration of the grant to ESE (tentative dates included in RFP), including progress on the development of the technology application, information regarding professional development on using the technology application, and any challenges that have been encountered and their anticipated resolution?**

   - Yes  
   - No

2. **Will the lead district collect and provide feedback from partnership participants, including end-users, to ESE regarding the use of the developed technology application and the associated professional development?**

   - Yes  
   - No

   **Please briefly describe the plan for collecting feedback:**

3. **Prior to the completion of the grant, will the lead district and vendor schedule a demonstration of the developed technology application to ESE?**

   **Final reports and demonstrations are expected by June 30th, 2014.**

   - Yes  
   - No

---

### Competitive Priority

Grant applications that include the following will be given competitive priority when ESE scores
1. Does the application include partnerships with other district(s) and/or collaborative(s)?
   - Yes  
   - No

2. Will the technology application include the Massachusetts Model System for Educator Evaluation (including the rubrics and forms)?
   - Yes  
   - No

3. Will the technology application be available in multiple formats in addition to web-based applications, such as mobile applications (available on multiple operating systems and offline)?
   - Yes  
   - No

   If Yes, please list and describe the formats in which the developed technology application will be available:

4. Will the technology application integrate with other district systems, have the ability to upload/export data to other systems (For example: Human Resources, Learning Management Systems (Professional Development), Student Information Systems, Student Assessment, etc.) or simplify other documentation (For example: Individual Professional Development Plans, 603 CMR 44.04)?
   - Yes  
   - No

   a. Please list the district systems (for each district in the partnership) for which the technology application will be integrated and include a description of the upload/export capabilities of the developed technology application.

   b. Please describe how the integration of these systems will ease the implementation of Educator Evaluation and simplify reporting to ESE.

5. Will the technology application include options to operate within a single school, with multiple schools, and with multiple districts and include appropriate privacy protections consistent with personnel protections?
   - Yes  
   - No

   a. Please describe which of these options will be available with the developed technology applications.
6. Will the technology application be end-user focused with an easy user interface, allowing for configurable elements anticipated being popular among districts (For example: adaptations to educator rubrics, number of observations, forms, additional supports for struggling educators, etc.)?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please list and describe the configurable elements that will be available in the developed technology application.

7. Will the technology application be built on Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. Will the technology application be compatible with district systems currently used for reporting the seven required data elements for submission to ESE (603 CMR 35.11 (5))?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a. Please describe the district(s) system(s) used to report the seven required data elements for submission to ESE.

b. Please describe how the developed technology application will be compatible/interact with the systems above.

9. Districts are strongly encouraged to use a deliverable-based payment system with partnering vendors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a. Will you pay the vendor based on deliverables produced?  

b. If so, please describe (or attach) the deliverables and payment schedule based on the proposed timeline.
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### c. If not, please describe how the vendor will be paid and the steps taken by the lead district to ensure a high quality, functional, and useful technology application will be developed and professional development provided.

### Funding

Approximately $250,000 is available for these technology innovation grants, but the total amount awarded will depend on the quantity and quality of the proposals received.

Applicants should clearly identify the award amount they are requesting (ranging from $50,000 - $75,000) and provide justification for the amount requested.

1. What is the award amount being requested?

2. In addition to submitting the required budget documents, please describe how this amount was determined and provide a general breakdown of how the funds will be used (technology application development, professional development, technology application testing, technology application refinement, etc.).

3. What is the estimated number of educators that will be using the tool during the 2013-2014 school year?

Note: Upon approval, ESE will issue grant payments to the lead district in accordance with grant management policies. For information about the release of funds, please review the Grant Management website at [http://finance1.doe.mass.edu/Grants/procedure/manual.html](http://finance1.doe.mass.edu/Grants/procedure/manual.html).

### Fund Use

Funds should be used to support the development of technology applications and professional development aligned with the above priorities and qualifications.

Funds can be used toward enhancements of current technology applications that support the implementation of Educator Evaluation with the purpose of bringing the technology applications into alignment with the requirements stated in this RFP. Funds can also be used to develop new technology applications consistent with the RFP requirements.

Spending priority is for the development and implementation of the technology application and
associated professional development.

Funds will be awarded to the lead districts. Lead districts are responsible for contracting with the identified vendor to develop the evaluation system or enhancements to an existing system. Lead districts may also pay stipends to their staff and to contract with their partnering districts and collaboratives to cover the cost of any time that representatives from those districts or collaboratives spend on developing system requirements beyond contractual hours. Travel costs are also allowable.

When submitting applications, applicants should clearly identify any funds being proposed for the purchase of technology devices to support the use of the developed technology application.

1. Are the requested grant funds for the enhancement of a current technology application that supports the implementation of Educator Evaluation? □ Yes □ No
   a. If so, please describe the current technology application and identify the gaps between its current capabilities and the requirements outlined in this RFP.
   b. Please provide any additional information about the current tool that you believe pertinent to this grant application (it is strongly recommended that, if available, you include a link to the current technology application and/or attach examples of the technology application and its functionality).
   c. If the grant funds are for the development of a new technology application, please describe the technology application including key functionalities, intended users, etc.

2. Will a portion of the requested funds be used for the purchase of technology devices to support the use of the developed technology application? □ Yes □ No
   a. If so, please list the amount of funds proposed for the purchase of such devices.
   b. If so, please describe the number and type(s) of devices being considered for purchase.
c. If so, please describe how the devices will be used by the lead district and any participating district partners.

| **Timeline** | Please attach a timeline for the duration of the grant (upon approval-June 2014). The timeline should include major activities associated with the development of the technology application, submission of written reporting requirements to ESE (tentative dates included in RFP), piloting the technology application in all participating districts by the 2013-2014 school year, professional development activities, feedback collection from participating districts and end-users, etc. |