

CALL FOR PROPOSALS
Expanding Computing Education Pathways Alliance (ECEP)
Invitational Mini-Grants to Expand Computing Education via Statewide Reform

RFP Available: November 28, 2016

Deadline: Friday, January 20, 2017 5 p.m. EST

Mini-grant funding: States may apply for up to \$25,000 in funding.

The Expanding Computing Education Pathways Alliance (ECEP), a Broadening Participation in Computing Alliance supported by the National Science Foundation, invites leaders from its cohort of states to apply for funding to support specific efforts to expand computing education via statewide reform in their state(s).

Eligibility:

- designated leaders in the current ECEP Cohort: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Indiana, Maryland, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Puerto Rico, Texas, Utah, Virginia. (Georgia and Massachusetts are not eligible). *All proposals must be endorsed by and submitted by the designated ECEP state leader.*
- applicants must have a receiving grantee organization identified (i.e., university, 501(c)3 nonprofit, or other entity that can subcontract with Georgia Tech via the National Science Foundation (NSF)).
- All mini-grant awardees will be required to submit the following documentation to Georgia Tech (these items do not need to be included in your mini-grant proposal):
 - SF FastLane system registration (if lead organization is not already in the system)
 - statement of work, a one-page abstract describing the project goals
 - final budget
 - final budget justification: This narrative must describe each line item in the budget.
 - Letter of Intent: The institution receiving the grant must submit a letter stating that they are confident in the application and the applicant's ability to meet the objectives outlined in the application.
- Past recipients may apply. Include a 1 – 2 page progress report on current mini-grant(s) with mini-grant application.

Criteria for state eligibility:

1. The state is engaged in efforts to grow the number and diversity of computing-intensive undergraduates in their state by improving and expanding the computing education pathways. Broadening participation in computing must be one of the state goals.
2. One or two identified state leader(s)/liaison(s) for ECEP, ideally with a role in the state education system and relevant experience.
3. An advisory/steering committee exists to work with leader(s), drawn from stakeholder groups across the state (e.g. high schools, colleges/universities, state department of education,

business/industry). The advisory/steering committee's role is to support broadening participation in computing state-wide and is not limited to advising on the proposed mini-grant project. States not currently meeting this requirement may still apply and must identify how funding will support development of a state-wide advisory board or steering committee.

4. The state is an active participant on ECEP Alliance calls and in ECEP Alliance activities. States not currently meeting this requirement may still apply and must identify how funding will support full participation in ECEP.

Purpose of mini-grants:

To support statewide and systemic change, expansion of computing education pathways, and broadened participation.

Timeframe for proposed activities: Activities should take place between notification of funding and no later than September 30, 2017 (shorter project timeframes are encouraged). Attach a timeline outlining activities in each calendar month of the award period.

Examples of activities that may be supported:

- o send teachers to train-the-trainer type professional development (PD) that prepares them to provide PD in the future.
- o support the creation of a report on the computing education landscape in a state (e.g. pay for research/writing/editing and/or meetings)
- o support a statewide meeting with teachers, policymakers, and other stakeholders to raise awareness and develop a common set of goals/strategies or achieve other goals related to statewide CS education reform (e.g., a Computing Education Summit)
- o support costs of Transfer Summits to gather faculty and transfer staff from two- and four- year higher education campuses to strategize ways to ease the transfer pathway and support success and retention of transfer students
- o disseminate ECEP-related work within the state or nationally
- o implement ECEP-developed activities in your state (e.g., Artbotics, Rise Up 4 CS [AP-CS help sessions], surveys of professional development needs of K12 teachers) at a statewide level.

Examples of activities that will not be supported:

- eacher professional development (we will only fund training for PD providers/ “train the trainers”)
- ne-time or one-site workshops, camps, or other educational programs that are not sustained
- evelopment of state-centric outreach materials (we will only fund resource development that can benefit multiple states)

Proposals will be evaluated using the following **criteria:**

1. Does the state have a designated leader(s) with relevant experience and position/network?

2. Does the state have an existing advisory/steering committee?
3. If successful, what will the proposed activity achieve?
4. How does the proposed activity fit into the state's overall plan to expand computing education pathways and broaden participation?
5. How does the proposed activity fit within the state change model ECEP is developing?
6. Does the proposed activity build on ECEP's work (e.g. [Process for How to Change a State](#), models such as transfer summits, [workshops on sustainable summer camps](#), [Artbotics](#), [Rise Up 4 CS](#), Computing Education Summits)?
7. Does the proposed activity utilize ECEP's [Expert Bureau](#) (if appropriate)?
8. What is the potential impact of this activity within the state? Beyond the state?
9. Is the activity planned sufficiently to guarantee success?
10. Will we have evaluation evidence that the proposed activity achieved its goals? ECEP does not require an external evaluator, though you may include one in your budget plans. We encourage you to re-use and modify evaluation materials that others states have used (ECEP can make suggestions).
11. Will this activity be sustained in the future with other funding or support? Or if a one-time activity, how will the impact be sustained or lead to other efforts toward reforming computing education?
12. Are the personnel qualified to meet the outcomes outlined in the proposal?
13. Can the activity be funded with NSF BPC funds (with legal limitations enforced by Georgia Tech's Office of Sponsored Programs)? For example, NSF BPC funds cannot be used to lobby legislators.

Budget Restrictions: Funds will be made available either via an invoice (if the amount is less than \$5,000 and can be charged through Georgia Tech) or a subaward. The recipient will be subject to the same federal cost principles to Georgia Tech, as a prime recipient, are bound, e.g., funds can't be used to purchase alcohol. Funding need not go to the state leader's institution, but can go to other organizations, schools, or institutions within the state, subject to Georgia Tech and NSF constraints.

Reporting: All funded proposals will be required to submit a 1 – 2 page report when mini-grant activities are completed, or at the end of the funding cycle. Awardees will receive communication regarding reporting requirements upon notification of successful applications.

Application Process:

1. Identify your state leader(s) and advisory/steering committee
2. Review ECEP's mission and work at <http://ecepalliance.org/>
3. Plan your proposed activity in the context of your state's current needs and efforts and ECEP's interventions and recommendations for state change
4. Submit proposal for support for your proposed activity, along with budget, no later than 5 pm. EST, Friday, January 20, 2017. Email Word (application) and Excel (budget) documents to Sarah Dunton at sdunton@cs.umass.edu.
5. ECEP PIs and co-PIs will review applications and request any follow-up information via email to the State Lead
6. Awards will be announced around February 20, 2017.
7. Questions about this RFP or the process can be addressed to Sarah Dunton, sdunton@cs.umass.edu

Funding Proposals should include the following information (Word doc preferred) and be emailed by the ECEP State Leader to Sarah Dunton (sdunton@cs.umass.edu) by 5 pm EST, January 20, 2017.

APPLICANT AND LEADERSHIP INFORMATION

State/Territory Leader(s):

Name
Institution/Company/Department
Title
Email
Phone
Mailing Address

Primary contact responsible for the proposed activity (if different from state leader(s):

Name
Institution/Company/Department
Title
Email
Phone
Mailing Address

Institution to which mini-grant would be awarded:

NOTE: this should be an organization authorized to subcontract with Georgia Tech for NSF funds; be mindful of indirect cost rates

Title of proposed activity:

Mini-grant funding request: \$ _____ (\$25,000 max)

Date or timeframe of activity:

Name of ECEP advisory/steering committee in your state:

List of current ECEP Alliance members consulted regarding this application.

Description/mission of above:

Committee has been in existence since: [DATE]

Primary contact for advisory/steering committee:

Name
Institution/Company/Department
Title
Email
Phone
Mailing Address

Names, titles, company/institutions of committee members:

PROPOSED PROJECT INFORMATION

PLEASE SUBMIT BRIEF ANSWERS TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS OR A PROPOSAL NARRATIVE THAT RESPONDS TO ALL QUESTIONS

1. Describe your proposed activity to support expansion of computing education and broaden participation in your state. What is the purpose/goal of the activity?
2. Explain where your state currently fits in the model for statewide reform ECEP is currently developing, and why this activity makes sense at this time.
3. Describe your plan to implement this activity. Generally, who will carry it out, when, how? Attach a monthly timeline of milestones/activities.
4. Describe your evaluation plan for the activity and your plan to share the results with ECEP. Contact SageFox if you want to contract with them to perform the evaluation.
5. Why is this activity needed and how does it fit into your state's plan to reform computing education and broaden participation in computing?
6. What do you anticipate to be the impact of this activity within your state? Do you expect any impact beyond your state?
7. How will the activity be evaluated, and how will you plan to work with ECEP evaluators to measure its impact?
8. Does this activity build on any of ECEP's work thus far? If you're not sure, let us know what kind of advice or consultation might be useful.
9. Does this activity utilize any of ECEP's Expert Bureau? If so, describe.
10. How will this activity be sustained after the mini-grant? Or, if it is meant to be a one-time activity, how will it lead to or leverage ongoing efforts?
11. What other information would you like to provide us about your proposed activity or work in your state up to this point?

BUDGET: Please submit your itemized budget, along with a written budget justification explaining each requested item/detail.

Requests for up to \$25,000 are welcome. Applicants may also propose to draw on the ECEP "Experts Bureau" to support their activities, with travel and stipends provided directly by ECEP—no subcontract is required for Expert Bureau support.

Funds will be made available either via invoice (if the amount is less than \$5,000 and can be charged through Georgia Tech) or a subaward. The recipient will be subject to the same federal cost principles to Georgia Tech, as a prime recipient, are bound, e.g., funds can't be used to purchase alcohol.