Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of	)
	)
E-rate Deployed Ubiquitously 2011	)
Pilot Program	) WC Docket No. 10-222

ORDER

Adopted: July 11, 2011   **Released: July 11, 2011**

By the Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau:

I.   INTRODUCTION

1.   In this order, we provide additional information on the 20 projects selected to participate in the Learning On-The-Go wireless pilot program (also known as the E-rate Deployed Ubiquitously (EDU) 2011 Pilot Program) and establish reporting requirements that recipients must comply with during the trial period.[1] Funding for these selected projects will support off-premises wireless access to the Internet in order to improve educational opportunities for students or to help library patrons, for example, find and apply for jobs. The projects will receive a total of up to approximately $9 million for the 2011-2012 funding year.[2] The selected projects will promote initiatives to improve off-campus access to e-textbooks for students, connectivity for netbooks for students living in remote, isolated areas, and access to flexible, online education programs for home-bound students unable to attend classes.

II.   BACKGROUND

2.   The E-rate program (formally known as the schools and libraries universal service support mechanism) currently supports, among other services, wireless Internet access on school and library grounds, but requires applicants to cost-allocate support for use of wireless Internet access off the school's or library's premises.[3]

---

[1] *See* appendix A. The selected project applicants were previously announced on March 9, 2011. *See Wireline Competition Bureau Announces Selected Applications for the E-rate Deployed Ubiquitously (EDU) 2011 Wireless Pilot Program*, WC Docket No. 10-222, Public Notice, DA 11-439 (rel. Mar. 9, 2011) (EDU 2011 Announcement PN).

[2] Funding year 2011-2012 starts on July 1, 2011, and ends on June 30, 2012.

[3] *See* USAC website, Schools and Libraries, Eligible Services List of the Schools and Libraries Universal Support Mechanism for Funding Year 2010, available at http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-09-105A2.pdf, at 8 (last visited July 6, 2011) (Funding Year 2010 ESL); USAC website, Schools and Libraries, Cost Allocation Guidelines for Products and Services, available at http://www.usac.org/sl/applicants/step06/cost-allocation-guidelines-products-services.aspx (last visited July 6, 2011); *see also* Funding Year 2010 ESL at 17 (homes or other non-school or non-library sites are provided as examples of ineligible locations) and 25 (explanation of cost allocation). The Commission's current rules presume that services used on school or library premises are serving an educational purpose. *Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism*, CC Docket No. 02-6,

3.   On September 28, 2010, the Commission released the *Schools and Libraries Sixth Report and Order* upgrading and modernizing the E-rate program to encourage the expansion of fast, affordable Internet access in schools and libraries across the country.[4] As part of the *Schools and Libraries Sixth Report and Order*, the Commission launched a pilot program – EDU2011 – to investigate the merits and challenges of wireless off-premises connectivity services for mobile learning devices, and to help the Commission determine whether and how those services should ultimately be eligible for E-rate support.[5] As part of this pilot program, the Commission authorized up to $10 million for funding year 2011 to support a small number of innovative, interactive off-premise wireless connectivity projects for schools and libraries. The Commission delegated implementation of this pilot program to the Wireline Competition Bureau (Bureau).[6] The Commission determined that support would be provided only for connectivity services for the portable devices or equipment.[7] The Commission anticipated that the pilot program's funding would be provided only to existing wireless projects that had already been planned at the time of the announcement (but may be awaiting funding) or were currently underway, to enable the Commission to evaluate how best to use E-rate support for successful wireless projects.[8] To this end, the Commission stated that selected applicants were required to submit a report to the Bureau detailing any data collected as a result of the program and a narrative describing lessons learned from the program.[9]

4.   On November 8, 2010, the Bureau released a public notice announcing the application filing deadline and setting forth the application criteria.[10] Specifically, we indicated that applicants must address the application requirements listed in the public notice and submit their applications to the Commission by December 17, 2010 to be considered for the wireless pilot funding.[11] In response to this public notice, the Bureau received 94 applications seeking approximately $37 million in funding under

---

Second Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 18 FCC Rcd 9202, 9208, paras. 17-18 (*Schools and Libraries Second Report and Order*); 47 C.F.R. § 54.500(b). *But see Schools and Libraries Second Report and Order*, 18 FCC Rcd at 9208-09, n.28 (identifying specific exceptions for offsite cost allocation).

[4] *See Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism, A National Broadband Plan For Our Future*, CC Docket No. 02-6, GN Docket No. 09-51, Sixth Report and Order, 25 FCC Rcd 18762 (2010) (*Schools and Libraries Sixth Report and Order*).

[5] *Id.* at 18785-87, paras. 44-50.

[6] *Id.* at 18786, para. 47.

[7] *Id.* at 18786-87, paras. 47, 50.

[8] *Id.* at 18786-87, para. 48. The Commission also waived, to the extent necessary, the applicable sections of the Commission's E-rate competitive bidding rules for applicants that had already entered into legally binding agreements with service providers for off-premises connectivity for portable wireless devices. *Id.* at 18786, para. 47; 47 C.F.R. § 54.504 (2009).

[9] *Id.*

[10] *See Wireline Competition Bureau Announces Application Deadline for the E-rate Deployed Ubiquitously (EDU) 2011 Pilot Program*, WC Docket No. 10-222, Public Notice, DA 10-2128 (rel. Nov. 8, 2010) (November 2010 Public Notice).

[11] November 2010 Public Notice at 1. On December 17, 2010, the Commission extended the deadline for paper and electronic filings due on December 17, 2010 to December 20, 2010, because the Commission's website and related electronic filing systems and documents became unavailable in the afternoon of December 17, 2010. *See Extension of Deadline, Electronic and Paper Filings*, Public Notice (rel. Dec. 17, 2010).

the pilot program.[12]

5.   On March 9, 2011, the Bureau released a public notice announcing 20 selected applications for the Learning On-The-Go wireless pilot program and reminding selected applicants that they would still need to comply with the regular E-rate application and review procedures in order to receive funding under the pilot program.[13] The selected project applicants (in alphabetical order) are:[14]

1.   Aurora Public Schools (Aurora, CO)
2.   Boys' Latin of Philadelphia Charter (Philadelphia, PA)
3.   City School District of New Rochelle (New Rochelle, NY)
4.   Clay Hill Elementary School (Jacksonville, FL)
5.   Foxfire Center for Student Success (Zanesville, OH)
6.   Greater Southern Tier Board of Cooperative Educational Services (Watkins Glen, NY)
7.   Haralson County Board of Education (Buchanan, GA)
8.   Katy Independent School District (Katy, TX)
9.   Michigan Technical Academy (Redford, MI)
10. Mohican School in the Out-of-Doors, Inc. (Butler, OH)
11. Onslow County Schools (Jacksonville, NC)
12. Orleans Parish School Board (New Orleans, LA)
13. Piedmont City School District (Piedmont, AL)
14. Riverside Unified School District (Riverside, CA)
15. Roy Municipal Schools (Roy, NM)
16. San Diego Unified School District (San Diego, CA)
17. Sioux City Community School District (Sioux City, IA)
18. Southern Tier Library System (Painted Post, NY)
19. Summit Academy Community School for Alternative Learners (Canton, OH)
20. Westwood Community Schools (Dearborn Heights, MI)

6.   As the Commission noted in the *Schools and Libraries Sixth Report and Order*, we believe these projects serve an educational purpose by **enabling innovation in learning outside the boundaries of school buildings and the traditional school day, as well as enabling the library system to innovate with new models of delivering service to library patrons.**[15] Those selected project applicants that successfully complete the E-rate application process will receive the allotted connectivity support and will not be required to cost-allocate the dollar amount of support for the time that portable devices are not on school or library premises. Specifically, selected project applicants will receive funds

---

[12] *See* appendix B; FCC Website, Electronic Comment Filing System, WC Docket No. 10-222, available at http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/ecfs/comment_search/execute?proceeding=102&applicant=&lawfirm=&author=&disseminat ed.minDate=&disseminated.maxDate=&recieved.minDate=3%2F22%2F10&recieved.maxDate=&address.city=&ad dress.state.stateCd=&address.zip=&daNumber=&fileNumber=&submissionTypeId=&__checkbox_exParte=true (last visited July 6, 2011). WC Docket 10-222 was established to receive filings solely related to the wireless pilot program.

[13] *See* EDU2011 Announcement PN. This funding only relates to support for wireless, off-premises connectivity service, and not the purchase of devices or equipment, such as mobile broadband cards, smartphones, or digital textbooks. *Schools and Libraries Sixth Report and Order* at 18785-87, paras. 46, 50. Although we have selected 20 project applicants, we recognize that some project applicants may be unable to participate in the pilot program if they fail to adhere to the E-rate program's rules and procedures.

[14] A brief description of each selected project is included on appendix A.

[15] *See Schools and Libraries Sixth Report and Order* at 18784-85, para. 43; 47 C.F.R. § 54.500(b).

sufficient to cover the amount of connectivity expenses eligible for E-rate funding based on their discount; they will still be required to pay their non-discounted portion of the requested services.[16]

7.   In this order, we provide a more detailed overview of the selection criteria and process. We also provide guidance to selected applicants regarding the reporting requirements at the end of the trial period.

III.   DISCUSSION

8.   Selection of Projects. The Bureau reviewed the many innovative off-premise wireless connectivity projects based on the criteria set forth in its November 2010 public notice and ultimately chose 20 project applicants to participate in the pilot program.[17] The 20 selected projects will enable the Commission to investigate the merits and challenges of wireless off-premises connectivity services for mobile learning devices, and will help determine whether such services should ultimately be eligible for E-rate support for additional schools and libraries. These selected projects will also assist us in identifying and disseminating best practices for other schools and libraries that may be interested in implementing such a wireless off-campus project in the future.

9.   As part of our initial review, we analyzed all submitted applications to eliminate those that did not address the criteria set forth in the November 2010 public notice.[18] As a result, we eliminated 46 applications because they did not meet our basic criteria in one of the following ways:[19] (1) the applicant's wireless program was not yet in place, was in the early planning stages, or appeared to be solely based on receipt of EDU2011 funding;[20] (2) the applicant did not provide detailed planning documents for the wireless program;[21] (3) the applicant's funding source or budget for the non-discounted portion of the services was uncertain;[22] (4) the applicant failed to adequately address all or some of the application criteria listed in the public notice;[23] (5) the applicant indicated that it does not filter content

---

[16] See 47 C.F.R. § 54.523.

[17] See appendix A; November 2010 Public Notice; Schools and Libraries Sixth Report and Order at 18786-87, para. 48.

[18] See November 2010 Public Notice.

[19] Some of the applications may have been eliminated for more than one reason.

[20] See Advanced Technology Academy; Alexandria City Public Schools; Caldwell School District; Campbell High School; Castleberry Independent School District; Choctaw County School System; Gobles Public Schools; Green County Board of Education; Hartford Union High School; Hermitage Public School District; Huntington Park Senior High School; Lancaster School District; Lee County Schools; Lowndes County Public Schools; Memphis City Schools; Mobile County Public Schools; Nashoba Valley Technical High School; Nettleton High School; Oneida-Herkimer-Madison Boards of Cooperative Educational Services; Oxnard Union High School District; Portland Public School District; Prairie-Hills Elementary School District; Queens Borough Public Library; Santa Paula Union High School District; Scales Technology Academy; Seattle Public Schools; Young Oak Kim Academy.

[21] See Global Technology Preparatory Middle School.

[22] See Highland Park School District; Jamestown Public Schools; Merrill Community Schools; Texas CAN! Academy Charter; Toms River Regional Schools.

[23] See Hancock County Schools; Hunterdon Central Regional High School; Huntley Virtual High School; New York City Department of Education; ReNEW Schools; Saratoga Springs City School District; Southwest Licking Local School District; St. Jude School.

and failed to adequately address what internal use and enforcement procedures are in place to ensure acceptable use of the wireless devices;[24] (6) the applicant sought support for a Wi-Fi community network, which did not fit within the parameters of the pilot program;[25] or (7) the applicant withdrew its application.[26]

10.　The remaining applications described projects that generally fell under one of four categories: (1) netbook/laptop projects; (2) virtual/online schools; (3) smartphone projects; and (4) projects that use a combination of different types of devices, including laptops, smartphones, netbooks, or electronic tablets. We reviewed the applications with the goal of selecting a diverse group of projects for the wireless pilot program in order to gain a better understanding of the issues that schools and libraries may face if they choose to implement an off-premises wireless project. Specifically, in selecting the pilot program participants, we chose multiple projects in each category and considered several additional factors, including the innovativeness of the proposed project, the number of students or patrons to be served, and the estimated cost of the project per student or patron. Additionally, to ensure geographic diversity in the projects selected, we looked at the location of the proposed project and the applicant's rural or urban status to ensure a reasonable distribution. In states where a number of applications were submitted, we selected the project(s) that committed to serve the most students or patrons in a cost-effective manner, based on their stated cost per student or patron. For school projects, we also examined: the grade level of the students that each project would serve, so we could evaluate whether the projects were more or less successful with older or younger students; the subject matter being taught, to determine how the mobile devices were integrated and utilized in the curriculum; and the poverty level of the students served by the school, to determine those schools in greatest need of assistance.[27] We also strongly considered a project's proposed protection measures to ensure that applicants were complying with the statutory requirements established by the Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA) and to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse.

11.　Based on the criteria and factors described above, we ultimately selected 20 projects for funding under the wireless pilot program for funding year 2011-2012.[28] Overall, we sought to keep the number of projects reasonable so that we could select a representative and manageable group of projects while keeping the funding amount within the authorized limit of no more than $10 million.[29] Among the 20 selected project applicants, we selected one library, Southern Tier Library System in Painted Post, New York, and 19 public schools across 14 states (Alabama, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, North Carolina, New Mexico, New York, Louisiana, Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Texas). Out of the 19 public schools, there were four charter schools: Boys' Latin of Philadelphia Charter in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Foxfire Center for Student Success in Zanesville, Ohio; Michigan Technical Academy in Redford, Michigan; and the Summit Academy Community School for Alternative Learners in Canton, Ohio. We also selected one educational service agency, Greater Southern Tier Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) in Watkins Glen, New York.[30] Additionally, out of the 20

---

[24] *See* Stoughton Area School District.

[25] *See* Houston Public Library; Presidio Independent School District; Revere Public Schools.

[26] *See* Wayne Regional Educational Service Agency.

[27] *See* November 2010 Public Notice; *Schools and Libraries Sixth Report and Order* at 18786-87, para. 48.

[28] *See* appendix A.

[29] *Schools and Libraries Sixth Report and Order* at 18785-86, para. 46.

[30] Educational Service Agencies (ESAs) in many states play key roles in the economic and efficient provision of a wide range of educational services to their component school districts. ESAs are known by a variety of names

project applicants, there were four rural applicants[31] and 16 urban applicants.[32] The 19 schools selected serve a total of approximately 35,000 students.[33] The average discount rate of the selected project applicants is approximately 75 percent with most of the selected project applicants falling between the 80 and 90 percent discount level.

12.   Specifically, among each of the types of projects, we selected a sample of the most innovative projects serving library patrons and elementary, middle, and high school students in both rural and urban areas. Selecting various categories of projects will allow us to determine if one type of wireless service delivery method is more successful than another type and will allow the Commission to decide if E-rate funding should be focused more in one area. Under the netbook/laptop project category, we selected 10 projects.[34] These selected projects serve elementary through high school students with certain projects focused on a particular set of students, such as low-income, special needs students or low-performing students, or focused on a specific subject area, such as math and science.[35] Under the virtual/online school category, we selected two projects.[36] These projects generally cover all areas of the curriculum and serve at-risk high schools students who are unable to attend school.[37] Under the smartphones category, we selected three applications.[38] These projects are narrower in scope and focus on

---

including Educational Service Units (ESUs), Local Educational Agencies (LEAs), and Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES). *See* USAC website, Schools and Libraries, Educational Service Agencies, available at http://www.usac.org/sl/applicants/step01/esa-guidelines/default.aspx (last visited July 6, 2011). To be eligible for support under the E-rate program, the ESA must provide elementary or secondary education as determined under state law. *Id.*; 47 C.F.R. § 54. 500(c).

[31] *See* Foxfire Center for Student Success; Greater Southern Tier BOCES; Haralson County Board of Education; Roy Municipal Schools.

[32] *See* Boys' Latin of Philadelphia Charter; Clay Hill Elementary School City School District of New Rochelle; Michigan Technical Academy; Mohican School in the Out-of-Doors, Inc.; Orleans Parish School Board; San Diego Unified School District; Sioux City Community School District; Aurora Public Schools; Westwood Community Schools; Katy Independent School District; Onslow County Schools; Piedmont City School District; Summit Academy Community School for Alternative Learners; Riverside Unified School District; Southern Tier Library System.

[33] Southern Tier Library System's project intends to cover patrons within a 3,500 square mile rural service area. *See* Southern Tier Library System.

[34] *See* Boys' Latin of Philadelphia Charter; City School District of New Rochelle; Foxfire Center for Student Success; Haralson County Board of Education; Michigan Technical Academy; Orleans Parish School Board; Piedmont City School District; Roy Municipal Schools; San Diego Unified School District; Sioux City Community School District.

[35] For example, the City School District of New Rochelle's laptop program targets certain student groups such as English language learners, economically disadvantaged students, lower-performing students, and students with disabilities in 5th through 9th grade. *See* City School District of New Rochelle.

[36] *See* Aurora Public Schools; Westwood Community Schools.

[37] *Id.*

[38] *See* Katy Independent School District; Onslow County Schools; Summit Academy Community School for Alternative Learners.

a particular grade, subject area, or students with certain challenges.[39] Under the combined project category, we selected five projects.[40] These projects utilize a combination of handheld devices, such as laptops, smartphones, netbooks, and electronic tablets, for wireless access for elementary through high school students and library patrons.[41] Certain projects submitted by schools focus on certain subject areas, like math and science or environmental education, while the library application focuses on assisting unemployed and underemployed persons.[42]

13. <u>Reporting Requirements</u>. As indicated in the *Schools and Libraries Sixth Report and Order*, we require all selected schools and libraries to submit an interim report to the Commission by **February 24, 2012** and a final report to the Commission by **October 31, 2012**. The reports will allow us to assess the impact of each selected project on its school(s) or library and gather information regarding any lessons learned from each project that would assist other schools and libraries desiring to implement similar projects in the future. The Commission will evaluate the effectiveness of the Learning On-The-Go wireless pilot program to determine whether and, if so, how off-premise wireless services should be made eligible for continued E-rate support based, among other things, on the costs and benefits of the wireless projects and the effectiveness of the measures that were taken to ensure compliance with the Children's Internet Protection Act and to protect against waste, fraud, and abuse. Selected project applicants, therefore, are required to include in their interim and final reports, at minimum, the following information to help the Commission assess whether and how wireless off-premises connectivity services for mobile learning devices should be eligible for E-rate funding. Commission staff also may informally discuss project status with selected schools and libraries during the course of the year.

Required Information (all selected project applicants). To the extent possible, the interim and final reports must, at minimum, contain the following information for all applicants:

<u>Project Benefits</u>

(a) a description of how the wireless devices were integrated into the project's curriculum and objectives (including approximately how many times per week the wireless devices were used to access program materials remotely and how many wireless devices were used during this period of time);

(b) if available, a detailed summary of any data collected by the school or library on the project's outcomes and achievement of the project's goals, including usage of educational and research resources by students and library patrons and number of devices actually used;

  o for schools, include any data collected regarding the impact on test scores or other measures of achievement levels for those students participating in the off-premises wireless project.

---

[39] For example, students enrolled at the Summit Academy Community School for Alternative Learners are on individualized learning plans and have Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) or Aspergers' Disorder, which makes learning a challenge in a traditional classroom environment. *See* Summit Academy Community School for Alternative Learners.

[40] *See* Clay Hill Elementary School; Greater Southern Tier BOCES; Mohican School in the Out-of-Doors, Inc.; Riverside Unified School District; Southern Tier Library System.

[41] *Id.*

[42] *See* Southern Tier Library System.

(c) if available, a copy of any results or summary of the results of any survey given to students, teachers, parents or library patrons to assess any aspects of the off-premises wireless project; and

(d) for the Southern Tier Library System, a description of how the off-premise wireless project facilitated access in the community to any needed services, such as job applications, governmental services, job training, online learning opportunities, and any other community services (including any available data of the number of patrons that were able to complete job applications, seek governmental services, or access educational opportunities).

Project Costs

(a) an analysis of the per student or per patron cost of the off-premises connectivity;

  o for schools, specify, by term used by the school (for example, by quarter or semester), the number of students and teachers involved or served as part of the project, the number of those students and teachers involved or served that were able to participate as a result of E-rate support, and, where appropriate, the number of students at each grade level using the wireless devices for Internet access for each specified term; and

  o for the Southern Tier Library System, indicate the number of library patrons involved or served as part of the project and the number of those patrons involved or served that were added as a result of E-rate funding during the trial period.

Effectiveness of Protective Measures

(a) a detailed description of the measures, including specific software or filtering mechanisms, that were taken to ensure compliance with the Children's Internet Protection Act as well as a description of measures that were taken to protect against waste, fraud and abuse; and

(b) a detailed description of what, if any, issues arose in ensuring that the wireless devices were used only for educational purposes.

Lessons Learned

(a) a description of any technical, operational, or administrative problems or issues associated with implementing the project (such as barriers in using the wireless devices or difficulties with the service) and a description of how those issues were addressed or are being addressed; and

(b) a narrative of the lessons learned as a result of the off-premise wireless project (for example, based on what you learned from the project, how would you plan and implement your project differently if you were doing it over again?).

Selected project applicants shall submit their interim and final reports via email to EDU2011pilot@fcc.gov and send a courtesy copy by mail to Regina Brown, Telecommunications Access Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., Room 5-A360, Washington, D.C. 20554.

14.   Upon submission of the reports by the selected project applicants, the Commission will evaluate the Learning On-The-Go wireless pilot program based upon review of the technical, operational, and administrative issues associated with off-premise use and connectivity, the financial impact on the E-

rate program overall, measures available to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse, and ensure compliance with CIPA, and the extent to which off-premise wireless connectivity enables student achievement and access to resources, and enables the utilization of library services and resources by patrons.

IV.   ORDERING CLAUSES

14.   Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED, that pursuant to the authority contained in sections 1 through 4, 254, 303(r), and 403 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151-154, 254, 303(r), and 403, and pursuant to sections 0.91 and 0.291 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.91, and 0.291 of the Commission's rules, this order IS ADOPTED.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Sharon Gillett
Chief
Wireline Competition Bureau

APPENDIX A

Brief Project Descriptions of the Selected Wireless Pilot Program Applicants

1. Aurora Public Schools/APS Online (Aurora, CO)
   APS Online is a hybrid online school, meaning the online learning experience is enhanced through focused classroom instruction, with an emphasis on high school students with a variety of socioeconomic challenges (medical challenges, drop-outs or the homeless), many of whom would not still be in school if not for the flexibility to receive instruction from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m.

2. Boys' Latin of Philadelphia Charter (Philadelphia, PA)
   This college prep high school for boys from low-income households has a program that allows sophomores to access the Internet through wireless mobile cards. The program supports both core subjects and its technology curriculum.

3. City School District of New Rochelle (New Rochelle, NY)
   This laptop program targets certain student groups (English language learners, economically disadvantaged students, lower-performing students, and students with disabilities) in 5th through 9th grade. One part of the curriculum's objective is to enable students to access digital textbooks via wireless connectivity.

4. Clay Hill Elementary School (Jacksonville, FL)
   The district currently has two pilots in progress for Internet access for its students: (1) the Leveraging Technology Initiative, a movement toward 1:1 computing by allowing students to bring their own devices (such as laptop computers, netbooks, tablets, and smartphones) on campus; and (2) the Digital Equity Initiative that addresses devices for low-income students.

5. Foxfire Center for Student Success (Zanesville, OH)
   This program uses netbooks to expand the availability of mobile technology to its at-risk secondary students beyond the school day through an interactive educational platform that provides teachers the ability to upload assignments and videos, and provide graphic organizers, guided notes, and assessments.

6. Greater Southern Tier Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) (Watkins Glen, NY)
   GST BOCES is an Educational Service Agency that supports 21 component districts in five counties across the Southern Tier of New York State. Its Mobile Learning Device Project will provide middle and high school students with ubiquitous access to online learning devices (such as smartphones and netbooks) utilizing a virtual classroom software program.

7. Haralson County Board of Education/Haralson County High School (Buchanan, GA)
   This blended learning opportunity program integrates face-to-face learning with online learning opportunities for high school students through the use of netbooks, with an emphasis on achievement in math and science.

8. Katy Independent School District (Katy, TX)
   This program is designed to provide all 5th graders and teachers within the district with smartphones utilizing a classroom management system. The system allows teachers to create and upload assignments to a server where students then can log-in and sync their device to receive the teacher's updates.

9. Michigan Technical Academy (Redford, MI)
    This netbook program utilizes an online mobile learning environment for its 5th through 8th graders with an emphasis on increasing educational productivity and proficiency with mobile learning devices, and to increase math, science, social studies, and English language arts proficiency with the use of technology.

10. Mohican School in the Out-of-Doors, Inc. (Butler, OH)
    This is an outdoor environmental education school. The school proposes to use the funds to expand and strengthen environmental mobile learning for its students in grades 5th and 6th via the implementation of learning green tech mobile learning program, enabling computer based instruction to students using handheld devices (such as netbooks, smartphones) in the field. For example, instead of simply reading about the parts of the flower, students will take pictures of the parts and transmit them via the wireless network.

11. Onslow County Schools (Jacksonville, NC)
    This program is intended to provide smartphones to high school students utilizing Project K-Nect targeted for use with Algebra I. Project K-Nect was designed to create resources for secondary at-risk students with a goal of increasing their math and science skills.

12. Orleans Parish School Board/Mary Bethune Elementary School (New Orleans, LA)
    This is a laptop program with broadband access through wireless data cards for 3rd through 6th grade elementary students. The software suite enables teachers to determine students' level of proficiency and engages a set of applications to empower the students with a digital learning environment.

13. Piedmont City School District (Piedmont, AL)
    The Piedmont City School System became the first school system in Alabama to implement a one-to-one laptop initiative, called MPower Piedmont. All laptops provide software and access to Internet resources for research, communication, multimedia content creation, and collaboration for use inside and outside of school.

14. Riverside Unified School District (Riverside, CA)
    This program utilizes netbooks, tablets, and laptops for its middle school students at four schools. About 70% of students residing in Riverside have access to free wireless connectivity and low-income students can obtain a free refurbished computer for home use through a digital inclusion training program. Riverside USCHOOL DISTRICT uses a cloud-based learning and content management system, which provides a blended learning environment so students and teachers can continue discussions and learning beyond the school walls and times. Riverside USCHOOL DISTRICT also collaborates with partners, such as textbook publishers, to provide content in a digital format to students.

15. Roy Municipal Schools (Roy, NM)
    This netbook program provides elementary and secondary students in an extremely rural area with off-premise Internet access to allow for interactive capabilities outside the classroom and beyond scheduled school hours.

16. San Diego Unified School District (San Diego, CA)
    The District has established a Mobile Learning Program to seamlessly integrate ubiquitous, one-to-one computing and other 21st century technology into all teaching and learning throughout the curriculum. Its program will serve 6th grade in eight middle schools and school-wide in two middle schools.

17. <u>Sioux City Community School District (Sioux City, IA)</u>
    This netbook program will provide wireless connectivity for 10th through 12th grade students across three high schools through blended instruction in its learning management system. This allows the district to extend the time and place of the classroom to virtually anytime and anywhere when coupled with offsite wireless access.

18. <u>Southern Tier Library System (Painted Post, NY)</u>
    The intent is to include handheld mobile devices, such as tablets, netbooks and smartphones as training platforms for its mobile JobLink project which provides online job searching, resume writing, job application skills, and digital literacy to unemployed and under employed individuals within a 3,500 square mile rural service area. The JobLink project would expand that training by providing wireless Internet access on handheld mobile devices.

19. <u>Summit Academy Community School for Alternative Learners (Canton, OH)</u>
    Students enrolled at this school are on individualized learning plans and have Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) or Aspergers' Disorder, which makes learning a challenge in a traditional classroom environment. This program utilizes smartphones as a portal to the curriculum, study materials, and a collaboration environment that positions students to be more effective communicators and problem solvers.

20. <u>Westwood Community Schools/Cyber High School (Dearborn Heights, MI)</u>
    This program will use mobile devices and/or desktop computers with wireless mobile cards along with a comprehensive online learning environment that offers a virtual educational experience for high school students who are unable to attend school for a variety of reasons.

APPENDIX B

List of Submitted Applications

1.   Advanced Technology Academy
2.   Alexandria City Public Schools
3.   Ashwaubenon School District
4.   Aurora Public Schools/APS Online
5.   Boys' Latin of Philadelphia Charter School
6.   Brocton Central School
7.   Caldwell School District
8.   Campbell High School
9.   Castleberry Independent School District
10. Choctaw County School System
11. City School District of New Rochelle
12. Clay Hill Elementary School
13. Coachella Valley Unified School District
14. Dover Area School District
15. Dysart Unified School District No.89
16. Foxfire Center for Student Success
17. Genesis School
18. Global Technology Preparatory Middle School
19. GOAL Academy
20. Gobles Public Schools
21. Greater Southern Tier Boards of Cooperative Educational Services
22. Green County Board of Education
23. Hancock County Schools
24. Haralson County Board of Education
25. Hartford Union High School
26. Hermitage Public School District
27. Highland Park School District
28. Houston Public Library
29. Hunterdon Central Regional High School
30. Huntington Park Senior High School
31. Huntley Virtual High School
32. Indianapolis Public Schools
33. Jamestown Public Schools
34. Kansas Public School District
35. Katy Independent School District
36. Lancaster School District
37. Learning Without Limits
38. Lee County Schools
39. Lincoln Intermediate Unit #12
40. Lowndes County Public Schools
41. Mathematics Network Project
42. Maysville Local School District
43. McKinney Independent School District
44. Melrose Elementary School
45. Memphis City Schools
46. Merrill Community Schools
47. Michigan Technical Academy

48. Mobile County Public Schools
49. Mohican School in the Out-of-Doors, Inc.
50. Monte Vista School District
51. Nashoba Valley Technical High School
52. Nettleton High School
53. New York City Department of Education
54. Newark Digital Academy
55. Oneida-Herkimer-Madison Boards of Cooperative Educational Services
56. Onslow County Schools
57. Orleans Parish School Board
58. Oxnard Union High School District
59. Pasadena Independent School District
60. Pennsylvania Cyber Charter School
61. Piedmont City School District
62. Pinconning Area School District
63. Portland Public School District
64. Prairie-Hills Elementary School District #144
65. Presidio Independent School District
66. Queens Borough Public Library
67. ReNEW Schools
68. Revere Public Schools
69. Reynoldsburg School District
70. Riverside Unified School District
71. Robert Louis Stevenson Middle School
72. Roy Municipal Schools
73. San Diego National School District
74. San Diego Unified School District
75. Santa Paula Union High School District
76. Saratoga Springs City School District
77. Scales Technology Academy
78. Seattle Public Schools
79. Sioux City Community School District
80. Southern Tier Library System
81. Southwest Licking Local School District
82. St. Jude School
83. St. Marys City School District
84. Stoughton Area School District
85. Summit Academy Community School for Alternative Learners
86. Texas CAN! Academy Charter
87. Thomasville City Schools
88. Toms River Regional Schools
89. Val Verde Unified School District
90. Vancouver Public Schools
91. Virtual Learning Academy of St Clair County
92. Wayne Regional Educational Service Agency
93. Westwood Community Schools
94. Young Oak Kim Academy