



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

September 26, 2005

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Michael P. Flanagan, Chairman 

SUBJECT: Discussion of the School Improvement Framework

In February 2005, the State Board of Education approved a draft of the School Improvement Framework for the purposes of field review. Since that time, Department staff has sought field input through a variety of methods. Meetings were hosted in May and August for intermediate personnel, local school district central office personnel, and representatives of educational organizations. Nearly 800 educators were involved in these meetings. Additionally, the state sought electronic feedback through a survey posted on the Department of Education website. There were 800 visitors to the website and a total of 128 responses were filed.

The responses to the School Improvement Framework were largely favorable with clarifications in language and format being the most common suggestions for change. Results from the electronic survey are attached (Attachment A). The suggestions for modification were reviewed by the authors of the School Improvement Framework and changes made to the document. The changes have resulted in a clearer document that will form the basis for school improvement activities, alignment of grants, work with High Priority Schools, as well as the indicators for Education Yes.

Currently, the revised School Improvement Framework (Attachment B) is being sent to a variety of organizations and individuals for national review. Additionally, tools for use with the Framework are being developed by educators from across the state. It is anticipated that Department staff will seek adoption of the document in December.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • JOHN C. AUSTIN – VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER
NANCY DANHOF – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER
REGINALD M. TURNER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

606 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

Michigan Department of Education

School Improvement Framework

Survey Results

Survey Results (Included Responses)

MDE School Improvement Framework Survey
 Report created on: Wednesday, September 21, 2005 4:37:00 PM

The results of your survey are displayed below. If your survey includes text responses, click the "View" button to read individual results. To exclude a particular response, click the Included Responses button. You can then view the set of individual responses that are currently included and select those you wish to exclude. Results below contain only included responses

Go to Individual Complete Responses:

Show respondent's emails.

INCLUDED RESPONSES

EXCLUDED RESPONSES

Included Respondents: 128
 Excluded Respondents: 0

EXCLUDE BLANK RESPONSES

Launch Date 04/05/2005 - 2:03 PM
 Modified Date
 Close Date 06/01/2005 - 10:48 AM
 Email Invites 0
 Visits 800
 Partial 0
 Completes 128

- Cross Tabulate
Cross reference multiple questions
- Download Results
Receive results in spreadsheet format

Responses: Completes only Partial only Completes & Partial

1. Was the PowerPoint easy to read and understand?



	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Yes	119	94%
No	8	6%
Total	127	

VIEW 42 Responses

2. Was the School Improvement Framework easy to understand?



	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Yes	100	79%
No	27	21%
Total	127	

VIEW 55 Responses

3. Do you have any concerns about the layout of the Framework?

Number of Responses Response Ratio

Yes		55	43%
No		72	57%
		127	100%
 60 Responses			

4. Is the Framework comprehensive?		Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Yes		91	72%
No		36	28%
		127	100%
 73 Responses			

5. What do you see as the strengths of the draft School Improvement Framework?

 105 Responses

6. What concerns do you have about the Framework?

 109 Responses

7. Did the structure (Strand, Standards and Benchmarks) of the Framework make sense to you?		Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Yes		110	87%
No		17	13%
		127	100%
 49 Responses			

8. Are the number of levels (Strands, Standards and Benchmarks) and amount of detail:		Number of Responses	Response Ratio
About Right		76	60%
Too Little		13	10%
Too Much		37	29%
 Why?		42	33%

9. Are the number of Strands appropriate?		Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Yes		94	74%

No		33	26%
Total		127	100%

 48 Responses

The five strands identified within the Framework address current
10. research of effective school practice?

	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Strongly Agree		43 34%
Agree		55 43%
Disagree		14 11%
Strongly Disagree		14 11%
 Why?		29 23%

11. Are the Standards within the Framework comprehensive?

	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Yes		99 78%
No		28 22%
Total	127	

 38 Responses

The 12 Standards identified within the Framework address current
12. research of effective school practice?

	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Strongly Agree		39 31%
Agree		59 46%
Disagree		16 13%
Strongly Disagree		12 9%
 Why?		25 20%

13. Are the Benchmarks within the Framework comprehensive?

	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Yes		96 76%
No		31 24%
Total	127	

 47 Responses

The 26 Benchmarks identified within the Framework address current
14. research of effective school practice?

Number of Responses	Response Ratio
---------------------	----------------

Strongly Agree		33	
Agree		62	49%
Disagree			
Strongly Disagree			12%
Why?		28	22%

Do you think the individual Benchmarks within the Framework can be measured?

		Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Yes		72	
No		55	43%
Total		127	100%

70 Responses

The Clarifying Criteria identified within the Framework address current research of effective school practice?

		Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Strongly Agree		30	25%
Agree		61	
Disagree		17	14%
Strongly Disagree		12	
Why?		25	

Do you think the Benchmarks can serve as the basis for revising the current Education Yes! performance indicators?

		Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Yes		71	59%
No		49	41%
Total		120	100%

56 Responses

What do you think could be gained by replacing the current 11 non-MEAP indicators in Education Yes?

82 Responses

What do you think could be lost by replacing the current 11 non-MEAP indicators in Education Yes?

74 Responses

What ways might the School Improvement Framework be used by 20. schools?

	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Develop, Support or Enhance School Improvement Plan	87	81%
Meeting NCLB (AYP) Requirements	67	63%
Professional Development Planning	80	75%
Grants	53	50%
Diagnostic Assessment Review	52	49%
Annual Title I, PA 25 Reporting	58	54%
Curriculum Alignment	65	61%

Please share all the types of School Improvement processes you've 21. been involved in:

	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Title I	65	57%
Comprehensive School Reform (CSR)	29	25%
North Central Accreditation (NCA)	87	76%
Other	34	30%

22. My primary job responsibility is as a (you may select up to two):

	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Parent	24	19%
General Public	10	8%
Michigan Department of Education Staff or Consultant	3	2%
Michigan Education Board Member	0	0%
Michigan Legislator or Legislative Staff	0	0%
Michigan Education Organization Management or Staff	0	0%
National Education Organization Management or Staff	0	0%
Teacher	42	33%
School Building Principal	32	25%
School Building School Improvement Team Member	18	14%
ISD/District Central Office Administrator	18	14%
ISD/District School Improvement Specialist	9	7%
ISD/District Technical Assistance Provider	0	0%

ISD/District Curriculum or Instruction Specialist	<input type="radio"/>	10	8%
ISD/District Consultant	<input type="radio"/>	7	5%
<input type="checkbox"/> Other, Please Specify	<input type="checkbox"/>	21	16%

Select a category below that best describes the type/size of your
23. school district:

		Number of Responses	Response Ratio
ISD	<input type="radio"/>	10	8%
Local Suburban	<input type="checkbox"/>	51	41%
Local Urban	<input type="checkbox"/>	25	20%
Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	33	26%
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	6	5%
Total		125	100%

If you would like to view the final results of this survey, please provide your email address in
24. the space below.

69 Responses

Copyright ©1999-2005 MarketTools, Inc. All Rights Reserved.
No portion of this site may be copied without the express written consent of MarketTools, Inc. Trademark Notice



MICHIGAN
**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT
FRAMEWORK**

These are DRAFT documents. Please DO NOT copy or distribute.



Michigan State Board of Education

Kathleen N. Straus, President
Bloomfield Township

John C. Austin, Vice President
Ann Arbor

Carolyn L. Curtin, Secretary
Ewart

Marianne Yared McGuire, Treasurer
Detroit

Nancy Danhof, NASBE Delegate
East Lansing

Elizabeth W. Bauer, Member
Birmingham

Reginald M. Turner, Member
Detroit

Eileen Lappin Weiser, Member
Ann Arbor

Governor Jennifer M. Granholm
Ex Officio

Michael P. Flanagan, Chairman
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Ex Officio

Jeremy M. Hughes, Ph.D.
Deputy Superintendent/Chief Academic Officer

Dr. Yvonne Caamal Canul, Director
Office of School Improvement

FRAMEWORK OVERVIEW

Each year, schools and districts review policies and practices to consider ways to improve and enhance student achievement. This process, commonly referred to as the school improvement process, is deeply embedded in building, district and state planning and accountability systems, and has become an integral and necessary part of school and system reform. While this type of planning has existed for many years, recent state and federal mandates including annual testing directives and increased accountability have intensified the importance of this process and its outcomes.

Since the passage of Public Act 25 in 1990, Michigan schools and districts have been required to develop 3-5 year school improvement plans. Schools and districts use these plans as a blueprint to establish goals and objectives that will guide teaching and learning, resource allocation, staff development, data management and assessment. They also use it to measure their ability to meet the goals and objectives established in the plan.

To provide schools and districts with a comprehensive framework based on current research and best practice, the Michigan Department of Education in conjunction with school improvement specialists and educators across the state, developed the Michigan School Improvement Framework. This framework can be individualized and used in multiple ways to develop, support and enhance school improvement plans. For example, the framework can be used to guide the development of a school improvement plan. It can also be used by buildings and districts to review and enhance existing improvement plans to reveal where plans match or differ from state-of-the-art school improvement practice. In addition, this framework can be used during a peer-assessment exchange with a similar school which could lead to mutual problem solving.

UNDERSTANDING THE FRAMEWORK

The framework is organized in a typical curriculum development layout with strands, standards, and benchmarks. Within the framework, there are five strands or areas of general focus. Drilling down into the 12 standards are 26 benchmarks that further define the standards within each strand. These benchmarks will be used to guide revisions to Michigan's Education Yes! accreditation performance indicators. Each benchmark also contains helpful key characteristics and sample discussion questions districts and schools can use to guide discussion and increase understanding of the research-based school improvement benchmarks.

Strand I	Strand II	Strand III	Strand IV	Strand V
Teaching & Learning	Leadership	Personnel & Professional Learning	School & Community Relations	Data & Information Management
Standards (12) and Benchmarks (26)				
1. Curriculum <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligned, Reviewed & Monitored Communicated 2. Instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning Delivery 3. Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligned to Curriculum and Instruction Data Reporting and Use 	1. Instructional Leadership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educational Program Instructional Support 2. Shared Leadership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Culture & Climate Continuous Improvement 3. Operational Resource Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resource Allocation Operational Management 	1. Personnel Qualifications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirements Skills, Knowledge, Dispositions 2. Professional Learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaboration Content & Pedagogy Alignment 	1. Parent/Family Involvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communication Engagement 2. Community Involvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communication Engagement 	1. Data Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Generation, Identification & Collection Data Accessibility Data Support 2. Information Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis & Interpretation Applications
Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions				

STRAND I: TEACHING & LEARNING

FRAMEWORK

STRAND I:
TEACHING & LEARNING

STANDARD 1:
CURRICULUM

BENCHMARK A:
ALIGNED, REVIEWED
& MONITORED

The school holds high expectations for all students, identifies essential curricular content, makes certain it is sequenced appropriately and is taught effectively in the available instructional times. Assessments used are aligned to curricular content and are used to guide instructional decisions and monitor student learning.

STANDARD 1: CURRICULUM

Schools/districts have a cohesive plan for instruction and learning that serves as the basis for teachers' and students' active involvement in the construction and application of knowledge.

BENCHMARK A: ALIGNED, REVIEWED & MONITORED

School/district written curriculum is aligned with, and references, the appropriate learning standards (Michigan Curriculum Framework, Grade Level Content Expectations, Addressing Unique Educational Needs, International Society for Technology in Education, etc.).

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Curriculum Document(s)

- In what ways does the school have current written curriculum documentation for the Michigan Curriculum Framework core areas (English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, the Arts)?
- In what ways does the school have current written curriculum documentation for all additional areas taught, e.g., Career and Employability Skills, Health Education, Physical Education, Technology, World Languages?

2. Standards Alignment

- How does the school curriculum align with, and reference, the Michigan Curriculum Framework standards and benchmarks?
- How does the school curriculum align with, and reference, the benchmarks and Content Expectations for English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, the Arts, Career and Employability Skills, Health Education, Physical Education, Technology, World Languages?

3. Articulated Design

- How do you assure the written curriculum in each content area is vertically aligned across grades?
- How do you assure the written curriculum is horizontally aligned across content at each grade level?

4. Curriculum Review

- How do you assure the written curriculum is reviewed and revised at least every five years?

5. Inclusive

- How does curriculum design assure all students have access to the general education curriculum?
- How is the curriculum design modified/differentiated to support the needs of all students?

Strand Navigation:

7 TEACHING & LEARNING

- LEADERSHIP
- PERSONNEL & PROFESSIONAL LEARNING
- SCHOOL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS
- DATA & INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

STRAND I: TEACHING & LEARNING

FRAMEWORK

STRAND I:
TEACHING & LEARNING

STANDARD 1:
CURRICULUM

BENCHMARK B:
COMMUNICATED

STANDARD 2:
INSTRUCTION

BENCHMARK A:
PLANNING

BENCHMARK B:
DELIVERY

Strand Navigation:

➤ TEACHING & LEARNING

- LEADERSHIP
- PERSONNEL & PROFESSIONAL LEARNING
- SCHOOL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS
- DATA & INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

BENCHMARK B: COMMUNICATED

School/district curriculum is provided to staff, students, and parents in a manner that they can understand.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Staff

- In what ways is the curriculum clear, concise, and discussed by staff?
- How do teachers know what they are expected to teach in their grade/course?
- How do teachers know the curriculum for the grade(s)/course(s) that precede and follow their current assignment?

2. Students

- How are the curriculum expectations communicated to students in a manner they can understand?

3. Parents

- How are the curriculum expectations communicated to parents in a manner they can understand?

STANDARD 2: INSTRUCTION

Intentional processes and practices are used by schools and teachers to facilitate high levels of student learning.

BENCHMARK A: PLANNING

Processes used to plan, monitor, reflect and refine instruction that support high expectations for all students.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Content Appropriateness

- How are classroom lessons aligned to the school's/district's written curriculum?
- How are the planned instructional processes and practices appropriate for the content?

2. Developmental Appropriateness

- How are the planned instructional processes and practices appropriate for the levels and needs of all students?
- How are the planned instructional processes and practices engaging for all students?

3. Reflection and Refinement

- How are planned instructional processes reviewed and refined to meet the needs of all students?

BENCHMARK B: DELIVERY

Instructional practices are used to facilitate student learning.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Delivered Curriculum

- How does classroom instruction implement the district/school curricula?
- How does best practice inform the delivery of the curriculum?
- To what extent is the planned instruction implemented?

2. Best Practice

- How is research-based instruction practice being used across the curriculum?
- How is instruction differentiated to meet the needs of individual learners?
- How are the teaching and learning standards from the Michigan Curriculum Framework implemented?
- How do teachers use available technology to support student learning?
- How does staff integrate technology into curriculum instruction and assessment?

3. Student Engagement

- How does instructional delivery engage the students?

STRAND I: TEACHING & LEARNING

FRAMEWORK

STRAND I:
TEACHING & LEARNING

STANDARD 3:
ASSESSMENT

BENCHMARK A:
ALIGNED TO CURRICULUM
& INSTRUCTION

BENCHMARK B:
DATA REPORTING & USE

Strand Navigation:

7 TEACHING & LEARNING

- LEADERSHIP
- PERSONNEL & PROFESSIONAL LEARNING
- SCHOOL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS
- DATA & INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

STANDARD 3: ASSESSMENT

Schools/districts systematically gather and use multiple sources of evidence to monitor student achievement.

BENCHMARK A: ALIGNED TO CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION

Student assessments are aligned to the school's curricula and instruction.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Alignment/Content Validity

- How are assessments aligned with the curricula and instruction (written and enacted)?
- To what extent are assessments aligned with assessment standards in the Michigan Curriculum Framework?

2. Consistency/Reliability

- In what ways are assessments reliable? (Are they stable sources of information?)
- How do different sources of information (e.g., tests, rubrics, teachers, etc.) produce comprehensive and/or comparable results?

3. Multiple Measures

- How are multiple measures used to evaluate student learning (classroom assessments, district assessments, MEAP, student portfolios, behavioral, measures other than achievement, etc.)?
- How are students enrolling in Prekindergarten through 12th grade assessed?

BENCHMARK B: DATA REPORTING & USE

Student assessment results are communicated to, and used by, staff, students, and parents to improve student achievement.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Reporting

- In what ways are assessment results reported to staff in a timely manner and in a form they can use?
- In what ways are assessment results reported to students in a timely manner and in a form they can use?
- In what ways are assessment results reported to parents in a timely manner and in a form they can use?

2. Informs Curriculum and Instruction

- How is data used to determine/improve curriculum and instruction at the building and classroom levels?
- How is data used to determine/improve student learning?

3. Meets Student Needs

- In what ways are assessment results used to identify needs and assist students?
- How do students use data and related staff feedback to monitor and improve their own performance?
- In what ways are students re-assessed on skills they have not previously attained?

STRAND II: LEADERSHIP

FRAMEWORK

STRAND II:
LEADERSHIP

STANDARD 1:
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

BENCHMARK A:
EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

BENCHMARK B:
INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT

School leaders create a school environment where everyone contributes to a cumulative, purposeful and positive effect on student learning.

STANDARD 1: INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

School leaders create and sustain a context for learning that puts students' learning first.

BENCHMARK A: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

School leaders are knowledgeable about the school's educational programs and act on this knowledge.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

- How knowledgeable are school leaders about curriculum?
- How knowledgeable are school leaders about instruction?
- How knowledgeable are school leaders about assessment?

2. Knowledge & Use of Data

- In what ways do school leaders demonstrate both their understanding and use of multiple types and sources of data in support of student learning?

3. Technology

- How do school leaders assure that technology supports curriculum, instruction, and assessment?

4. Knowledge of Student Development & Learning

- How do school leaders consider student developmental stages and adolescent learning theory when making decisions?

5. Knowledge of Adult Learning

- How do school leaders apply adult learning theory?

6. Change Agent

- In what ways do school leaders understand and act on their role as a catalyst for change?

7. Focus on Student Results

- In what ways do school leaders focus on student results to inform curriculum, instruction, and assessment?

BENCHMARK B: INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT

School leaders set high expectations, communicate, monitor, support, and make adjustments to enhance instruction.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Monitoring

- How do school leaders monitor programs and practices on a regular basis?

2. Coaching & Facilitating

- In what ways do school leaders model, coach, and facilitate best-practices of teaching and learning?

3. Evaluation

- In what ways do staff evaluations include components critical to effective teaching and learning?

4. Clear Expectations

- In what ways do leaders clearly communicate expectations?

5. Collaboration & Communication

- How do school leaders provide opportunities to staff for communicating about teaching and learning?

Strand Navigation:

- TEACHING & LEARNING
- **LEADERSHIP**
- PERSONNEL & PROFESSIONAL LEARNING
- SCHOOL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS
- DATA & INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

STRAND II: LEADERSHIP

FRAMEWORK

STRAND II:
LEADERSHIP

STANDARD 2:
SHARED LEADERSHIP

BENCHMARK A:
SCHOOL CULTURE & CLIMATE

BENCHMARK B:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Strand Navigation:

- TEACHING & LEARNING
- **LEADERSHIP**
- PERSONNEL & PROFESSIONAL LEARNING
- SCHOOL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS
- DATA & INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

STANDARD 2: SHARED LEADERSHIP

Structures and processes exist to support shared leadership in which all staff has collective responsibility for student learning.

BENCHMARK A: SCHOOL CULTURE & CLIMATE

Staff creates an environment conducive to effective teaching and learning.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

- 1. Safe and Orderly**
 - Does a safe and orderly environment exist in the building?
- 2. Learning Focused**
 - In what ways does a culture and climate focused on learner outcomes exist in the school?
- 3. Inclusive & Equitable**
 - In what ways do all students have equal access to the curriculum and learning opportunities?
- 4. Collaborative Inquiry**
 - How do staff engage in dialogue and reflection about teaching and learning?
- 5. Data-Driven Culture**
 - How do staff use data to measure the effectiveness of the school and its processes?
 - How do staff use data continuously, collaboratively, and effectively to improve teaching and learning?
- 6. Collaborative Decision-Making Process**
 - How do staff engage in making decisions that impact the school community?
 - How do staff take ownership for the decisions that are made?

BENCHMARK B: CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Staff engages in collaborative inquiry focused on continuous improvement to increase student achievement.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

- 1. Shared Vision & Mission**
 - How are the vision and mission of the school clearly articulated to all stakeholders?
 - How do staff communicate high expectations for students?
- 2. Results-Focused Plan**
 - Is there a school-developed, written plan for continuous improvement?
 - How do the improvement plan strategies and interventions support the attainment of the school's student goals as identified by data?
 - How does the plan meet the requirements of state and federal mandates?
- 3. Implemented**
 - How is the plan for improvement implemented and supported by the entire school and community?
- 4. Monitored**
 - How is the plan for improvement continuously monitored and adjusted at least annually?

STRAND II: LEADERSHIP

FRAMEWORK

STRAND II:
LEADERSHIP

STANDARD 3:
OPERATIONAL & RESOURCE
MANAGEMENT

BENCHMARK A:
RESOURCE ALLOCATION

BENCHMARK B:
OPERATIONAL MANAGEMENT

Strand Navigation:

- TEACHING & LEARNING
- LEADERSHIP
- PERSONNEL & PROFESSIONAL LEARNING
- SCHOOL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS
- DATA & INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

STANDARD 3:

OPERATIONAL & RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

School leaders organize and manage the school to support teaching and learning.

BENCHMARK A: RESOURCE ALLOCATION

School leaders allocate resources in alignment with the vision, mission, and educational goals of the school.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Human Resources

- How do school leaders deploy and support human resources to maximize student learning?

2. Fiscal

- How do school leaders align the allocation of monetary resources to support teaching and learning goals?

3. Equipment and Materials

- How do school leaders align the allocation of equipment and materials to support teaching and learning goals?

4. Time

- How do school leaders allocate time to support teaching and learning goals?

5. Space

- How do school leaders allocate space to support teaching and learning goals?

BENCHMARK B: OPERATIONAL MANAGEMENT

School leaders develop, implement and/or monitor policies and procedures for the operation of the school.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. State and Federal

- In what ways do school leaders implement state- and federal-level mandates, regulations and rules as they apply to the school?

2. District

- How do school leaders implement local Board policies and district-level procedures as they apply to the school?

3. School

- In what ways do school leaders design, implement, and monitor school-level policies and procedures?
- In what ways does the school meet all required state and federal regulations and building maintenance standards?

STRAND III: PERSONNEL & PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

FRAMEWORK

STRAND III:
PERSONNEL & PROFESSIONAL
LEARNING

STANDARD 1:
PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS

BENCHMARK A:
REQUIREMENTS

BENCHMARK B:
SKILLS, KNOWLEDGE
& DISPOSITIONS

The school has highly qualified personnel who continually acquire and use skills, knowledge, attitudes and beliefs necessary to create a culture with high levels of learning for all.

STANDARD 1: PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS

School/district staff qualifications, knowledge, and skills support student learning.

BENCHMARK A: REQUIREMENTS

Staff meet requirements for position held.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Certification/Requirements

- How do school leaders assure that all staff hold necessary certification(s) and/or meet applicable requirements?

2. NCLB (Highly Qualified)

- How do impacted staff meet requirements as specified in federal law?

BENCHMARK B: SKILLS, KNOWLEDGE & DISPOSITIONS

Staff has the professional skills to be effective in their positions.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Content Knowledge

- How do school leaders assure staff have substantial content knowledge in their assigned area?

2. Communication

- In what ways does staff communicate effectively with students, parents, and colleagues?

3. School/Classroom Management

- How do staff establish and use systems to maximize student learning?
- How do staff utilize strategies to maximize student learning?

4. Collaboration

- How do staff collaborate on student learning?

5. Student-Centered

- How do staff give the needs of students first priority?

6. Technology

- In what ways does staff possess/use instructional technology skills to support/enhance professional practice?
- How do staff integrate educational technology into curriculum, instruction and assessment?

Strand Navigation:

- TEACHING & LEARNING
- LEADERSHIP
- **PERSONNEL & PROFESSIONAL LEARNING**
- SCHOOL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS
- DATA & INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

STRAND III: PERSONNEL & PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

FRAMEWORK

STRAND III:
PERSONNEL &
PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

STANDARD 2:
PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

BENCHMARK A:
COLLABORATION

BENCHMARK B:
CONTENT & PEDAGOGY

BENCHMARK C:
ALIGNMENT

Strand Navigation:

- TEACHING & LEARNING
- LEADERSHIP
- PERSONNEL & PROFESSIONAL LEARNING
- SCHOOL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS
- DATA & INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

STANDARD 2: PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

Educators in schools/districts acquire or enhance the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and beliefs necessary to create high levels of learning for all students (NSDC).

BENCHMARK A: COLLABORATION

Professional learning is conducted with colleagues across the school/district on improving staff practices and student achievement.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Staff Participates in Learning Teams

- In what ways does the school have structures in place where teachers/staff work in learning teams?

2. Staff Collaboratively Analyze Student Work

- How do staff continuously collaborate to adjust instruction based on on-going student performance?

BENCHMARK B: CONTENT & PEDAGOGY

Professional learning at schools/districts emphasize both content and pedagogy of teaching and learning.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Uses Best-Practices

- How does professional learning use examples of best practice to increase teachers' understanding of how students learn?
- How does professional learning model effective constructive strategies to improve student achievement?
- How does professional learning model best practice to help teachers better differentiate instruction?

2. Applies Curriculum Content

- In what ways do teachers have deeper content understanding due to professional learning?

3. Induction/Mentoring/Coaching

- How are new teachers inducted and supported in a manner that helps them be successful?

BENCHMARK C: ALIGNMENT

School/district professional learning is needs-based, aligned, job-embedded, and results-driven.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Aligned

- How are professional learning opportunities provided to meet identified individual/group staff needs?
- How is professional learning aligned with the school improvement plan, Michigan Curriculum Framework and National Staff Development Council Standards?

2. Job-embedded

- In what ways are professional learning opportunities embedded within the regular work day?
- In what ways are professional learning opportunities structured to meet adult learning needs?
- How do teachers/staff apply learning from professional learning?
- To what extent do colleagues observe one another and provide feedback regarding application of learning?

3. Results-driven

- How do colleagues observe one another and provide feedback regarding application of learning?
- How are student results analyzed to determine the impact of professional learning?

STRAND IV: SCHOOL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS

FRAMEWORK

STRAND IV:
SCHOOL &
COMMUNITY RELATIONS

STANDARD 1:
PARENT/FAMILY INVOLVEMENT

BENCHMARK A:
COMMUNICATION

BENCHMARK B:
ENGAGEMENT

Strand Navigation:

- TEACHING & LEARNING
- LEADERSHIP
- PERSONNEL & PROFESSIONAL LEARNING
- **SCHOOL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS**
- DATA & INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

The school staff maintains purposeful, active, positive relationships with families of its students and with the community in which it operates to support student learning.

STANDARD 1: PARENT/FAMILY INVOLVEMENT

Schools actively and continuously involve parents and families in student learning and other school activities.

BENCHMARK A: COMMUNICATION

School/parent/family communications are two-way, ongoing, and meaningful.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Methods

- How are a variety of communication tools used on a regular basis by the schools?
- How are opportunities provided for direct contact between the school and parents/families that take into consideration a variety of parent needs (e.g., parents' schedules, transportation, translations, interpretation, and child care)?
- How does the school share the board-approved district and school parent involvement plans with parents and families?

2. Diversity

- How does the communication system address issues of family diversity, including language, culture, economic status, and belief systems?

BENCHMARK B: ENGAGEMENT

Schools have a systematic approach that encompasses a variety of meaningful activities/actions that engage parents/families as partners in helping students and schools succeed.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Volunteering

- In what ways are those who are able to volunteer provided various opportunities to do so?
- Is there a system in place to identify and utilize parents' interests, talents, and availability?

2. Extended Learning Opportunities

- How does the school create opportunities for parents/families to learn about, and become involved in, curricular and instructional activities in school?
- How is information provided about how parents/families can foster learning at home by giving appropriate assistance, monitoring homework, and giving feedback to teachers?

3. Decision-Making

- How does the school engage parents/families in school improvement planning and policy-making?

STRAND IV: SCHOOL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS

FRAMEWORK

STRAND IV:
SCHOOL &
COMMUNITY RELATIONS

STANDARD 2:
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

BENCHMARK A:
COMMUNICATION

BENCHMARK B:
ENGAGEMENT

STANDARD 2: COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

The community-at-large is supportive of and involved in student learning and other school activities.

BENCHMARK A: COMMUNICATION

Communications within the community are welcoming, visible, purposeful, and take into account diverse populations.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Methods

- How are a variety of communication tools used on a regular basis?

2. Diversity

- How does the communication system address issues of community diversity, including: language, culture, economic status, and belief systems?

BENCHMARK B: ENGAGEMENT

The school and community work collaboratively and share resources in order to strengthen student, family, and community learning.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Business Community

- In what ways does the partnership extend the learning opportunities for students and relate expectations of the workplace?
- In what ways does the school partner with businesses to obtain additional resources to support programs?

2. Educational Institutions

- In what ways does the school partner with educational institutions and other organizations that offer educational programs, to supplement and extend learning opportunities for students?

3. Community Agencies

- In what ways does the school partner with community agencies to coordinate social services for students and families?

4. Collaboration

- How is community input utilized in planning?
- How are community resources used to enhance educational opportunities?
- How are school resources used to support community programs?

Strand Navigation:

- TEACHING & LEARNING
- LEADERSHIP
- PERSONNEL & PROFESSIONAL LEARNING
- **SCHOOL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS**
- DATA & INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

STRAND V: DATA & INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

FRAMEWORK

STRAND V:
DATA & INFORMATION
MANAGEMENT

STANDARD 1:
DATA MANAGEMENT

BENCHMARK A:
DATA GENERATION,
IDENTIFICATION,
AND COLLECTION

BENCHMARK B:
DATA ACCESSIBILITY

Strand Navigation:

- TEACHING & LEARNING
- LEADERSHIP
- PERSONNEL & PROFESSIONAL LEARNING
- SCHOOL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS
- DATA & INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Schools/districts have a system for managing data and information in order to inform decisions to improve student achievement.

STANDARD 1: DATA MANAGEMENT

The school has policies, procedures, and systems for the generation, collection, storage, and retrieval of its data.

BENCHMARK A: DATA GENERATION, IDENTIFICATION, AND COLLECTION

Schools have a process for the generation, identification, and collection of student and school information.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Purpose

- How does the school use data to identify strengths and challenges?
- How does the school use data to develop strategies to maintain strengths and address challenges?
- How does the school collect data that shows who is or is not learning and why?
- How does the school use data to determine the effectiveness of strategies?
- How does the school collect the appropriate data for identified groups and use it in the planning process?

2. Systematic

- To what extent does the school have a process to determine the data to be collected?
- How does the school ensure the collection of all needed data?

3. Multiple Types

- How are multiple types of data collected (e.g., student achievement, demographics, perception, context/process)?

4. Multiple Sources

- How is each type of data collected from multiple sources?
- How are multiple years of data available from any given source?

5. Technical Quality

- In what ways is the data reliable, valid, and timely?

BENCHMARK B: DATA ACCESSIBILITY

The appropriate information and data is readily accessible.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Retrievable

- In what ways do teachers, students, administrators, parents and community members, have access to the data they need when they need it?

2. Security

- How is data secured so that it is available only to authorized users?

STRAND V: DATA & INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

FRAMEWORK

STRAND V:
DATA & INFORMATION
MANAGEMENT

BENCHMARK C:
DATA SUPPORT

STANDARD 2:
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

BENCHMARK A:
ANALYSIS
& INTERPRETATION

BENCHMARK B:
APPLICATIONS

Strand Navigation:

- TEACHING & LEARNING
- LEADERSHIP
- PERSONNEL & PROFESSIONAL LEARNING
- SCHOOL & COMMUNITY RELATIONS
- DATA & INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

BENCHMARK C: DATA SUPPORT

The system provides multiple types and sources of data.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Process

- How is data organized, summarized, and formatted for analysis?
- Does staff have the skills, knowledge, and disposition to analyze data?
- How are opportunities provided by the school/district for collaborative analysis of data?

2. Tools

- To what extent is data provided that shows comparison across groups?
- To what extent is data provided that shows comparisons over time?
- To what extent are multiple types and sources of data provided that show comparison for analysis over time?

STANDARD 2: INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

The school/district staff collaborate to derive information from data and use it to support decisions.

BENCHMARK A: ANALYSIS & INTERPRETATION

Staff use appropriate methods to examine data and collaboratively determine its possible meaning.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Analysis

- How well does the data help staff understand comparisons across groups?
- How well does the data help staff understand comparisons over time?
- How well does the analysis of multiple types and sources of data help staff understand comparisons over time?
- How are multiple years of data aggregated and disaggregated?
- In what ways do schools use benchmark data to improve student achievement?

2. Dialogue about Meaning

- How do staff discuss the data they have, what it means, and what action it implies?
- Is there a process in place to interpret/explain data that involves multiple members of the school community?
- How have various interpretations and explanations been considered?

BENCHMARK B: APPLICATIONS

Data is used to inform school decisions including monitoring and adjusting teaching and learning.

Key Characteristics with Sample Discussion Questions:

1. Dissemination

- How does the school share what it has learned from data analysis and interpretation?
- How does the school determine the audience for its data analysis and interpretation results?
- How does the school use information to build support for decisions?

2. Data-Driven Decision Making

- How is information derived from the data used to make decisions and determine actions at the classroom and student level?
- How is information derived from the data used to make decisions and determine actions at the school level?
- How is information derived from the data used to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of decisions and actions?

SUPPORTING RESEARCH

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria, VA. (2002). *Guide for Instructional Leaders*.

Baldrige National Quality Program: *Education Criteria for Performance Excellence, Measurement, Analysis and Knowledge Management*. (2004). http://www.quality.nist.gov/PDF_files/2004_Education_Criteria.pdf, page 22.

Barth, Roland S., Darnell, Bob, Lipton, Laura, & Wellman, Bruce. (2002). *Guide for Instructional Leaders (1) and Guide for Instructional Leaders (2)*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Bernhardt, Victoria L. (1998). *Data Analysis for Comprehensive School-wide Improvement*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Bernhardt, Victoria L. (1999). *The School Portfolio: A Comprehensive Framework for School Improvement*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Bernhardt, Victoria. (2002). *The School Portfolio Tool Kit: A Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation Guide for Continuous School Improvement*.

Bernhardt, Victoria. (2005). *Using Data To Improve Student Learning In High Schools*.

Brewer, Harold. (Winter, 2001). *10 Steps to Success*. *Journal of Staff Development*. Vol 22, No. 1, p.30-31.

Carter, Samuel Casey. (2001). *No Excuses: Lessons from 21 High-performing, High-poverty Schools*. Washington, DC: Heritage Foundation.

Collins, J. (2001). *Good to Great*. New York: Harper Collins.

Comodore, Carol R. *Assessment for Learning: Building Student Success*.

Costa, A.L. & Garmston, R.J. (2000). *Habits of Mind: A Developmental Series*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Costa, A.L. & Kallick, B. (2000). *Cognitive Coaching: A Foundation for Renaissance Schools*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc./Norwood Publishers.

Council of Chief State School Officers. Washington, DC. (2000). *Standards for School Leaders*.

Craig, Cheryl J. (2003). *Narrative Inquiries of School Reform: Storied Lives, Storied Landscapes, Storied Metaphors*.

Craig, Cheryl J. (2003). *School portfolio development: a teacher knowledge approach*. An article from: *Journal of Teacher Education*.

Danielson, Charlotte. (1996). *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C. (2002). *Enhancing Student Achievement: A Framework for School Improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Deal, Terrence E. & Peterson, Kent D. (1999). *Shaping School Culture: The Heart of Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass (A Wiley Imprint).

Downey, C., Frase, L., Poston Jr., W., Steffy, B., English, F., & Melton, R. (2003). *Leaving No Child Behind: 50 Ways to Close the Achievement Gap*. Johnston, IA: Curriculum Management Systems.

DuFour, Richard, Sparks, Dennis. (Ed.). (1991). *The Principal as Staff Developer*. Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.

DuFour, Richard & Eaker, Robert. (1998). *Professional Learning Communities at Work: Best Practices for Enhancing Student Achievement*. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service.

DuFour, Rick. (Winter, 2001). *In the Right Context*. *Journal of Staff Development*, Volume 22, No.1, p.14-17.

DuFour, Richard, Eaker, Robert, & DuFour, Rebecca. (2002). *Getting Started: Reculturing schools to Become Professional Learning Communities*. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service.

Educational Research Service. Arlington, VA. (2004). *Handbook of Research on Improving Student Achievement*.

SUPPORTING RESEARCH

- English, F.W. & Scaffy, B.E. (2001). *Deep Curriculum Alignment*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Epstein, Joyce. (2002). *School, Family and Community Partnerships*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Erickson, H.L. (1998). *Concept-based Curriculum and Instruction*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Fitzpatrick, Kathleen. (1997). *Indicators of School Quality*. Schaumburg, IL: National Study of School Evaluation.
- Fullan, Michael. (2001). *Leading in a Culture of Change*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass (A Wiley Imprint).
- Furhman, Susan H. & Elmore, Richard F. (eds.). (2004). *Redesigning Accountability Systems for Education*. Critical Issues in Educational Leadership Series, Joseph Murphy (series editor). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Glickman, C. (2003b). *Holding Sacred Ground: Essays on Leadership, Courage, and Endurance in Our Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass (A Wiley Imprint).
- Green, Reginald Leon. (2001). *Practicing the Art of Leadership: A Problem-based Approach to Implementing the ISLLC Standards*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Guskey, Thomas R. (2000). *Evaluating Professional Development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Hessel, Karen & Holloway, John. (2002). *A Framework for School Leaders: Linking the ISLLC Standards to Practice*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. (1998). *Alexandria, VA. Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards*.
- Jacobs, Hedi Hayes (2004). *Getting Results with Curriculum Mapping*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Jacobs, Hedi Hayes (1997). *Mapping the Big Picture: Integrating Curriculum and Assessment K-12*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Killion, Joellen. (2002). *Assessing Impact: Evaluating Staff Development*. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.
- Kline, E, Kukulis, R, & Zmuda, A. (2004). *Transforming Schools: Creating a Culture of Continuous Improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Kouzes, James M. & Posner, Barry Z. (2002). *Leadership Challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass (A Wiley Imprint) <http://www.leadershipchallenge.com>.
- Kouzes, Posbner. (2003). *The Leadership Challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ladd, Helen F. (editor). (1996). *Holding Schools Accountable: Performance-based Reform in Education*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Lambert, Linda. (2003). *Leadership Capacity for Lasting School Improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Langer, Georgea M., Colton, Amy B., & Goff, Loretta S. (2003). *Collaborative Analysis of Student Work: Improving Teaching and Learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Lezotte, Lawrence W. & McKee, Kathleen M. (2002). *Assembly Required: A Continuous School Improvement System*. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.
- Lick, Dale W. & Murphy, Carlene U. (2001). *Whole-faculty Study Groups: Creating Student-based Professional Development (2e)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Marzano, Robert J. & Kendall, John S. (1996). *Designing Standards-based Districts, Schools, and Classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

SUPPORTING RESEARCH

Marzano, Robert J., Pickering, Debra J. & Pollock, Jane E. (2001). *Classroom Instruction that Works: Research-based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, Robert J., Norford, Jennifer S., Paynter, Diane E., Pickering, Debra J. & Gaddy, Barbara B. (2001). *A Handbook for Classroom Instruction that Works*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, Robert J. (2002). *What Works in Schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, Robert J. (2003). *What Works in Schools: Translating Research Into Action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McNulty, Brian. Dr. McNulty is a key researcher in the area of balanced leadership conducted and distributed by McREL. Much of this research is the foundation for Robert Marzano's new book on what works in leadership.

Michigan Department of Education. Lansing, MI. (1996). *Michigan Curriculum Framework*.

Michigan Department of Education. Lansing, MI. (2002). *Parent Involvement Toolkit*.

Michigan State Board of Education. Lansing, MI: (2003). *Elevating Educational Leadership*.

Millman, Jason (editor.). (1997). *Grading Teachers, Grading Schools: Is student achievement a valid evaluation measure?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc. (A SAGE Publication).

National Association of Elementary School Principals. Alexandria, VA. (Vol. 15, Number 1, Fall 1998). *Standards*.

National PTA. (2000). Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service Publishing. *Building Successful Partnerships: A Guide for Developing Parent and Family Involvement Programs*.

National Staff Development Council. Oxford, OH. (2003). *Moving NSDC's Staff Development Standards into Practice: Innovation Configurations*.

National Staff Development Council. Oxford, OH: (2001). *Standards for staff development*.

North Central Accreditation: Tempe, AZ. Commission on Accreditation and School Improvement. *School District and Systems Accreditation, Information System Criteria*.

O'Connor, Ken (2002). *How to Grade for Learning: Linking Grades to Standards*.

Reeves, Douglas B. (2004). *Accountability for Learning: How Teachers and School Leaders can Take Charge*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Reeves, Douglas B. (2004). *Assessing Educational Leaders: Evaluating Performance for Improved Individual and Organizational Results*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc / Advanced Learning Press.
<http://www.makingstandswork.com/ResourceCtr/index.php>

Reeves, Douglas B. (2002). *Holistic Accountability: Serving Students, Schools, and Community*. Experts in Assessment Series. Thomas R. Guskey and Robert J. Marzano (series editors). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc. (A SAGE Publications Company).

Reeves, Douglas B. (2004). *Leadership for Learning: Transforming Theory into Action for Improved Achievement and Educational Equity*. Englewood, CO: Center for Performance Assessment.

Roeber, Edward & Mastie, Marjorie. (1999). *Steps in the Right Direction: A Guide to Using and Reporting Assessment Results*. Dover, NH: Advanced Systems in Measurement & Evaluation, Inc.

Schmoker, Mike. (1996, 1999 2e). *Results: The Key to Continuous Improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Schmoker, Mike (2001). *The Results Fieldbook: Practical Strategies from Dramatically Improving Schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

SUPPORTING RESEARCH

Senge, Peter. (2000). *Schools that learn: A Fifth Discipline Fieldbook for Educators, Parents, and Everyone Who Cares About Education*. New York: Doubleday. <http://www.fieldbook.com>

Tomlinson, C. (1999). *The Differentiated Classroom: Responding to the Needs of All Learners*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Udelhofen, S. & Larson, K. (2002). *The Mentoring Year: A Step-by-Step Guide to Professional Development*. Phoenix, AZ: All-Star Publishing.

Using Data to Improve Schools: What's Working. Washington, DC: Publication of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, Award #R215 U990019. (2002).

Waters, Tim B. (2004). *The Leadership we Need: Using Research to Strengthen the Use of Standards for Administrators, Preparation and Licensure Programs*. Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Research of Education and Learning.

Wahlstrom, Deborah (1999, 2002). *Using Data to Improve Student Achievement*. Suffolk, VA: Successline, Inc.

Wiggins, G. & McTighe, J. (1998). *Understanding by Design*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Zemelman, Steven, Daniels, Harvey, & Hyde, Arthur. (1998). *Best Practice: New Standards for Teaching and Learning in America's Schools (2e)*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, (a Division of Reed Elsevier, Inc.).

Zmuda, Allison, Kulkis, Robert, & Kline, Everett. (2004). *Transforming Schools: Creating a Culture of Continuous Improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

RESEARCH ORGANIZATION WEB REFERENCES

ASCD—Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. <http://www.ascd.org>

Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc./Norwood Publishers. Norwood, MA. <http://www.christopher-gordon.com>

Corwin Press, Inc. Thousand Oaks, CA. <http://www.corwinpress.com>

Doubleday (a Division of Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, Inc.). New York, NY. <http://www.doubleday.com>

Educational Testing Service. Princeton, NJ. <http://www.teachingandlearning.org>

Effective Schools Products, Ltd. Okemos, MI. <http://www.effectiveschools.com>

Heinemann (a Division of Reed Elsevier, Inc.). Portsmouth, NH. <http://www.heinemann.com>

Jossey Bass (A Wiley Imprint). San Francisco, CA. <http://www.josseybass.com>

McREL—Mid-Continent Research of Education and Learning (formerly the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory). <http://www.mcrel.org>

Merrill Prentice Hall. Upper Saddle River, NJ. <http://www.merrilleducation.com>

National Educational Service. Bloomington, IN. <http://www.nesonline.com>

NCA-CASI—North Central Association—Commission on Accreditation and School Improvement. Tempe, AZ. <http://www.ncacasl.org/standard/district>

Scarecrow Press. Lanham, MD. <http://www.scarecroweducation.com>



For more information visit:
Michigan Department of Education
Office of School Improvement
www.michigan.gov/osi

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION STATEMENT OF ASSURANCE OF COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL LAW

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) complies with all federal laws and regulations prohibiting discrimination and with all requirements and regulations of the U.S. Department of Education. It is the policy of the Michigan Department of Education that no person on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, sex, marital status, or handicap shall be discriminated against, excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or otherwise be subjected to discrimination in any program or activity for which it is responsible or for which it received financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education.

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION TITLE IX COMPLIANCE STATEMENT

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) is in compliance with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq. (Title IX), and its implementing regulation, at 34 C.F.R. Part 106, which prohibits discrimination based on sex. The MDE, as a recipient of federal financial assistance from the United States Department of Education (USDOE), is subject to the provisions of Title IX. MDE does not discriminate based on gender in employment or in any educational program or activity that it operates. Inquiries and complaints regarding Title IX should be sent to Ms. Roberta E. Stanley, stanleyr@michigan.gov.