SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

Applicants must respond to each question/item in each section of the application. Incomplete applications will not be considered.

Electronic Application Process

Applicants are required to complete and submit the application, including all required attachments to:

MDE-SSOS@michigan.gov

The application and all required attachments must be submitted before 5:00 p.m. on May 21, 2010 to be considered for the first list to be posted on the website. Applications will be received after May 21 on an ongoing basis and will be reviewed in the order in which they are received.

Applicants must respond to each question/item in each section of the application. Incomplete applications will not be considered.

Please make sure you complete the application as early as possible so that we may help you correct any problems associated with technical difficulties. Technical support will be available Monday – Friday, throughout the application period, from 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

All information included in the application package must be accurate. All information that is submitted is subject to verification. All applications are subject to public inspection and/or photocopying.

Contact Information

All questions related to the preferred provider application process should be directed to:

Mark Coscarella
Interim Supervisor
Office of Education Improvement & Innovation

OR

Anne Hansen or Bill Witt
Consultants
Office of Education Improvement & Innovation

Telephone:  (517) 373-8480 or (517) 335-4733
Email:  MDE-SSOS@michigan.gov
Under the Final Requirements for School Improvements Grants, as defined under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, Title I, Part A. Section 1003(g) and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act as amended in January 2010, one of the criteria that the MDE (SEA) must consider when an LEA applies for a SIG grant is the extent to which the LEA has taken action to “recruit, screen, and select external providers...”. To assist LEA’s in this process, the MDE is requesting information/applications from entities wishing to be considered for placement on a preferred provider list that will be made available to LEA’s on the MDE website. If an LEA selects a provider that is not on the list, the provider will have to go through the application review process before engaging in the turnaround intervention at the LEA. Applications will be reviewed on their merits and not on a competitive basis. Please note that the application and accompanying attachments will be accessible online to LEA’s seeking to contract for educational services.

Preferred external providers will be required to participate in a state-run training program that specifies performance expectations and familiarizes providers with state legislation and regulations. External providers will be monitored and evaluated regularly and those who are not getting results will be removed from the preferred provider list.

All decisions made by the MDE are final. There is no appeal process.

Please note that being placed on the Preferred Provider List does not guarantee that a provider will be selected by an LEA to provide services.

Two or more qualified reviewers will rate the application using the scoring rubric developed by the Michigan Department of Education (MDE).

Applications will only be reviewed if:

1. All portions of the application are complete;

2. All application materials, including attachments, are submitted electronically prior to the due date;

Applications will only be approved if:

1. The above conditions are met for review;

2. The total application score meets a minimum of 70 points
Exemplar | Total Points Possible
--- | ---
1. Description of comprehensive improvement services | 25
2. Use of scientific educational research | 15
3. Job embedded professional development | 15
4. Experience with state and federal requirements | 15
5. Sustainability Plan | 15
6. Staff Qualifications | 15
Total Points Possible | 100
Minimum Points Required for Approval | 70

**Note:** Applicants may apply to become preferred providers in all or some of the program delivery areas listed in Section B. If applicant does not wish to become a provider in a program area, that should be noted on the application.

If an applicant is applying to be a preferred provider in less than the five areas listed, they must have a review score not less than the following in each area for which they apply:

- Section 1: 15 points
- Section 2: 10 points
- Section 3: 10 points
- Section 4: 10 points
- Section 5: 10 points
- Section 6: 10 points

Section 6 must be completed by all applicants.
The Application is divided into four sections.

**Section A** contains basic provider information.

**Section B** requests information related to six exemplars (program delivery information and staff qualifications). Responses in Section B must be in narrative form. You may include figures (e.g., tables, charts, graphs) to support your narrative, but such items will be counted toward applicable page/word limits.

**Section C** contains the Assurances. Please read each statement carefully. By submitting your application, you certify your agreement with all statements therein.

**Section D** Attachments
**SECTION A: BASIC PROVIDER INFORMATION**

Please enter the requested information in the spaces provided. Be sure to read all notes, as they provide important information.

**Instructions:** Complete each section in full.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Federal EIN, Tax ID or Social Security Number</th>
<th>2. Legal Name of Entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Name of Entity as you would like it to appear on the Approved List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMU Center for Excellence in Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Entity Type:</th>
<th>5. Check the category that best describes your entity:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ Non-profit</td>
<td>☒ Institution of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Applicant Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Contact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ian R. Davison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foust 251, ORSP, Central Michigan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-Mail</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:davis1ir@cmich.edu">davis1ir@cmich.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Local Contact Information (if different than information listed above)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Contact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHS Building 132, CEIE, Central Michigan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-Mail</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:palmelpj@cmich.edu">palmelpj@cmich.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Service Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List the intermediate school district and each individual district in which you agree to provide services. Enter “Statewide” ONLY if you agree to provide services to any district in the State of Michigan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate School District(s):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 9. Conflict of Interest Disclosure

Are you or any member of your organization currently employed in any capacity by any public school district or public school academy (charter school) in Michigan, or do you serve in a decision making capacity for any public school district or public school academy in Michigan (i.e. school board member)?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

What school district are you employed by or serve: **Central Michigan University**

In what capacity are you employed or do you serve (position title): **Executive Director, CEIE**

Schools or school districts are encouraged to apply to become preferred providers. However, the school or school district may not become a preferred provider in its own district. This restriction does not apply to Intermediate School Districts or Regional Educational Service Authorities.

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** Once approved, providers must operate within the information identified in this application.

Changes in application information may be requested in writing to MDE. The request must include the rationale for the changes. All changes must receive written approval from MDE prior to implementation and will be determined on a case-by-case basis. This includes, but is not limited to, information changes in the following categories:

- Change in service area
- Change in services to be offered
- Change in method of offering services
SECTION B: PROGRAM DELIVERY AND STAFF QUALIFICATION NARRATIVES

Instructions: Section B responses must be in narrative form. Provide data/documentation of previous achievements where applicable. All responses must comply with stated page limits. Figures such as tables, charts and graphs can be included in the narrative, but such information will be counted toward page limits. Text and figures beyond the stated page limit will not be considered and should not be submitted with the application. All references must be cited.

Exemplar 1: Description of Comprehensive Improvement Services (25 points possible)

Describe how comprehensive improvement services that result in dramatic, documented and sustainable improvement in underperforming urban secondary schools will be delivered to LEA’s that contract for your services. Comprehensive services include, but are not limited to the following:

- Support systems to ensure student and teacher success and sustain improvement
- Content and delivery systems and mechanisms proven to result in dramatic and sustained improvement linked to student achievement
- Job embedded professional development at leadership, teacher and support levels to increase internal capacity for improvement and sustainability linked to student achievement
- Comprehensive short cycle and summative assessment systems to measure performance and goal attainment linked to the building school improvement plan.
Exemplar 1 Narrative Limit: 4 pages (insert narrative here)
Exemplar 2: Use of Scientific Educational Research
(15 points possible)

Describe how scientific educational research and evidence based practices will be used as the basis for all content and delivery systems and services provided to the LEA.

- The applicant should provide detailed data that supports successful performance in utilizing research and evidence-based practices in the delivery of systems and services, especially as applied to secondary school settings.
- Cite and reference available research studies (as appropriate) and provide data that indicate the practices used have a positive impact on the academic achievement of students in the subjects and grade levels in which you intend to provide services.
Exemplar 2 Narrative Limit:  3 pages  (insert narrative here)
Exemplar 3: Job Embedded Professional Development
(15 points possible)

Describe how a job-embedded professional development plan will be put in place to support principals, school leadership teams, teachers, and support staff.

- The applicant should provide detailed data that supports successful performance in developing job-embedded professional development plans for:
  - principals
  - school leadership teams
  - teachers
  - support staff
Exemplar 3 Narrative Limit: 2 pages (insert narrative here).
Exemplar 4: Experience with State and Federal Requirements
(15 points possible)

Describe your experience with State and Federal Requirements, especially as it relates to the following:

- Aligning model(s) to be implemented with the School Improvement Framework
- The Michigan Comprehensive Needs Assessment
- Individual School/District Improvement Plans, North Central Association (NCA)
  - Response demonstrates alignment of the above mentioned elements, AKA “One Common Voice - One Plan.”
- Understanding of Title 1 (differences between Targeted Assistance and School-wide)
- State assessments — Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) and the Michigan Merit Exam (MME)
- Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCEs)
- Michigan High School Content Expectations (HSCEs)
- Michigan Merit Curriculum
- Michigan Curriculum Framework
- Section 504 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)
Exemplar 4 Narrative Limit: 2 pages (insert narrative here)
Exemplar 5: Sustainability Plan
(15 points possible)

Describe how a sustainability plan will be put in place for the building to become self-sufficient at the end of the 3-year grant period.

- The applicant should demonstrate significant knowledge and experience in developing sustainability plans.
Exemplar 5 Narrative Limit: 2 pages (insert narrative here)
Exemplar 6: Staff Qualifications
(15 points possible)

Provide names and a brief summary of qualifications for the primary staff who will be involved in providing services to LEA’s. Provide criteria for selection of additional staff that are projected to be working with LEA’s. Include vitae of primary staff.

- Staff qualifications and vitae should match with areas that the applicant wishes to serve. Staff should have extensive experience in implementation of all applicable areas.
Exemplar 6 Narrative Limit:  1 page plus vitae for personnel (insert narrative and vitae here)
SECTION C: ASSURANCES

The applicant entity:

1. will follow all applicable legislation and guidance governing the Section 1003(g) school improvement grants.

2. will follow all applicable Federal, state, and local health, safety, employment, and civil rights laws at all times.

3. will comply with the MDE Standards for Monitoring Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants Preferred External Education Services Providers.

4. agrees to make all documents available to the MDE or LEA for inspection/monitoring purposes, and participate in site visits at the request of the MDE, the district, or facilitators/monitors for the SIG grant.

5. agrees to notify MDE and applicable district(s), in writing, of any change in the contact information provided in this application within ten business days.

6. ensures that it will provide written notification to MDE, when external preferred provider services will no longer be provided, thirty days prior to termination of services.

7. assures that they have accurately and completely described services they will provide to the LEA.

8. assures they will comply with SEA and LEA requirements and procedures.
SECTION D: ATTACHMENTS

- **Licensure:** Applicants must attach a copy of their business license or formal documentation of legal status with respect to conducting business in Michigan (e.g., certificate of incorporation, proof of 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status). Schools, school districts, and ISDs/RESAs may substitute documents that include address/contact information and the appropriate building or district code as found in the Educational Entity Master (EEM).

- **Insurance:** Applicants must provide a proof of their liability insurance or a quote from an insurance agency that reflects the intent to obtain general and/or professional liability insurance coverage.

**LICENSURE AND INSURANCE DOCUMENTS ARE ON FILE WITH MDE**
Exemplar 1: Description of Comprehensive Improvement Services

The Center for Excellence in Education at Central Michigan University has a rich history of success with comprehensive school reform (CSR) efforts provided to high needs secondary schools in Michigan. The Center for Excellence in Education, formerly Michigan Schools in the Middle, provided comprehensive services through the Middle Start model for more than forty schools throughout the state of Michigan under the CSR federal funding. The Center has twice received national awards for its work with underachieving schools. In 2003 the American Association for State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) recognized CEIE for its work with thirteen Middle Start/CSR schools. Students test scores in these schools were compared to students’ state test scores in comparison schools, and in all cases, students in CEIE assisted schools, students outperformed their counterparts in all tested areas. In 2008 the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) included the Center’s work with Title schools in their monograph, “Partnerships that Work” which was presented to legislators in Washington D.C. Twenty partnerships across the nation were recognized in the report and CEIE was the only one from Michigan. This recognition was also based on improved student achievement.

Since CSR funding ended, the Center for Excellence has continued to work with urban high schools through Title IIA “Improving Teacher Quality” funding, including work in Flint, Lansing and Saginaw school districts. The philosophy of the Center’s work is informed by the National Secondary Schools Principals’ recommendations in Breaking Ranks II which states, “Each school works closely with a veteran educator acting as a change coach to guide staff toward implementation of components of systemic reform based upon creating high standards for all students, smaller and more personalized learning environments, collaborative leadership structures, and the use of data to support continuous improvement.”

The comprehensive improvement services provided by the Center for Excellence are research-based and multi-faceted and tailored to the specific needs of the school and community served. Specifically, CEIE targets services to building leadership personnel, teachers, and support staff through coaching and differentiated professional development. Our model is aligned with the IES Practice Guide recommendations and includes twelve components (detailed in Exemplar 2) for comprehensive improvement services with the following goals and key practices:

LEADERSHIP COACHING

Coaching has been the hallmark of the Center for Excellence school improvement work. Specifically, all CEIE coaches are former teachers & administrators and have been trained in the Adaptive Schools work, as well as Cognitive Coaching. They have had extensive experience in applying the Adaptive Schools’ skills of collaboration in
their work. Adaptive Schools has enhanced coaches’ abilities to build strong collaborative cultures, assist people in clarifying their goals, and make data driven decisions. Essentially Adaptive Schools work provides urban educators with the “how to” of professional learning communities.

A second powerful aspect of Adaptive Schools is that it builds teacher and administrative efficacy through honoring the expertise and problem-solving abilities that lie within the urban schools. All CEIE coaches are committed to facilitating the thinking of educators with whom they work, as opposed to coming in as the “outside expert” and telling schools what needs to be done. Services provided through the Center will include training for administrators and teacher-leaders in skills of collaboration, and the use of Cognitive Coaching. (Costa & Garmston, 1994) Cognitive Coaching will provide teachers and administrators with the skills to engage in deep conversations around teaching and learning. Coaches and professional development facilitators will train and model planning and reflective conversations so that urban educators embed these practices into the culture of their schools.

One of the primary goals of comprehensive improvement services will be establishing trust within the school and community. Trust will be enhanced between Coaching staff and administrators and teachers as coaches show commitment to the goals of the school through daily participation in school activities and responding to the needs of teachers and administrators.

Coaches will immerse themselves in the culture of the school in an effort to gain understanding and trust and prepare to assist educators in developing their own plan of action. They will do this through participation in such things as staff meetings, school improvement sessions, administrative meetings and community events. Michigan educators who worked with high needs schools serve as coaches while still holding the vision for the school moving forward and sustaining comprehensive improvement efforts.

“As the coach and teacher work together in a non-threatening relationship, they place greater value in the coaching process, thus increasing their capacity for self-improvement.” (p. 50 CC) Coaching will be provided at leadership levels, teacher levels, and support levels in an effort to increase efficacy and sustain improvement in all areas.

CEIE’s services to each building will provide a three person coaching team which will consist of a leadership coach (providing support to administrators and teacher leaders) and two academic coaches (providing on-going support to teachers in the critical areas of Math and Literacy). This coaching team of highly-qualified, experienced individuals will meet regularly and work collaboratively with one another to provide a unified set of support services specifically targeted to their school. Each coaching team will provide services to only one building so they can focus on the culture and needs of the individual school. Services will be customized to meet the goals of individual school improvement plans.
ACADEMIC COACHING

Two academic coaches will serve each urban secondary school. An academic coach will work in the area of literacy to ensure that all students become proficient in the areas of reading and writing. Math teachers will be supported by an academic coach focused on supporting students in their achievement in algebra. Academic coaches’ work will be based on National Staff Development Council’s professional standards as they address content, context and process (NSDC, 2001). Literacy work will be supported by resources such as the Teaching Adolescent Writers (Gallagher, 2006). Math will be supported by Martin (2009) as well as the use of strategies to support success for all learners. Both Literacy & Math coaches will model research-based instructional strategies in classrooms, coach teachers as they use strategies, and provide opportunities for peer coaching. These practices are aligned with the Joyce & Showers research (2002) that confirms that professional development does not get implemented in classrooms without the job-embedded aspect of coaching. Specifically, academic coaches will model each of the nine instructional strategies identified by Marzano, Pickering & Pollock (2001): including cooperative learning, summarizing and notetaking, graphic organizers, identifying similarities and differences, and setting objectives and providing feedback.

Periodically coaches will engage in classroom observations as formative assessment. These observations will be non-evaluative and aligned with the Collegial Peer Review model in which teachers provide aspects of their teaching and student learning about which they would like to receive feedback. These observations will provide coaching staff with information about instructional approaches and further guide their work and increase the quality of their planning and execution.

Coaches also support administrators as they learn to conduct powerful, effective walk-throughs and train teachers to engage in collegial walk-throughs.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Center for Excellence in Education will plan professional development based on a results-based model from the National Staff Development Council (1999). Teachers’ professional development plans will be directly linked to student achievement goals and teacher need for support, followed by professional development evaluation and on-going support for learning and implementation (see Figure 1). Based on research related to student outcomes as well as identified needs within a particular urban secondary school, we will provide on-going job-embedded professional development in the following areas: Differentiated Instruction (Tomlinson & Eidson, 2003), Instructional Strategies (Marzano, 2001), formative & summative assessment, protocols for lesson study and studying student work, RTI, & Data-based decision making.
Urban school reform efforts have often fallen short of expectations due to lack of attention to ongoing assessment that informs the work of the service providers as well as educators within the system (Hess, 2005). CEIE coaches and professional development facilitators will employ the use of Understanding by Design (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005) to help educators clearly identify HSCEs that they will address, paying careful attention to formative and summative assessments.

A review of comprehensive reform models confirms that in high schools that have made significant gains in student achievement, nearly all have implemented a “DuFour-Based model” (DuFour, R. & Eaker, R., 1998) in which building teachers are very clear about the standards that are being addressed, and develop pre-and post assessment to guide their practice & measure their progress, followed by differentiating instruction and employing interventions to support all students learning at high levels. CEIE staff will pay careful attention to helping teachers & administrators have an early success and reflect upon data that supports gains in student achievement.
Exemplar 2: Use of Scientific Educational Research

The comprehensive services to improvement urban high schools, provided by the Center for Excellence in Education (CEIE) is a synthesis of several school reform models coupled with research-based components and the Center’s own experience in working with high schools in Michigan’s urban areas. Each of the twelve components of the CEIE service model is aligned with the four core recommendations from the National Center for Educational Evaluation and Regional Assistance (Institute of Education Sciences) for “Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools” (Herman, R., et al. 2008).

**IES Recommendations**

1. Signal the need for dramatic change with strong leadership.

   · **Onsite coaching** will be a major component of the service provided to schools selecting CEIE as their provider. Our experience with Middle Start (2002) and subsequently with TITLE IIA: Improving Teacher Quality projects has validated that both leadership coaches and academic coaches are critical to achieving success in urban schools. Experience and research have also underscored the importance of onsite coaches being in the building multiple days each week (McGatha, 2008).

   CEIE leadership and academic coaches will work as a team, however, it will be the role of the leadership coach to work with building administrators and teacher leaders to signal changes in the building. Coaches will provide leaders with the support and skills needed to serve as instructional leaders in the reform effort.

   · **Distributed Leadership** was also a key factor in the success of the Middle Start CSR (2002) work and will be developed in the persistently low-performing high schools served by CEIE. For many buildings, the practice of distributed or shared leadership has not become a reality; a school improvement/leadership team will help signal change in the building and help all staff members become familiar with and involved in the reform effort.

   · **Change Process** and the support to engage in dramatic reform in overstressed high schools is a recommendation from the National High School Center (2006) and one of the components in the CEIE model. CEIE staff members use the “Managing Complex Change” process (Enterprise Management Ltd.1987) to assist schools in identifying the vision, skills, incentives, resources and action plan necessary to bring about rapid changes in student achievement. The National Staff Development Council (NSDC) has also developed a tool for helping deal with resistance to change (Tools for Schools, February/March 2003). CEIE also incorporates the change process from Adaptive Schools (Garmston & Wellman, 2009) to help educators embrace change efforts.
Coordination of Reform Initiatives is a major focus of CEIE coaching teams. This component of the model is a recommendation from The U.S. Department of Education Office of Elementary and Secondary Education’s forum document, “Great Expectations: Reforming Urban High Schools (Neild, Balfanz, and Herzog, 2007). Our reform experience has taught us the absolute necessity of reviewing all district and school initiatives in order to coordinate efforts to increase student achievement. Research has long informed educators that “piecemeal” reform efforts do little to produce or sustain gains in student achievement. Coordination of all efforts and honoring those successful practices already in place will do much to garner support for the work to be done.

2. Maintain a Consistent Focus on Improving Instruction.

Professional Development will provide all staff members with the content knowledge and instructional skills necessary for improving student achievement. All CEIE professional development adheres to the NSDC standards, research-based, and job-embedded. The CEIE models draw on the Adaptive Schools (Garmston & Wellman, 2009) and Cognitive Coaching (Costa & Garmston, 2002) work and pays careful attention to full implementation identified by Reeves (2006) and Joyce and Showers (2002). Professional development will be tailored to the needs of each school, departments and teachers within the building. For example, a secondary urban school that struggles to teach students with special needs might have data that leads to significant professional development in the area of co-teaching.

Instructional Improvement is based on research from the National High School Center. The National High School Center reports, “studies indicate that instructional improvement and personalization are the twin pillars of high school reform” (Herlihy & Quint, 2006). Instructional improvement is a major focus of the services provided by CEIE. Academic Coaches trained in cooperative learning, multiple literacy strategies, inquiry-based learning, formative assessments, and differentiated instruction will focus attention in the gate-keeping areas of math and literacy to help ALL students become proficient.

Using Data to Inform Work CEIE leadership coaches are trained and experienced in analyzing and using multiple forms of data to guide the work in urban high schools. CEIE coaches assist building administrators, teacher leaders, and school improvement teams in reviewing student achievement data, graduation and attendance rates, disciplinary referrals, special education students, and other pertinent information to guide decision-making. CEIE coaches are also equipped to conduct peer reviews to gain an understanding of the needs in a building or district.

As a part of the CEIE Model schools may choose to participate in the School Self-study developed by the Center for Prevention Research and Development (CPRD) at the University of Illinois. The self-study provides data regarding teacher practices that have been implemented in classrooms. Each school’s self-study, completed by
staff, will be analyzed and used to help identify professional development needs and to refine school improvement goals.

3. Make visible improvements early in the school turnaround process (quick wins).

- **Build upon Strengths** is a proven strategy to achieve a “quick-win” as it honors what is going well in a struggling school. The Center has a very strong philosophy and rich history of honoring the knowledge and skills of teachers and administrators. Indeed, the Adaptive Schools work and Cognitive Coaching is centered around building educator efficacy through guiding the thinking of building teachers and leaders as they identify solutions to the challenges they face.

CEIE coaches will NOT play the role of “coming in to fix” what is wrong with the system by issuing mandates or delivery of a “canned” program. Our experience tells us that people who do not “own” the solution do NOT implement solutions. As was the policy in Middle Start schools and is with our TITLE II A schools, CEIE fosters relationships early-on with union representatives to ensure a collaborative working environment.

- **Support Ninth-graders and Struggling Students** is a recommendation of Breaking Ranks II (2004) developed by the National Association of Secondary School Principals. It is also a recommendation of the National High School Center and an important aspect of the CEIE model. The Center will work with schools to review existing supports for ninth-grade students and to strengthen them as may be necessary. CEIE also pays careful attention to students with special needs as area in which visible improvements can be documented early on in the effort.

4. Build a committed staff.

- **Collegial Dialogue and Collaboration** is cited in The U.S. Department of Education Office of Elementary and Secondary Education’s forum document, “Great Expectations: Reforming Urban High Schools” (2000) and has also informed the work of CEIE. Among the “critical components of successful urban high schools” identified in the document is the importance of creating an environment for high school staff to learn from one another. CEIE fosters this environment through offering Cognitive Coaching and collaboration skills to teachers. The Center also creates opportunities for collaboration through the use of collegial walk-throughs, studying student work protocols, and collaborative assessment dialogues and discussions. The skills of collaboration are also crucial to the sustainability of reform efforts.

- **Personalization** will be addressed in multiple ways. The Center works with high schools to develop, implement, evaluate, and refine ninth-grade academies or smaller learning communities. The intention is to improve ninth-graders success in high school through providing a safe, caring environment with a rigorous curriculum that
is accompanied by support systems and programs for struggling students. CEIE will also “borrow” from the Talent Development model (MDRC, 2004) regarding which third-party, independent evaluation has reported strong success with their emphasis on the ninth grade and combining high-quality curriculum with instructional enhancements. The First Things First reform model has also received high marks for increases in high school student achievement (MDRC 2008). This model also focuses on smaller learning communities (teaming), teachers as family advocates, and the use of more engaging instructional strategies. CEIE will, therefore, pay careful attention to the ninth-grade year by fostering strong teacher/student relationships and concentrating our efforts on improving the quality of instruction in all classrooms.

The Center also advocates for and assists teachers in working collaboratively (and giving teachers the skills to work collaboratively) in teams to address the cognitive, physical, and social needs of adolescents. Research confirms that relationship and students’ feeling of connectedness to teachers is related to their academic success (National High School Center, 2006). The Center also creates opportunities for collaboration through the use of collegial walk-throughs, studying student work protocols, and collaborative assessment dialogues and discussions.

- **Recognize the Needs of Diverse Population** is also a part of CEIE’s work and philosophy. First, all CEIE leadership and academic coaches have experience in Michigan’s urban schools. CEIE coaches have credibility and recognize the challenges of working with diverse student populations in our urban high schools. Through book studies, modeling of behaviors and attitudes, and candid dialogue, CEIE staff support “middle-class” educators teaching in poverty-stricken, urban communities. CEIE coaches also are trained in differentiated instruction and inclusionary practices and will provide job-embedded professional development as needed in these areas.

**Exemplar 3: Job Embedded Professional Development**

The Center for Excellence believes strongly in the benefits of job-embedded professional development, and has an outstanding record of providing this kind of professional development for urban, secondary schools. Specifically, CEIE has been working in a Saginaw High School and in a Lansing High School over the past two years through the use of Title IIA Improving Teacher Quality funds. In Saginaw and Lansing, our approach has focused on two job embedded forms of professional development:

- **Coaching** which involves the use of Cognitive Coaching tools: Planning and Reflective Conversations to engage teachers in deep conversations around teaching and learning. Teachers have seen these conversations modeled numerous times and have been taught the skills to engage in this type of ongoing, job-embedded professional development in their team and departmental meetings.
Coaching is also used to help teachers engage in backward planning conversations in order to help them focus first on the outcomes/HSCE that will be addressed in the lesson.

**Classroom Observations and Modeling** also occurs regularly in CEIE assisted buildings. CEIE staff members observe classrooms, noting whatever the teacher requests that the observer note. For example, a teacher might want the observer to note the questions posed by the teacher; or the use of a certain strategy. The CEIE staff member then engages the teacher in a reflective conversation, without judgment or evaluation, but with the purpose helping the teacher reflect on the lesson.

CEIE coaches also regularly co-teach or guest-teach in classrooms to help teachers observe the use of a new instructional strategy with “their own students.”

The CEIE model bases its professional development philosophy around a quote from The Instructional Leader (Rock, 2002):

> “Using a professional development model that identifies individual performance objectives for each teacher. . . is the most beneficial model for teacher learning.”

Our model assists schools in focusing on a change in culture and growth in each educator. It will help teachers and administrators begin to “own” the practice of embedding their own learning throughout their day, as they reflect on their formative assessments and engage in dialogue with colleagues around the use of strategies to assist all students in achieving at high levels.

Our mission statement assists us in staying focused on the importance of job-embedded professional development:

> “CEIE will make a powerful, positive impact on the lives of K-12 students by providing ongoing, results-oriented, job-embedded professional development to teachers and administrators to build leadership capacity, and develop professional learning communities that support a unified vision of uncompromising success for every learner.”

In the CEIE model, each school will be assigned a team of coaches, including a leadership coach and two academic coaches (literacy and math). Each coach will spend at least three days per week in the building working with the administrators by attending staff meetings and assisting administrators with daily decision making.
Exemplar 4: Experience with State and Federal Requirements

The CEIE model of services is aligned with the One Common Voice – One Plan School Improvement Framework (See Figure 2). The additional boxes in the diagram below define the ways in which the CEIE model meshes with the framework.

CEIE
Focus on re-culturing the school through use of skills of collaboration & successful meeting strategies; this includes engagement in dialogue, discussion and cognitive conflict as teachers evaluate their practice

Gather
Getting Ready
Collect Data
Build Profile

Do
Implement Plan
Monitor Plan
Evaluate Plan

Study
Analyze Data
Set Goals & Measurable Objectives
Research
Best Practices

Plan
Develop Action Plan

CEIE
Conduct self study with staff members
Review/update CAN
Engage schools in “Existing State / Desired State” process
Engage in classroom observations and reviews of school policies & practices

CEIE
Coaches will help staff & administrators reach full implementation of identified strategies through onsite coaching, collegial walk-throughs, modeling, planning/reflective dialogue and continued review of earlier data

CEIE
Onsite coaches work with departments to analyze teacher practice & student learning through the use of a protocol to study student work
Compare with data (listed above)

CEIE has considerable experience in assisting schools as they develop their CNA, looking at the four types of data: (1) demographic and (2) achievement data (obtained from school), (3) process data (criteria for high performing schools and Schools to Watch rubric) and (4) perception data (self-study survey including student, parent, and teacher survey).

CEIE coaches are familiar with and use the school process rubric [SPR (40) and SPR (90)] and the district process rubric [DPR (19)]. Elements of various rubrics are embedded in our professional development. The Center has also worked with numerous schools using the NCA accreditation and is familiar with the self-evaluation process.
All CEIE coaches are educators who have worked as administrators in Title I buildings, some of which were targeted assistance and others of which were school-wide. As coaches, they have been instrumental in helping schools move from targeted assistance to school-wide. Further, many CEIE coaches have experience with Title I audits and will provide this type of support to persistently low-performing schools. CEIE coaches’ experience will be invaluable as they assist schools with the coordination of all reform initiatives implemented in the building. CEIE coaches come from and maintain a broad perspective as they manage the intricacies of multiple responsibilities.

CEIE coaches frequently work with schools in analyzing MEAP and MME data. A focus of this kind of coaching is to assist teams in understanding the data, identifying the gap, and making decisions about how this informs their practice. CEIE staff members are also very familiar with GLCEs and HSCEs as they regularly provide follow up to professional development for Middle School and High School teachers in Michigan. CEIE will also support teachers through professional development that focuses specifically on a backward planning process where teachers are clearly defining the GLCE or HSCE around which the lesson is focused. They will also have opportunity in the backward planning conversation to identify the formative and/or summative assessment they will use. Much of the Title IIA work in Lansing and Saginaw schools has been directed to the development of common assessments in content areas being matched to GLCEs and HSCEs. CEIE staff members are keeping abreast of the Common Core Curriculum as a result of national standards and will assist schools in paying attention to depth, rather than breadth, of content.

All coaches are familiar with the Michigan Merit Curriculum through their previous work as administrators in high schools. As coaches, they regularly work with leadership teams to ensure compliance with the Michigan Merit Curriculum. Research supports the importance of a rigorous curriculum to help increase student engagement in persistently low performing schools.

The Michigan Curriculum Framework formed the basis of much of the Middle Start work during the late 1990s and early part of this decade. Of particular importance to the work are the standards for authentic instruction, including Higher Order Thinking, Deep Knowledge, Substantive Conversation and Connections to the World Beyond the Classroom. These four standards are aligned with the Breaking Ranks II recommendation that urges high schools to pay attention to rigor, relevance and relationship. Professional development provided by the Center for Excellence in Education embeds these elements of authentic instruction through teaching and modeling Marzano’s nine research-based instructional strategies (2001). Furthermore, professional development regularly focuses on the use of collegial dialogue to plan and reflect on teaching and learning.

CEIE staff includes individuals with Special Education teaching background and experience, both as teachers and administrators. Specifically, the Saginaw Title IIA
project staff members have been working with a middle and high school building around the area of co-teaching, and have engaged teachers in dialogue as they review IEPs and plan for the implementation of co-teaching in the content areas.

**Exemplar 5: Sustainability Plan**

The Center for Excellence in Education at Central Michigan University has worked intensely with high-needs schools engaged in reform efforts for the past twelve years. The Center is committed to sustaining the hard-won efforts made in student achievement in Michigan’s Schools and, therefore, works with schools to develop sustainability plans.

Our work is aligned with and informed by The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement (Jerald, C., 2008) and their recommendations for “sustaining improvement efforts over the long run.” Specifically CEIE sustainability addresses three key elements recommended by CCSRI:

1. **Maintaining the improvement effort beyond initial implementation.**

   The obvious first step in sustaining any school improvement effort must be to maintain new practices beyond a few months or the first year of implementation. However, school leaders and staff members are often surprised to discover that maintaining reforms can require more than simple persistence. Even in schools where implementation goes smoothly and successfully during the first year, many kinds of unforeseen obstacles can arise the following year or the year after.

   Unfortunately, there is no formula for predicting the factors that will threaten an improvement effort two or three years into implementation. Schools are complex organizations, and changing major practices in one part of the organization can have unforeseeable effects on other parts of the organization. Therefore, maintaining an improvement effort requires keeping a sharp eye on how the change process is affecting staff members and students; keeping a constant lookout for warning signs of obstacles that might threaten the effort; and keeping a very open mind to how challenges can arise from even the most unlikely places.

   In the CEIE model it is the role of the experienced administrator, serving as the Leadership Coach to ensure that efforts are maintained and “quick wins” are continually occurring and celebrated. The hard work of change engaged in by teachers must be acknowledged and celebrated.

2. **Extending the Improvement Effort to Capitalize on Early Success.**

   After watching dozens of organizational change efforts, retired Harvard Business School Professor John P. Kotter wrote that one of the most common and most damaging mistakes leaders make following implementation is to declare victory too early.
“Instead of declaring victory,” he wrote, “leaders of successful efforts use the credibility afforded by short-term wins to tackle even bigger problems. They go after systems and structures that are not consistent with the transformation vision and have not been confronted before.” In other words, sustaining success over the long term requires fierce, very intentional kind of “opportunism.”

The Center works with schools very intentionally to foster the notion promoted by Jill Collins that “good is never good enough.” Sustainable reform must never be taken for granted. The best changes in culture and instruction must be monitored and shared with new teachers and administrators so that the school remains on the path of continuous improvement.

3. Adapting Improvement Initiatives Over Time.

Over the long term, maintaining and extending improvement initiatives is not enough. Expectations change, policies change, local and state political environments change, students change, school leaders change, and faculties change. As a result, even the most successful improvement initiatives must eventually “evolve or die.” Indeed, researchers who study successful organizational change efforts that are sustained over long periods of time frequently invoke evolution as a metaphor to describe what they find.

The Center’s foundation is built around the notion of adaptivity as defined by Robert Garmston who contends that all organizations must be adaptive in order to survive and, indeed, thrive. The continuous cycle of school improvement model that leads schools to consistently reflect and use data to inform and adjust practices is crucial in sustaining gains in school achievement.
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The following staff members have been identified for work with persistently low performing schools through the Center for Excellence in Education:

Andrea Abke - Andrea is coordinator for professional development at the Center for Excellence in Education and trained in providing job-embedded, research-based, ongoing professional development.

Patricia Benson - Pat Benson serves as director for CEIE and will oversee and direct the coaching teams in their work with persistently low performing schools.

Nic Cooper - Dr. Cooper, a former Michigan building administrator, has worked with schools around the state to engage in comprehensive reform efforts.

Paula Geller - Paula, a former building administrator is currently serving Lansing public schools as a leadership and academic coach.

Peggy Hall - a recently retired administrator in Saginaw City Schools has experience in working with high-needs urban populations.

Steve Holscher - Mr. Holscher is director of Michigan Middle Start and has worked with numerous middle schools around the state and nation to engage in comprehensive school reform.

Mary Alice Krajenta - Dr. Krajenta, a former urban building administrator currently works with the Saginaw ISD in data analysis and has experience in serving as a leadership coach in several Michigan schools.

Toby Kahn-Loftus - Toby has nearly three decades of experience in Detroit City schools and has worked as a literacy coach in dozens of Michigan schools that have achieved significant improvement in student achievement.

Carolyn McKanders - Carolyn is Co-Director of the Center for Adaptive Schools and has years of experience working with students and teachers in Detroit Public Schools.

Dave Nizinski - Mr. Nizinski, a former building administrator, is currently working in Saginaw schools and has served numerous high-needs schools throughout the state in engaging in reform efforts. Dave’s background is in Special Education.

Polly Pritchard - Mrs. Pritchard is the Assistant Director of CEIE and currently working in Saginaw Schools through the Title IIA Improving Teacher Quality grant. She is trained in Adaptive Schools and regularly presents differentiated instruction research and application to teachers throughout the state.

The Center for Excellence in Education at Central Michigan University and its partner organization SMTC will see qualified math coaches and additional literacy coaches. Applicants will be required to have experience working as teacher or administrators in urban high schools and have excellent coaching skills. Coaches will be required to have a proven track record of successfully increasing student achievement.

Vitas are attached in separate documents.
Carolyn McKanders, M.A., M.S.W.
11512 Wilson Ave, Belleville, MI 48111
(734)697-6847
kmckanders@aol.com

A. Education
- Bachelor of Science Degree, Magna Cum Laude, Early Childhood Development and Education, Social Science, Minor, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI., 1972
- Michigan Teaching Certification K-8 all subjects, Early Childhood Endorsement
- Master of Arts Degree, Guidance and Counseling/Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI., 1976
- Post-graduate Study, Higher and Adult Continuing Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI., 1988-1990
- Master of Social Work Degree, Family and Children’s Services, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, MI., 1997

B. Academic Appointments: Leadership roles in the development, implementation, maintenance and evaluation of the following programs, initiatives and positions.
1985-2006

2003-present Adaptive Schools Associate, Serve as National Consultant to schools
2001-present Michigan Schools in the Middle Staff Development Facilitator, Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, MI
2000-present Improving Instruction Through Collegial Dialogue Facilitator, Marquette, MI., Midland, MI, Calhoun County, MI., Flint, MI.
1985-present Staff Development Specialist/Educational Consultant, Detroit Public Schools, Department of Staff and Learning Development
1997-present Counselor/Social Worker, Private Practice, Royal Oak, MI
1997-present Coordinator, Professional Development Academy at Wayne State University, College of Education, Detroit, MI
1987-1990 Adjunct Instructor, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, MI
1973-1985 Teacher, Detroit Public Schools

C. Relevant Publications
D. Professional Activities

- Educational Consultant/Staff Development Specialist, Detroit Public Schools (DPS), Professional Development Academy
- Facilitates training for the National Staff Development Council
- Special Administrative Assignment: Coordinator of Wayne State University Site of Professional Development Academy
- The Detroit Public Schools Task Force to Educate Homeless Children
- Annual Implementation of the *African American Child in Crisis Conference*.
- Polarity Management (Barry Johnson Model)
- Total Quality Model of Excellence
- New Teacher Induction & Mentoring Program
- Leadership Role in Initiating the *Dimensions of Learning Model* in Detroit Public Schools.

E. Professional Memberships

- National Association of Social Workers
- National Middle School Association
- National Staff Development Council
- Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society
Vita
David L. Nizinski
2971 Lakeview Drive
Sanford, MI 48657
989-687-5751

Education/Training
Spring 2008  Adaptive Schools Training
Winter 2007  Cognitive Coaching
Summer 2007  Improving Instruction Through Collegial Dialogue
Winter 2002  Kagan Cooperative Learning
1994        Certified Reality Therapist, William Glasser Institute
1983        Master of Arts, Saginaw Valley State University
1973        Bachelor of Science, Special Education, Emotionally Impaired, Eastern Michigan University, Teaching Certificates

Professional Experience
2002 to present  Leadership Coach in: Saginaw High School; Rueben Daniels Middle School, Saginaw; Mt. Morris Middle School; Davison Alternative Education; Farwell Middle School; Bendle Middle School; Atlanta K-12; and Vanderbilt K-12
1992 – 2002  Principal, White Pine Middle School, Saginaw Township
1991 – 1992  Principal, Plainfield Elementary, Saginaw Township
1989 – 1991  Assistant Principal, White Pine Middle School, Saginaw Township

Professional Memberships
Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals
National Association of Secondary School Principals
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
National Middle School Association (NMSA)

Recent Presentations
2009-2010 School Year  Center for Excellence in Education Leadership Seminars (12 days)
2009-2010                Co-Teaching Seminar Series (6 days)
2008-2009 School Year    Center for Excellence in Education Leadership Seminars (12 days)
March 2009                Michigan Association of Middle School Educators
2007-2008 School Year    Middle School & High School Leadership Seminars (12 days)
2006-2007 School Year    Middle School Leadership Seminars (6 days)
March 2008                Michigan Association of Middle School Educators
Fall 2006                 NMSA National Conference
Vita
Paula Geller
15810 Dice Road
Hemlock, MI 48626
989-642-4186

Education/Training
Summer 2009    Adaptive Schools Training
Spring 2008    Adaptive Schools Training

M. A., Education Leadership, Central Michigan University
M. Ed., Science Education, University of Houston
B. S., Biology, Western Michigan University

Professional Experience
2009 to present Leadership and Academic Science Coach in J.W. Sexton High School, Lansing School District (Center for Excellence in Education)
2004 - 2008 Principal, Central Middle School, Midland Public Schools
1998 - 2004 Assistant Principal, Northeast Middle School, Midland Public Schools
1994 - 1998 Assistant Principal, Central Middle School, Midland Public Schools
1987 – 1994 Middle School Teacher, Jefferson Middle School/Northeast Middle School, Midland Public Schools
1982 – 1987 Middle School Coordinator of Museum Field Trips – R.A. Vines Science Center, Spring Branch School District, Houston, TX
1982 – 1979 Middle School Teacher, Almont Middle School, Almont, MI
1978 – 1979 Middle School Teacher, Stephenson Junior High, Stephenson, MI

Professional Memberships
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals
National Association of Secondary School Principals
National Middle School Association (NMSA)

Recent Presentations
2009-2010 School Year Vertical Coordination of Science Curriculum Grades 6-12, Lansing School District (8 days)
August 2009 Center for Excellence in Education, Middle School & High School Science Workshop (3 days)
Curriculum Vitae
Patricia P. Benson

303 E. Saginaw
St. Louis, MI 48880
Ph. 989-681-5154
palme1pj@cmich.edu

Educational Background
1983 M.A., Central Michigan University, Family Studies
1971 B.S., Central Michigan University, Home Economics, Sociology
1971 Michigan Teacher Certification, Secondary Home Economics & Sociology

Professional Experience
2007 – present Director, Center for Excellence in Education, Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, MI
2000 - 2007 Director, Michigan Schools in the Middle, Central Michigan University
1990 - present Temporary Instructor, Teacher Education and Professional Development, Central Michigan University
1994 – 1996 Temporary Staff, Michigan Schools in the Middle, Central Michigan University
1989 – 1996 Director, Opportunities for Talent Development Program, Central Michigan University
1988 – 1989 Consultant, Michigan Vocational-Technical Education Services Grant, Central Michigan University

Trainings Attended
2008 Adaptive Schools
2005 National Schools to Watch Trainer of Trainers Workshop, Indianapolis
2004 Improving Instruction Through Collegial Dialogue
2004 Cognitive Coaching
2000 National Staff Development Council Academy XII: Two and one-half year program to develop skills in designing and implementing effective staff development
1999 Kagan Workshop: Multiple Intelligences: Jackson, Michigan
1998 Kagan Training of Trainers: Cooperative Learning, Concord, New Hampshire, taught by Laurie Kagan
1997 Multiple Intelligences Workshop Training of Trainers, Performance Learning Systems, Washington, D.C.
1996 Integrating the Curriculum: Training of Trainers: IRI Skylight Institute, Chicago, Illinois, taught by Robin Fogarty

Selected Presentations
Michigan Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Macomb ISD, Middle School Symposium, February 2007, Keynote speaker and panelist
National Middle School Association Conference, November 2006. *High Performing Teams*, half day ticketed session

Selected Grants & Contracts
Project Director: Comprehensive School Reform, $477,359. Academy for Educational Development, December 2006
Co-Project Director: Highly Successful High Schools, Institute for Education Sciences, $943,346.

Project Director: CMU/Flint Partnership 2010 Grant, $308,000. Central Michigan University, November 2006

Project Director: Contract for Professional Development Services for Pontiac Middle Schools, $52,182. September 2006

Project Director: Contract for Professional Development Services for Saginaw Public Schools, $80,000. September 2005

Project Director: Michigan Department of Education: Improving Teacher Quality Grant, Strategies in Action, $186,499. September 2004
Toby-Kahn Loftus  
3741 Marsh Rd.  
East Jordan, MI 49727  
231-582-0183  
tobyteach@aol.com

Education

Bachelor’s degree in Literature (major), and Social Studies and Secondary Education (minors), from Wayne State University, in 1971.

Master’s degree in Education Administration and Leadership, from Wayne State University, in 1987

Admitted into a Doctoral program in Curriculum, Teaching and Educational Policy, Michigan State University, March 1994; Part-time graduate studies began formally in August 1994.

Michigan Certification

Michigan Secondary Teaching Certificate, includes a Middle School Endorsement, Certified all subjects grades 5-9, Certified English/Social Studies 6-12.

Current Professional Experience

May 2005 – Present  
Literacy coach for multiple Michigan schools, working through Center for Excellence in Education at Central Michigan University.

February 2004 – Present  
Appointed Site Coordinator, Red Cedar Writing Project Leadership team for the National Reading Initiative, A Specially funded, 3 Year Grant with the National Writing Project, Funded by the Carnegie Corporation and Evaluated by the Academy for Educational Development

May 2000 – Present  
Leadership Coach in two Middle Schools with state funded Comprehensive School Reform Grants; administered by the Michigan Middle Start Initiative and Michigan Schools in the Middle, Central Michigan University.
Curriculum Vitae
Polly M. Pritchard

1232 Buckingham Place  Ph. 989-330-2864
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48858  matyo1pm@cmich.edu

Educational Background

1997  M.S., The Ohio State University, Consumer & Textile Sciences
1994  B.A.A., Central Michigan University, Family Studies

Professional Experience:

3/08 – present  Assistant Director, Center for Excellence in Education, Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, MI
3/07 to 3/08  Professional Development Facilitator and Flint Community Schools/CMU Partnership Coordinator, Center for Excellence in Education, Mt. Pleasant, MI
4/06 to 8/06  Teaching Assistant, Western Michigan University, Grand Rapids, MI
9/05 to 4/06  Teacher, Forest Hills Public Schools, Grand Rapids, MI
8/03 to 9/05  Adjunct Instructor, Western Michigan University
9/99 to 9/05  Social Services Coordinator, Laurels of Hudsonville, Hudsonville, MI
3/97 to 12/00  Extension Associate, Ohio State University Extension, Columbus, OH

Trainings Attended:

05/10  Differentiated Instruction Lesson Plan Training, Oak Lawn, IL
02/09  Schools to Watch Reviewer Training, Ann Arbor, MI
07/08  Adaptive Schools Summer Leadership Institute, Lake Tahoe, CA
11/07  Adaptive Schools Foundations Training, Ann Arbor, MI
07/07  Breaking Ranks II Facilitator Training, Lansing, MI
08/07  Kagan Cooperative Learning Training, Mt. Pleasant, MI
08/07  Collegial Dialogue Facilitator Training, Mt. Pleasant, MI
Selected Presentations:

Michigan Association of Middle School Educators (MAMSE), 40th Annual Conference, Dexter, MI, March 4, 2010. *Differentiating Instruction in Your Middle Grades Math Class*

National Middle School Association, NMSA Annual Conference, Indianapolis, IN, November 5, 2009. *Teams as Professional Learning Communities*

National Middle School Association, NMSA Annual Conference, Indianapolis, IN, November 6, 2009. *Teacher Collaboration that Benefits Students*

Differentiated Instruction 3-day Workshop, Co-Presenter, Central Michigan University, August

Adaptive Schools Foundations Seminar, Co-Presenter, Central Michigan University, June 29-July 2, 2009

Michigan Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Kent ISD, Middle School Symposium, February 27, 2008. *Engaging Students Through Instructional Strategies*

Collegiate Middle Level Association at Central Michigan University, February 9, 2008. *Cooperative Learning*


Presented research findings at 14th World Congress of Sociology (International Sociological Association), Montreal, Canada, 1999

Selected Contracts/Grants:

Title IIA(3) Improving Teacher Quality: Principal Investigator, Saginaw Special Education, $198,774, November, 2008

Professional Development Delivery: Marion Junior/Senior High School, $4,382.00, December 2007

Professional Development Delivery: Central Middle School, Saginaw MI, $21,600.00, October 2007