

LEA Application
Michigan SIG Cohort V
APPLICATION COVER SHEET
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS (SIG)

LEA Information

Legal Name of LEA Applicant: Education Achievement Authority of Michigan

District Code: 84060

Applicant's Mailing Address: 300 River Place Drive., Suite 3600, Detroit MI 48207

LEA Contact for the School Improvement Grant

Name: Dr. Gabriela Gui

Position and Office: Executive Director of Strategic Planning

Contact's Mailing Address: 300 River Place Drive, Suite 3600, Detroit MI 48207

Telephone: 313-263-9800

Fax: 313-456-3011

Email address: ggui@eaaofmichigan.org

Chancellor Veronica Conforme
LEA School Superintendent/Director (Printed Name)

313-263-9800
Telephone



Signature of the LEA School Superintendent/Director

7/14/16
Date

Chairperson Joyce Hayes Giles
LEA School Board President (Printed Name)

313-220-0861
Telephone



Signature of the LEA Board President

7/14/16
Date

N/A
Union Representative (Printed Name)

N/A
Telephone

N/A
Signature of Union Representative

N/A
Date

The LEA, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the conditions that apply to any waivers the State of Michigan receives through this application.

ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATION: By signing this cover sheet, the applicant certifies that it will agree to perform all actions and support all intentions stated in the Assurances and Certifications in **Attachment G**, and will comply with all state and federal regulations and requirements pertaining to this program. The applicant certifies further that the information submitted on this application is true and correct.

LEA Application Schools to be Served

SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the Eligible schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.

The LEA must identify each Eligible school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Eligible school. Detailed descriptions of the requirements for each intervention are in attachments B.1 – B.6

An LEA in which one or more priority schools are located must serve all of these schools before it may serve one or more focus schools.

Note: Weight will be given to applicant schools that:

- have not previously received a SIG award
- are identified as priority
- choose the transformation, turnaround, whole-school reform, or early learning models
- are facing a documented public health or environmental emergency

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	PRIORITY (check)	FOCUS (check - if applicable)	INTERVENTION MODEL
Burns Elementary-Middle School	260100104660	√		Evidence-Based Whole-School Reform Model
Law Elementary School	260100104773	√		Transformation Model
Mary McLeod Bethune Elementary-Middle School	260100104724	√		Early Intervention Model
Nolan Elementary-Middle School	260100104800	√		Transformation Model
Denby High School	260100104693	√		Evidence-Based Whole-School Reform Model
Henry Ford High School	260100104734	√		Evidence-Based Whole-School Reform Model
Mumford High School	260100104793	√		Transformation Model
Pershing High School	260100104813	√		Evidence-Based Whole-School Reform Model
Southeastern High School	260100104830	√		Evidence-Based Whole-School Reform Model

Overview of Application Requirements

- DO NOT RESPOND HERE -

1. **Analysis of Need: (Section B, Question 1)** For each priority and focus school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that the LEA has analyzed the needs of each school, such as instructional programs, school leadership and school infrastructure, based on a needs analysis that, among other things, analyzes the needs identified by families and the community, and selected interventions for each school aligned to the needs each school has identified.
2. **Family and Community Input: (Section B, Question 1.b)** For each priority and focus school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that it has taken into consideration family and community input in selecting the intervention.
3. **Intervention Plan: (Section B, Question 3)** The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to design and implement a plan consistent with the final requirements of the turnaround model, restart model, school closure, transformation model, evidence-based whole school reform model, early learning model, or state-determined model.
4. **Capacity to Provide Adequate Resources: (Section A, Question 1)** The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to determine its capacity to provide adequate resources and related support each priority and focus school, identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected on the first day of the first school year of full implementation.
5. **External Service Provider Selection: (Section B, Question 5)** The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality, and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.
6. **Resource Profile: (Section B, Question 4)** The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to align other resources (for example, Title I funding) with the selected intervention.
7. **LEA Actions to Support the Intervention Model: (Section A, Question 1)** The LEA (district/central office) must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively.
8. **LEA Oversight of SIG Implementation: (Section A, Question 2)** The LEA must describe how it will provide effective oversight and support for implementation of the selected intervention for each school it proposes to serve.
9. **Family and Community Engagement: (Section B, Question 3.e)** The LEA must describe how it will meaningfully engage families and the community in the implementation of the selected intervention on an ongoing basis.
10. **Sustaining Reforms: (Section B, Question 9)** The LEA must describe how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

11. **Reform Model Implementation: (Section B, Question 3, Attachment B)** The LEA must describe how it will implement, to the extent practicable, in accordance with its selected SIG intervention model(s), one or more evidence-based strategies.
12. **Annual Goals:** The LEA must describe how it will monitor each priority and focus school, that receives school improvement funds including by
 - a. Establishing annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics **(Section B, Question 8)**
 - b. Measuring progress on the leading indicators from attachment A, Baseline Data. **(Section A, Question 3)**
13. **Charter School and External Service Provider Accountability: (Section A, Questions 4 and 5)** An LEA must hold the charter school operator, CMO, EMO, or other external provider accountable for meeting these requirements, if applicable.
14. **Pre-Implementation Activities: (Section B, Question 3, Attachments B and D)** An LEA that intends to use the first year of its School Improvement Grants award for planning and other pre-implementation activities for an eligible school, the LEA must include a description of the activities, the timeline for implementing those activities, and a description of how those activities will lead to successful implementation of the selected intervention.
15. **Rural LEA Model Modification: (Section B, Question 3.d)** For an LEA eligible for services under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of Title VI of the ESEA (Rural Education Assistance Program) that chooses to modify one element of the turnaround or transformation model, the LEA must describe how it will meet the intent and purpose of that element.
16. **Evidence-Based, Whole-School Reform Model: (Section B, Question 3, Attachment B.4)** For an LEA that applies to implement an evidence-based, whole-school reform model in one or more eligible schools, the LEA must describe how it will
 - a. Implement a model with evidence of effectiveness that includes a sample population or setting similar to the population or setting of the school to be served; and
 - b. Partner with a whole school reform model developer, as defined in the SIG requirements.
17. **Restart Model: (Section B, Question 3, Attachment B.5)** For an LEA that applies to implement the restart model in one or more eligible schools, the LEA must describe the rigorous review process (as described in the final requirements) it has conducted or will conduct of the charter school operator, CMO, or EMO that it has selected or will select to operate or manage the school or schools.
18. **Implementation Timeline: (Section B, Question 7, Attachment D)** the LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each school identified in the LEA’s application.

Section A
District/Central Office Level Responses

1. Actions to Support the Intervention Model:

The Education Achievement Authority of Michigan (EAA) was proposed by the Michigan Legislature during the 2011-2012 school year, with the mandate to radically change the approach to educating students who are trapped in the state's lowest performing schools. In the fall of 2014, Chancellor Veronica Conforme was given the authority to take control of 15 of the persistently poor performing schools in Detroit, and to carry out a radical new approach to improving outcomes for all students. In the middle of all the media coverage and legislation debates regarding the state of education in Detroit, the EAA remains focused on our students. Although the future of the EAA is not clear yet, we do know for sure that there will be students and schools that need great teachers, transformational school leaders, and resources to implement change next year and beyond.

a) Overview of actions the EAA has taken, or will take, to modify its practices or policies, to enable implementation of the selected intervention models fully and effectively:

Our vision at the EAA is, "We believe that all children succeed." This is our purpose and why we exist - to work every day towards achieving our vision of all children succeeding. We turn the *lowest* performing schools into the *highest* performing schools through people development, proven instructional strategies, and seamless operations. To achieve that vision, the District has changed policies/practices to focus on five strategic initiatives: a) rigorous academic standards (college and career readiness); b) holistic approach to address all student needs (support services); c) career pathways for teachers to become great leaders (people development); d) New School Models (Smaller Learning Communities; 9th Grade Academies; college-prep, small high schools; CTE models); and e) school and staff performance accountability based on student outcomes.

Chancellor Conforme has had – and used – the authority to bypass current state education regulations; change the way teachers and school administrators are evaluated and paid; extend learning time for all students; raise the bar on accountability; create new school models; begin the development of a talent pipeline; and use state and federal funding in allowable ways that dramatically improve the quality of learning. The EAA currently has the systems and structures required to support significant improvement efforts, including: data systems, communication protocols, expert personnel, accountability structures, technical assistance, and organizational policies and procedures. We are now in a position to invest in long-term planning that supports a lasting, consistent academic growth that will lead to closing the achievement gap in a most aggressive way.

Deciding the best-fit intervention model for each EAA school has been a very deliberate process. The improvement intervention model is of paramount importance for successful change, and the EAA teams worked together to find the model that would result in the most immediate and substantial improvement in learning and school success, given the existing capacity in each school and the district. The model also had to align with the District's 5 strategic priorities. A next step was to set goals for implementation; decide how much improvement should be expected and the timeline; and align all resources to support implementation of models.

The EAA has already begun modifying practices and policies to enable schools to implement the selected models fully and effectively. For example, every intervention model we selected addresses college readiness and increased student achievement. Having reviewed the entrance requirements for a variety of relevant universities, the EAA has increased the graduation requirements for our students from 18 credits, required by the Michigan Merit Curriculum, to 23 credits. Another example of how the EAA changed policies to support the goal of increased student achievement (key element of each intervention model) has to do with developing a teacher evaluation tool in which the students' academic growth counts as 50% of the evaluation (increased from 25% required by the State of Michigan). The increased learning time (extended day and school year) is yet another example of changed policies and practices to support the intervention models selected.

In addition, the EAA District has the capacity and systems to negotiate with external partners or providers; has extended operational autonomy to school leaders; and, through its Performance Framework, is exercising strong accountability for teachers', school leaders' and schools' performance. At the same time, our district has granted principals operational flexibility over items such as budgets, staffing, professional development, selection of instructional materials and strategies– to name just a few. The EAA has been giving capable leaders unprecedented freedom to change, even if this creates inconsistency and inconvenience for the Central Office.

b) Description of how Human Resources will be involved in intentional hiring and developing of staff:

The EAA's Talent/Human Resources Department has partnered with national experts to create a leadership development program aimed at increasing student achievement. The New Teacher Project (TNTP) and its subsidiary Michigan Teacher Corps have been our partners since this past year in a few key areas: building out our new teacher and principal evaluation tools and systems; recruiting new teacher talent to the district; and developing our future school leaders through the Career Pathways program. Some of our Talent/HR Department's objectives that support the intervention models selected by our schools include:

- a) Recruit a pipeline of strong teaching applicants for our schools to fill highest-need vacancies;

- b) Design a teacher selection model aligned to the school’s priorities to fill vacancies with the best-fit applicants;
- c) Implement a rigorous pre-service training program for alternate route and recently certified teachers at our schools;
- d) Conduct a 1-week Induction for all teachers, focused on articulating and implementing a vision for excellent instruction;
- e) Provide ongoing coaching and training to newly certified teachers and MTC Fellows throughout the first year of teaching to support individual needs of teachers and the collective needs of each school and the district;
- f) Implementing the EAA Career Ladder – building a talent pipeline for future administration in the EAA and ensuring that tomorrow's building leaders have had the training and experience they will need to excel in the role. The EAA Career Ladder includes: Teacher, Lead Teacher, Master Teacher, Assistant Principal, and Principal;
- g) Selection and development of school leaders. Our newly created Achievement Leadership Institute (ALI) prepares future leaders to develop a coherent vision for their schools, the habits to enact that vision, and the systems to sustain it;
- h) Implement a staff evaluation system that provides for professional growth and an Observation-Feedback-Coaching cycle;
- i) Make smart retention decisions and reward effective teachers with a stipend through the Pay for Performance program; and
- j) Remove unsuccessful principals and teachers based on performance.

Because of these initiatives, our district has staff qualified to lead bold changes in schools.

c) Summary of community resources aligned with the intervention model selected

Our schools must reach beyond the classroom if we want our students to be successful. While consistently having powerful, engaging instruction is a necessity, our staff recognizes that students have external challenges affecting their ability to learn. Our schools have positioned themselves to provide wrap-around services that assist our students and their families, and our community resources are an integral part of the intervention model at each school. This looks slightly different at each school, but an example of some of the resources and programs that our schools offer include:

- Safe Schools/Healthy Students (SS/HS) – prevents youth violence and substance use in schools and communities, and promotes and improves student access to mental health services.
- Pathways to Potential – a branch of the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services, who works to address cases of bedbugs, relocation support, and help with bills.
- Michigan College Access Network (MCAN) – supports the creation, expansion, and sustainability of high quality, community-based college access strategic partnerships.
- Project Graduation – a Detroit Parent Network initiative that provides a coach for each grade level.
- Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools – provides job-embedded, targeted professional development to teachers
- Parent Resource Rooms – allow families access to the school building where they can get job training support.
- My Brother’s Keeper – provides our schools with mentors for our young men of color.

These wrap-around services are change makers. They impact student achievement, college readiness, parental involvement, graduation and college-going rates, attendance, etc., in addition to improving the quality of life in the neighborhoods surrounding our schools.

d) Alignment and support of existing state reform/redesign plan

Each of the EAA schools applying for SIG V are currently listed as “priority status”. The district’s and the schools’ priority plans are data-driven and take into consideration current academic achievement and growth data from multiple sources; perception data (learning environment, values and beliefs, attitudes); demographics (enrollment, gender, ethnicity, free lunches, attendance, special needs, etc.); and processes (school programs and processes). In addition, we also look at historical trends over the last five (5) years.

Based on these data points, we develop outcome-based goals: interim and annual goals. Using the backward planning strategy, we then employ the highest leverage research-based, evidence-based strategies and initiatives that would support the achievement of goals. We align our resources (financial, human, etc.) to these initiatives; we monitor and track progress; make adjustments, if granted; and engage again in the implementation process (we follow Deming's Cycle of Continuous Improvement).

The plans are aligned to the State Board Reform and Redesign Goals. Each school’s proposed budget was developed strategically to focus on essential components of school reform and redesign. The proposed budgets are aligned to the school plans, to provide direct and timely intervention to all students and to enable teachers to maximize opportunities for academic improvement in all core subjects.

Our professional development and coaching also aligns with the State reform/redesign plans because we build capacity aligned with Michigan School Improvement Framework strands, standards, and indicators. The strands and our professional development sessions address four broad goals: Teaching for Learning, Leadership for Learning, Personnel and Professional Development, School and Community Relations, Data and Information Management. School leaders ensure high quality job-embedded professional development based on the specific needs of each school, to support improvement. Our evidence rests in stipends for after-school professional development, partnership with the Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools, adequate pool of substitutes to cover teachers participating in PD, professional development annual plans designed by each school, etc.

2. Oversight of SIG Implementation:

At the building level, the SIG Coordinators will provide oversight in the areas of model implementation and fiscal accountability.

The EAA Central Office, in collaboration with school leadership and SIG personnel, will develop an on-site monitoring cycle for each year of the grant, in which all schools awarded the grant will be monitored at least once every month to assess the level of implementation of their School Improvement Grant program and to assure program and fiscal compliance with the grant terms.

This year, the EAA has initiated the SchoolStat monthly process, in which the Central Office academic staff (including the Chief of Schools) have met with schools' Instructional Leadership Teams (ILT) to review the monthly data dashboards and discuss progress (or lack thereof) on high leverage school initiatives designed to improve student achievement/growth; the school culture; and/or talent development. Upon notification of grant award, the SchoolStat process will also include monitoring indicators based on the selected intervention model.

Through these monitoring visits and SchoolStat, we would identify schools needing additional on-site monitoring and/or support. The focused on-site monitoring will include the following: progress toward achievement goals (annual measurable objectives and/or annual goals set in the School Improvement Grant application; progress toward improvement on the leading and lagging indicators of our District's Performance Framework; fidelity to the approved school intervention model implementation plan and timelines; the effectiveness of instruction and the quality of the learning environment; and other indicators that directly relate to the specific intervention model being implemented.

The Central Office will consider additional on-site monitoring in special circumstances, including: failure to make substantial progress toward grant goals and objectives; failure to adhere to terms and conditions set forth in the grant award notice Audits results; non-compliance relative to unresolved findings from previous monitoring reviews; complaints to Central Office related to the implementation of the grant or funds allocation; late reporting for expenditures, status reports, progress reports, equipment inventory, etc.; lack of alignment between expenditures and approved budget; percent of disallowed to allowed expenditures; etc.

Another way in which the Central Office will provide oversight of the intervention model implementation is through our School Performance Framework. The Performance Framework was developed by the EAA before the beginning of this school year; is aligned with our Strategic Vision; and serves as a road map for school turnaround and improved outcomes for all of our students. The Performance Framework reflects the EAA Theory of Action, aligns with the teachers' and principals' evaluation systems, and would be perfectly aligned with the intervention models selected by our schools for the SIG because the indicators include, at the minimum, all the quantitative and qualitative measures of school performance specified in our applications.

The domains of the Performance Framework are divided into Leading Indicators and Lagging Indicators. The Leading Indicators provide us an early look to see if a school has the systems and structures in place for success. We believe that voice and perception are important components of any evaluation. The Leading Indicators include 5Essentials and Insight Surveys to give us perception data from teachers and parents. Starting next year, and based on initiatives specified in our school's applications, we will include Suspension data in the Performance Framework, because we are committed to reducing suspensions in half in the next 5 years. The Lagging Indicators tell us how our students are doing on district and state assessments, as well as how they do post-graduation.

Finally, we intend to use a portion of the SIG District funds to pay for a third-party evaluation of the implementation and results of school improvement interventions.

The number of central office personnel and respective FTEs for individuals who will provide oversight of the SIG project will depend on the number of awards granted to the EAA schools. This could range from a percentage of one person's FTE to several individuals, as allowed by the grant guidelines. Dr. Gabriela Gui, from the academic team, will serve as the main grant supervisor and will add approximately 10%-15% of time and effort to her current responsibilities to oversee the SIG. In the fortunate event that more EAA schools will be granted the award, additional individuals could be given responsibility related to the grant's oversight: Angela Rudolph, Grants Accountant, for approximately 10% of duties; Mark Paik, Director of Data, Evaluation and Research, for approximately 15% of his duties; and Noelle Polaski, Program Manager, who will devote approximately 10% of her time for management and communication support, in addition to organizing and facilitating the on-site monitoring and SchoolStat processes. Finally, if we qualify to make a new hire who will devote 100% of his/her time to the grant oversight, we will take advantage of that opportunity.

3. Monitoring Progress on Annual Goals:

Monitoring our progress on annual goals will happen through several main avenues.

- a) **Teacher Evaluation Process** – this school year, the EAA launched a new teacher evaluation system that more clearly reflects the high expectations for everyone who works with our students. The new teacher evaluation system is comprised of three main components: **Student Growth – 50% of the evaluation** (an objective measure of student academic growth based on the NWEA reading and math tests); **Classroom Observation – 35% of the evaluation**; and **Professional Growth and Practice – 15% of the evaluation**.

The teacher evaluation cycle (with goals-setting; mid-year conference; and end-of-year conference) is designed to create an ongoing dialogue about a teacher's performance, and to support monitoring annual goals and teacher development throughout the school year.

- b) **Principal Evaluation Process** – the principal evaluation system creates a summative evaluation rating that draws from three categories of measures that capture a principal's practice and the results of that practice - student outcomes: **Student Performance – 60% of the evaluation**; **Leadership Practice – 30% of the evaluation** (strategic commitment, culture of learning, family and community engagement, etc.); and **Professional Growth – 10% of the evaluation** (including a NWEA-specific goal, a talent goal, a culture goal, and a network-specific goal).

The Student Growth measure leverages the metrics of the School Performance Framework in three categories: **Learning Growth** (mean student growth based on state assessments); **Academic Achievement** (proficiency rates on state assessments, student portfolio reviews, 9th grade on-track rates, SAT scores, graduation rates); and **Prepared for Success** (proficiency rates in benchmark grades, college readiness on SAT, post-secondary preparedness, and college enrollment and persistence rates).

As in the case with the Teacher Evaluation, the Principal Evaluation process is designed to create an ongoing dialogue/reflection on a school leader's performance; support monitoring annual goals; and provide leadership development throughout the school year. The process starts with a goal-setting conference; includes a first semester observation and walkthrough; a mid-year conference; a second semester observation, walkthrough, and School Quality Review visits; and end-of-year conference; and ends with the summative rating of the school leader.

c) School evaluation through the Performance Framework

The EAA Performance Framework includes six (6) categories that are aligned with the EAA's vision for success. The first three of these categories (**Strategic Commitment, Culture of Learning, and Student, Family, & Community Engagement**), measure the quality of school *inputs*. The next three categories (**Student Academic Achievement, Student Growth Measures, and Prepared for Success**), measure the impact of those inputs on student *outcomes*. Examining school inputs and student outcomes in concert allows for a more immediate and actionable approach to measuring school quality; in addition, school staff can more quickly identify adjustments and implement those adjustments before student outcomes become available. In each category, the Performance Framework incorporates multiple quantitative and qualitative measures of school performance that, in combination, provide a holistic picture of how a school is progressing towards the annual goals established and impacting student outcomes. These measures are scored individually (and are a part of distinct evaluation processes), but are also aggregated to generate a rating for each category.

d) Other processes that support the monitoring of annual goals:

- Monthly SchoolStat process (explained in another section of the application);
- Bi-weekly Principal check-in sessions;
- Data-dialogues at the school level;
- Grade level meetings;
- Content area meetings
- Instructional Leadership Team meetings
- Analysis of interim assessments (at district and school level)
- Weekly Dashboards
- School Quality Reviews
- School Walkthroughs
- Formal Program Evaluations

We believe that all these processes, used in concert, will provide an excellent framework for monitoring and measuring progress for student achievement on the District's and State's assessments in core subject areas (at the minimum), and on the leading indicators of our baseline data.

4. Charter School Accountability: “N/A”

5. External Service Provider Accountability:

The EAA School District will regularly review the performance of external service providers through the use of the following deliverables:

- Project Plans
- Professional Development and Coaching Plan
- School Comprehensive Instructional Framework Plans – One for each school
- Implementation Plan Timeline
- Monitoring Plan – Program Implementation, Student Progress, Performance Outcomes
- Transformation Strategies
- Monthly Progress Reports

Key performance indicators that will be measured and reported on:

- Improvement in Student Performance (using multiple achievement and growth measures)
- Increased Attendance Rates and Decreased Tardiness Rates
- Increased Graduation Rates
- Increased Student Retention
- Increased Number of Students Applying and Being Accepted into College
- Increased College Readiness Skills
- Better School Culture and Climate (as measured by perception surveys, observations, discussions with school community leaders)
- Sustainability of Program Implementation

With the use of 5% of the grant, the district will fund a position or part of a position to ensure the above deliverables are provided and met expectations.

6. District Level Budget:

- a. Complete a five year budget overview for all eligible schools and applying for the SIG. Include annual district costs. **See Attachment F.1;**
- b. Describe how the district budget represents the costs incurred by the district over each of the five years of the grant will support grant implementation, monitor the progress of each school, and monitor external service providers and charter school operators/CMOs/EMOs to hold them accountable for meeting SIG requirements. How does this align with and support the existing state reform/redesign plan? (N/A for focus schools) If proposing to add SIG-funded positions at the district level, describe how these will be funded and sustained when the grant ends?

Education Achievement Authority schools will receive 95% of SIG financial awards. The EAA District Office will only utilize 5% of the funds to support grant implementation, monitor the progress of each school, and monitor external service providers.

The EAA School District will regularly examine evidence that each school is implementing the required components of their selected intervention model. District staff will ensure that all school budgets and expenditures for the SIG grant are allowable, reasonable and necessary; meet federal and state requirements; and enhance and supplement activities described in the school's intervention model. The EAA's Executive Director of Strategic Planning, Grants Compliance Accountant, Director of Data, Evaluation, and Research and the Program Manager will work collaboratively with all school leaders and SIG school personnel to provide ongoing technical assistance via monitoring school visits, the SchoolStat process, conference calls, and emails.

Through monitoring visits and SchoolStat, we would identify schools needing additional on-site monitoring and/or support. The focused on-site monitoring will include the following: progress toward achievement goals (annual measurable objectives and/or annual goals set in the School Improvement Grant application; progress toward improvement on the leading and lagging indicators of our District's Performance Framework; fidelity to the approved school intervention model implementation plan and timelines; the effectiveness of instruction and the quality of the learning environment; audit preparation; parental involvement initiatives; and other indicators that directly relate to the specific intervention model being implemented.

The Central Office will consider additional on-site monitoring in special circumstances, including: failure to make substantial progress toward grant goals and objectives; failure to adhere to terms and conditions set forth in the grant award notice Audits results; non-compliance relative to unresolved findings from previous monitoring reviews; complaints to Central Office related to the implementation of the grant or funds allocation; late reporting for expenditures, status reports, progress reports, equipment inventory, etc.; lack of alignment between expenditures and approved budget; percent of disallowed to allowed expenditures; etc.

In addition, the EAA will regularly review the performance of external service providers by reviewing the following deliverables:

- Project Plans
- Professional Development and Coaching Plan
- School Comprehensive instructional Framework Plans – One for each school
- Implementation Plan Timeline
- Monitoring Plan – Program Implementation, Student Progress, Performance Outcomes
- Transformation Strategies
- Monthly Progress Reports

The district and school-level SIG budget is aligned with the state reform/redesign plan. Each of the EAA schools applying for SIG V are Priority Schools and rank in the bottom 5% of all schools in Michigan. The district and the schools' priority plans, which are based on current academic achievement over the last five years, include performance- and research-based programs and services to support students and teachers. These plans are also aligned to the State Board Reform and Redesign goals and designed with initiatives to continue developing an effective and equitable performance-based educational system that promotes academic growth and success for all students. Each school developed budget proposals to strategically focus on essential components of school reform and redesign. The proposed budgets are aligned to the school plans to provide direct and timely intervention to all students and teachers to ensure the opportunities for academic improvement in all core subjects.

SIG-funded district-level personnel and school-based programs and personnel will be funded from the district's general funds (state funding) when SIG V funding ends.

Attachment F.1: Five Year Budget Overview

LEA BUDGET OVERVIEW						
Budget Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	5 Year Total
Mary McLeod Bethune Elementary-Middle School Option 2	\$712,500	\$712,500	\$712,500	\$475,000	\$475,000	\$3,087,500
Burns Elementary-Middle School Option 2	\$712,500	\$712,500	\$712,500	\$475,000	\$475,000	\$3,087,500
Edwin C. Denby High School Option 2	\$712,500	\$712,500	\$712,500	\$475,000	\$475,000	\$3,087,500
Henry Ford High School Option 2	\$712,500	\$712,500	\$712,500	\$475,000	\$475,000	\$3,087,500
Law Elementary School Option 2	\$712,500	\$712,500	\$712,500	\$475,000	\$475,000	\$3,087,500
Mumford High School Option 2	\$712,500	\$712,500	\$712,500	\$475,000	\$475,000	\$3,087,500
Nolan Elementary-Middle School Option 2	\$712,500	\$712,500	\$712,500	\$475,000	\$475,000	\$3,087,500

Budget Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	5 Year Total
John J. Pershing High Option 2	\$712,500	\$712,500	\$712,500	\$475,000	\$475,000	\$3,087,500
Southeastern High School Option 2	\$712,500	\$712,500	\$712,500	\$475,000	\$475,000	\$3,087,500
LEA Costs	\$337,500	\$337,500	\$337,500	\$225,000	\$225,000	\$1,462,500
Total Budget	\$6,750,000	\$6,750,000	\$6,750,000	\$4,500,000	\$4,500,000	