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
EXTERNAL PROVIDERS: BACKGROUND & APPROVAL PROCESS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of comprehensive improvement services</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of scientific educational research</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job embedded professional development</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with state and federal requirements</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Plan</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Qualifications</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points Possible</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.
APPLICATION OVERVIEW

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>[Blacked Out]</td>
<td>EdWorks, LLC, a Subsidiary of KnowledgeWorks</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>EdWorks</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>☑ Non-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Community-Based Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Educational Service Agency (e.g., RESA or ISD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Institution of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Other (specify): Nonprofit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Applicant Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold C. Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One West Fourth Street, Suite 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:brownh@edworkspartners.org">brownh@edworkspartners.org</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>Name of Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Service Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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.

☑ Statewide

Intermediate School District(s): Name(s) of District(s):
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: ____

In what capacity are you employed or do you serve (position title): ____

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)

EdWorks, LLC is a not-for-profit, fee-for-service subsidiary of the nationally recognized KnowledgeWorks Foundation. To drive its work on the ground, EdWorks has developed a portfolio of proven secondary school approaches: Redesign; Early College; and Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM). Collectively referred to as, “The EdWorks Model,” these approaches enable school and district leaders to start-up or restructure a secondary school through a five-year, step-by-step system of strategies, processes, and tools.

The EdWorks Model represents a very specific point of view about the structure and process of working with schools to turnaround operations and student achievement. The Model is designed to develop a high-performing secondary school that uses personalization as the key to its success. Personalization is achieved in three ways:

1. Through the development of high-functioning small learning communities in an existing school building.
2. By building the capacity of each and every person in the school to “get the work done” through very structured professional and leadership development plans.
3. By developing a culture in which the teaching and learning process focuses on individual student growth and achievement and thus drives everything that happens in the building (i.e., if it doesn’t improve teaching and learning, we don’t do it).

Student achievement forms the focal point for the EdWorks Model. The four fundamental components—rigorous curriculum and instruction, climate and culture, aligned assessments and a system of student support—provide the foundation for the work with schools. A total of 36 essential elements refine the implementation strategy. Together, these four components, their underlying elements, and the district support framework form a tightly-woven, interconnected, interdependent system.

The four fundamental components and 36 essential elements in the EdWorks Model include:

Rigorous Curriculum and Instruction
1. Rigorous, college-ready curriculum for every student, every day
2. Clear learning objectives
3. Differentiated instruction
4. High levels of student engagement
5. Higher order thinking skills
6. High payoff, short-term instructional strategies across the content areas
7. Broad, school-wide early college experience
8. 21st century literacy across the curriculum
9. Results-driven, flexible scheduling
10. On-site and online professional learning communities
11. Intensive summer institutes for teachers and curriculum staff

Comprehensive Student Support
12. Just-in-time interventions, including re-teaching, and tutoring, among other strategies
13. Semi-annual student led progress review
14. Accessible, detailed, easy-to-understand student progress data and portfolio
15. Student Advisory System
16. Accelerated Academies
17. Summer Bridge Program
18. Higher education partnerships
19. Internships and community service

Aligned Assessments
20. Baseline diagnostic data
21. Short Cycle Assessment
22. Classroom assessment
23. State-mandated graduation tests
24. College and Career Readiness tests
25. Performance-based alternative assessment
26. Teacher, school and district self-assessments
27. Regular Dashboard Reports for each shareholders’ shared accountability data (student, teacher, principal, administration, Board, partners, parents, community)

Supportive Climate & Culture
28. Safe, purposeful school environment
29. Community engagement for accountability
30. Students and families as primary stakeholders
31. Distributed leadership from the student’s desk to the superintendent’s desk
32. School design for personalization
33. Coordination of campus-wide issues
34. Personalized student growth plans with quarterly outcomes
35. Results-driven goals
36. A culture of continuous learning for adults

EdWorks Processes and Tools
EdWorks offers a well-developed process that is contextualized to meet local needs—EdWorks doesn’t just tell sites what they need to do, EdWorks shows school teams how
to transform to effective, 21st century learning organizations. The EdWorks Model works on all elements, not just one or two. EdWorks gives school teams a structure to achieve their goals:

- Technical Assistance Coach
- Scope and Sequence for the design and delivery of effective, innovative secondary school education
  - Easy to follow annual planning and implementation calendar
  - Fully developed 5-Year Teacher Professional Development Plan
  - Hands-on Leadership Development Plan
  - Teacher Summer Institute
  - National Leadership Institute and Leadership Retreats
  - Online social networking and professional learning community focused specifically on secondary schools
  - Data capture tools and customized dashboard presentation of results

And Continuous monitoring and adjustment.

The Power of the EdWorks Model
EdWorks believes in placing knowledge, skills and responsibility in the hands of every adult in a school, rather than vesting information in the hands of a few, as some models do. For instance, some strategies train a single person on a campus to develop the small school schedules, the EdWorks technical assistance coach helps a team in each small learning community wrestle with difficult scheduling questions and guides them through the development of a schedule that provides access to rigor and college-or-career-readiness for each student in the school. While some models train one or two teachers in a school or department, the EdWorks System provides ongoing institutes, workshops and embedded professional development that impacts the practices of every educator in a school or small learning community.

Through full participation in the complete EdWorks five-year professional and leadership development process, sites build capacity within the school system’s most valuable resource—its district, school and classroom leadership—to sustain and continuously improve the operations and outcomes of a high-performing secondary school and translate that passion to their students.
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.
The EdWorks Model is rooted in more than 20 years of research by educators, scientists, social scientists, and economists. The research can be distilled to five simple strategies:

- Begin with the individual student.
- Drive instructional practice with data.
- Conduct teaching and learning through the tightly-woven fabric of standards, assessments, curricula, student supports, and instructional practices.
- Connect teaching and learning to students’ prior knowledge and understanding.
- Make connections across content areas and with the real world; don’t teach isolated facts in artificial silos in a sterile classroom environment.

Research from three individuals well-known to secondary reform initiatives, Conley (2007), Lachat (2010), and Lachat & Williams (1996), underscore the simple strategies cited above.

This foundational informational base, then, drove the development of the five-year EdWorks teacher professional development and coaching systems, rooted primarily in the research and practices of:

- Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe, Understanding by Design, 2005
- Robert Marzano, Classroom Instruction that Works: Research-Based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement, 2004; and The Art and Science of Teaching: A Comprehensive Framework for Effective Instruction, 2007
- The International Center for Leadership in Education’s Rigor & Relevance Framework
- Gayle Gregory and Lin Kuzmich, Differentiated Literacy Strategies for Student Growth and Achievement in Grades 7-12
- National Research Council, How People Learn, 2000
- Rick Stiggins, Assessment for Learning
- The Differentiated Classroom, Tomlinson
- Whatever It Takes: How Professional Learning Communities Respond When Kids Don’t Learn, DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, Karhanek, 2004

While the EdWorks Model was originally designed to serve high schools, student performance at the EdWorks’ ECHS that have expanded to serve students in grades 6-12 demonstrate that the research-based instructional strategies that improve teaching, learning and outcomes at the high school achieve similar results at the middle grades level. The strategies used in EdWorks middle grades echo research surrounding Middle Start, where four key principles have been shown to improve student outcomes:

- Reflective Review and Self-Assessment
- Effective Small Learning Communities
- Rigorous Curriculum, Instruction, and Student Assessment
Distributed Leadership and Sustainable Partnerships


EdWorks Evidence of Effectiveness

The research on EdWorks’ high school reform approaches is well documented through studies on the two largest initiatives designed and managed by the EdWorks team for its parent company, KnowledgeWorks Foundation. These initiatives are the Ohio High School Transformation Initiative and the Ohio Early College High School Network.

In a 2010 report (unpublished), Learning Point Associates studied the effect of the Ohio High School Transformation Initiative (OHSTI) high school graduation rates. The study employed an interrupted time series design with a non-equivalent comparison group, drawing on data from the seven years prior to the introduction of the initiative (the 1995-96 through the 2001-02 school years) and five years of data from when the initiative was being implemented (2002-03 to 2007-08). Graduation rates for the state of Ohio over the same time period served as the nonequivalent comparison group. The study found that while graduation rates were substantially lower in OHSTI schools than in the state of Ohio prior to the introduction of the initiative, graduation rates in OHSTI schools increased 2.9 percentage points each year once the program was implemented compared to an annual growth of 0.8 percentage points over the same period in the state. The difference in growth between OHSTI schools and schools throughout Ohio during this time was statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

The OHSTI initiative was evaluated using a well-designed quasi-experimental study. While the OHSTI schools are certainly not equivalent to other high schools in the state of Ohio, the inclusion in the study of seven pre-treatment measurements of the outcome in the interrupted time series analysis addresses many possible threats to internal validity, including history, regression to the mean, and maturation.

Interrupted time series is one of the strongest quasi-experimental designs when a comparison or control series can be constructed. One possible threat to internal validity in time series study is history, the possibility that something else occurred at the same time as that the intervention was implemented and is actually responsible for the perceived effect. In the case of this program, a major federal education initiative was implemented at the same time as the OHSTI initiative, the No Child Left Behind Act. To guard against the possibility that that improvement in graduation rates were simply the result of this new legislation, graduation rates for the whole state of Ohio were added to the model as a comparison. Further, the OHSTI initiative was implemented in persistently low-performing schools across the state of Ohio. The effectiveness of this initiative in such diverse settings suggests a high degree of external validity; that is the initiative is highly likely to be effective in other persistently low-performing schools across the country.

The OHSTI and ECHS sites are similar to the schools targeted by School Improvement
Grants; the OHSTI and ECHS schools were selected for their persistently low academic performance, illustrating that the EdWorks model has a proven track record in these most challenging settings. The difference in increase in graduation rates between OHSTI schools and schools throughout Ohio after implementation of the initiative was statistically significant at the 0.01 level. More importantly, the difference was substantively significant. During the five years of implementation, growth in OHSTI schools was 3.6 times higher than was state of Ohio growth overall.

In addition to the interrupted time series described above, research was conducted by multiple external organizations regarding OHSTI and ECHS students and schools. Each study has repeatedly found program impacts on student achievement and on college enrollment and completion.

Improved Student Achievement. In an interrupted time-series study, AIR found that OHSTI schools demonstrated improved student achievement on both the mathematics and reading sections of the Ohio Graduation Test (OGT). Further, AIR reported that whereas no OHSTI schools met the Ohio state standard for proficiency in reading prior to the program, a large majority achieved the standard within the first two years of implementation. Studies by Edvantia and Augenblick, Palaich & Associates confirmed greater percentages of students from Ohio Early College High School sites scored either “Accelerated” or “Advanced” on Ohio state achievement tests than students at comparable high schools, suggesting that they are more college ready.

Increased College Enrollment and Completion Rates. Internal and external research found that OECHS facilitate college enrollment and completion. Students at Early College High Schools earned over 10,000 hours of college credits between 2003 and 2007; over half complete 60 college credit hours before graduation, and 99% of 10th grade Early College High School students were enrolled in a college course. Finally, APA’s evaluation found that the Early College High School is a good investment for the state and families. APA estimated that 15 years after graduation, each student may bring the state of Ohio $1.30 in additional tax revenue for every dollar invested, and nearly $2.50 per dollar invested 25 years after graduation.

These studies provide convincing evidence that the EdWorks Model has a significant impact on students and schools. The EdWorks Model will not only improve graduation rates, but also student achievement, school performance, and college readiness and enrollment.
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
The heart of the EdWorks Model is a unique scope and sequence guides the work on the ground from the first day of planning through the first graduating class. Implementation of the “play book” may vary slightly for local context, but all processes must be completed to be successful. The scope and sequence also includes specific facilitation of teacher union and central office decision-making and practice to support the new school development.

Specifically, the EdWorks scope and sequence:
1. Provides a step-by-step high school redesign process for moving from exploration to the first graduating class.
2. Includes a common template for benchmarks and accountability measures.
3. Combines in new ways the best practices from a broad base of school improvement efforts to create a high achieving high school system.
4. Provides a rigorous, college prep education for all students—and a proven system of supports to ensure all students are successful in the curriculum.
5. Makes the early college experience a regular part of the design for all high schools—providing a path for all students to leave high school with college credit.
6. Provides a system for simultaneously training all teachers in a school in rigorous instructional strategies and curriculum design—before the doors of the small schools open—and continues to deepen skills throughout the process.
7. Takes the focus off of structure and moves it to instruction, from the minute the school doors open.
8. Presents a roadmap for engaging business and the community in the design process and multiple avenues for keeping them involved in the school.
9. Advances from point A through Z by a tight system of on-site technical assistance and professional development.
10. Is “scripted” enough to ensure results, but flexible enough to allow some variability to meet local contextual needs.

The Technical Assistance Coach who works at the district and building level as many as 70 days per year to support the transformation of a secondary school. The coach guides the development and implementation of the operational guidelines/practices. They also assist school personnel in identifying key outcomes and benchmarks through: recruiting and hiring staff; planning and implementation of integrated standards; aligned curriculum, instructional strategies, and assessments. Key to the success of the EdWorks school model is the ability to offer specific, highly contextual technical assistance in such critical areas as labor-management collaboration and business plan formation.

Leadership development is delivered by the Coach in three ways:
1. In the context of doing the work on the ground
2. Through structured annual leadership retreats
3. Through one-on-one counseling sessions

Teacher professional development is delivered in the school building through a combination of:
1. Whole-school late start or early release time
2. Small group release time using substitutes
3. Teacher Summer Institutes
4. Common planning time
5. One-on-one coaching and modeling
6. Educators Knowledge Network

The Leadership Institute
Once a year the school chooses a team to travel to the site of the EdWorks National Leadership Institute for three days of networking with schools from across the country engaged in the EdWorks process.

Educators Knowledge Network
Within EKN, EdWorks builds a collaboration space for each school. The EdWorks Coach introduces EKN in the planning process and provides preliminary training in its use, with the assistance of EKN staff.

School and Educator Review Process
Growth in school and educator effectiveness is monitored through annual implementation of a complete set of organizational effectiveness and instructional rubrics developed by the nationally-recognized curriculum and assessment specialists at Edvantia, in addition to attainment of student growth and achievement targets.

The Instructional Rubric is designed around five focus areas: professional growth, unit design, lesson development, instructional delivery, and assessment of learning. The elements of each focus area describe the expectations for integrating and implementing effective research-based instructional strategies and practices into the curriculum. Designed around the four essential components of the EdWorks Model—rigorous curriculum and instruction; supportive climate and culture, aligned assessments, and comprehensive student support—the Organizational Effectiveness Rubric is a comprehensive set of indicators used to review and assess progress that schools make in implementing high school initiatives designed to increase achievement for all students and prepare each student for life in the 21st century. The Organization Effectiveness Rubric enables leaders to gather data that they can use to reflect on practices that are shaping the future of their school(s), to gauge their progress in implementing innovative high school practices, and to motivate staff and stakeholders.
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)
EdWorks brings to its work with secondary schools field-tested experience from 30 districts, across five states and the District of Columbus. Sites include 11 urban and 1 suburban districts in Ohio; 11 urban and rural districts in New York; one urban and two suburban districts in Tennessee; Detroit, Michigan, and three suburban districts in Washington State, as well as work with an Early College High School in Washington, DC.

EdWorks grew out of experiences of its parent company, KnowledgeWorks Foundation (KW), where, beginning in 2002, the EdWorks leadership team designed and managed $100 million in grant-funded school improvement work funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the U.S. Department of Education, the Ohio Department of Education, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and others. In addition, EdWorks and its parent company, KnowledgeWorks, have deepened their understanding and experience in federal and state requirements through involvement in the development of Race To The Top proposals in six states (all of which were finalists or award-winners in Round I RTTT competition) and leadership or participation in more than a dozen proposals for the Investing in Innovation grants in the validation and innovation categories.

From the beginning, EdWorks’ approach has been research and standards-based. For each new state in which it works, EdWorks becomes immersed in the specific standards, grade level expectations and benchmarks, assessments, curriculum frameworks, and specific secondary school policies and procedures. Knowledge of the educational climate, requirements and framework in each state forms the first step of a “backwards planning process” for engagement in each site. Curriculum design and unit and lesson development revolve around “big ideas, enduring understandings and essential questions” (Wiggins and McTighe, 2005) gleaned from the national standards and the unique standards of each state. Pacing guides are built in each school specific to the assessment frameworks of the state and local context.

Experience in Michigan
The EdWorks Model is built upon largely the same research base as the Michigan Framework, from Bernhardt, DuFour and Killion to Marzano, Schmoker, and Tomlinson, to name a few. Progress in each site is measured by detailed “Organizational Effectiveness” and “Instructional” Rubrics. EdWorks’ Organizational Effectiveness Rubrics address four specific sets of outcomes—rigorous curriculum and instruction, aligned assessments, systems of student support, and a supportive climate and culture—that include 36 specific elements fully aligned with Strands I, II, IV and V of the Michigan Framework. The EdWorks Instructional Rubrics—focusing on professional growth, unit design, lesson development, instructional delivery and assessment of learning—are fully aligned with Strands I and II of the Michigan Framework.
EdWorks Technical Assistance Coaches have had the opportunity in 2009-10 to test the alignment of the EdWorks process of support for schools with the Michigan School Improvement Framework and the Comprehensive Needs Assessment through work on-the-ground with six comprehensive high schools in Detroit undergoing a federal transformation process. Involving the full staff and representatives of students, families and community stakeholder, the coaches involved each school in a multifaceted assessment process to deepen individual School Quality Plans, paying specific attention to the daily operational aspects of the school, strategies for safety and security, the vision for rigorous curriculum and instruction and a full range of assessments, and innovative strategies for engaging families and the community in the daily life of the school and communicating student and school progress. Reflecting District and State frameworks, each school examined current performance and set targets and detailed action plans designed to, at a minimum:

- Ensure all 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th grade students are enrolled in a college and career-ready curriculum
- Increase ACT, MME and end-of-course passage rates
- Increase on-time grade-level progression
- Increase AP and dual enrollment participation
- Decrease dropout rate over 2011-12
- Increase Graduation Rate
- Ensure, by the end of a 3-year period, more than 90% of teachers will use using research-based instructional strategies.

One of the key strategies cited in every plan for reaching these goals, was use of the Michigan Curriculum Framework and State assessments to guide vertical and horizontal alignment of the curriculum. In addition, beginning this summer, teacher summer institutes for curriculum alignment, unit development and lesson design will utilize the new Common Core Standards adopted by Michigan in June. Another strategy employed in every plan was full inclusion of special needs students into the regular classroom and the broader fabric of the school with appropriate levels of supports.

EdWorks sat down with each principal and mapped out a process for using Title I funds to support teacher professional development, data analysis, extended days and hours for students and teachers, and a full range of instructional materials. This process was a tedious one, as most of the Detroit leaders had no knowledge of federal Title I regulations. Even if they had been in a Title I school in the past, they were unaccustomed to having the ability to focus funds for schoolwide academic assistance, rather than support for the 20-30% of students identified as needing special services. Most schools in Detroit and other districts where EdWorks is engaged first became aware of the fact that high schools could be eligible for schoolwide Title I funding when they were designated a “Tier 2” school in the School Improvement Grant and Race to the Top competitive funding process.
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)

A Value-Added Model

In an industry crying out for strong leaders and effective teachers, the power of the EdWorks Model focuses on building human capital from the classroom to the principal’s office to the district system.

The EdWorks technical assistance coach doesn’t just introduce sites to research-based practices and then leave them to determine how and when to use that new information. The EdWorks coach is on the ground almost weekly during the planning year and several times a month in the next two years guiding the implementation of those research-based strategies, asking tough questions, and using lessons learned in the launching of more than 80 new small schools and small learning communities to help sites work through the tough issues that stall many improvement processes.

The EdWorks Site Support System is a value-added model built on a “learn-by-doing” philosophy reflective of the quality management cycle, “Plan-Do-Study-Act,” developed by W. Edwards Deming. EdWorks technical assistance coaches model the habits of mind, behaviors, problem-solving techniques and effective teaching practices desired in high-performing educators, put the tools of the trade (the protocols and processes) in the hands of those educators—and then mentor leaders and teachers on the ground as they put those new skills to work in the design and implementation of their new small learning communities.

The EdWorks System believes in placing knowledge, skills and responsibility in the hands of every adult in a school, rather than vesting information in the hands of a few, as some models do. For instance, some strategies train a single person on a campus to develop the small school schedules, the EdWorks technical assistance coach helps a team in each small learning community wrestle with difficult scheduling questions and guides them through the development of a schedule that provides access to rigor and college-or-career-readiness for each student in the school. While some models train one or two teachers in a school or department, the EdWorks System provides ongoing institutes, workshops and embedded professional development that impacts the practices of every educator in a school or small learning community.

Resources and Support of Stakeholders

The EdWorks Model creates strong, self-sustained schools that will continue their success well beyond the three years of the grant. Just as important, the system in which each school operates will have greater capacity to sustain improvements. The entire EdWorks process is focused on building capacity and developing structures within each school and at the system level, as well as fostering community, district, and state support. During the three-year process, these procedures become natural, ingrained parts of the school culture and pattern of activities. The new habits are expected to last well beyond the grant’s duration. Moreover, EdWorks builds stakeholder support by its very design. Implementation of the EdWorks Model includes and respects all stakeholders, and they become invested in the vision. As the new
structures, processes, and practices begin to show an impact, first in the improved climate of the school and next in student performance, all stakeholders—administrators, teachers, students, community members, and district and state leaders—become increasingly committed to seeing its continued success.

Teacher Leaders
Teacher Leaders become a key force in the sustainability of the EdWorks Model. The professional development of the Teacher Leader begins from the first day of technical assistance work on the ground in a school site. The seasoned EdWorks Technical Assistance Coach acts as teacher and mentor for the Teacher Leader, guiding him or her through a step-by-step, learn by doing process.

The Teacher Leader becomes an integral part of the leadership team for each small school, working hand-in-hand with the small school principal, communicating about the implementation process, seeking counsel, providing guidance, particularly on matters of teaching and learning. As a member of the school leadership team, the Teacher Leader plays a key role in the small school governance team. The Teacher Leader becomes immersed in the EdWorks Model, its instructional, assessment, and student support strategies, and serves as the campus “expert” in those areas. As a primary instructional leader in the building, these professionals:

• Assist colleagues in planning for effective use of collaborative time
• Keep abreast of the latest research, adding resources to the Educators Knowledge Network that are pertinent to the work in their small schools
• Implement within their own classrooms research-based instructional strategies and actively encourage colleagues to do the same
• Work side-by-side with colleagues to team teach lessons, observe and comment on instructional strategies, brainstorm solutions to classroom challenges, and encourage others to do the same
• Lead Professional Learning Communities (PLC) for their small school and help the EdWorks Coach train colleagues to do the same, as the need for additional PLCs emerges
• Help the new small school principal hold the vision for the school and update the strategic plan, SMART Goals, and benchmarks for the school, based on data
• Help colleagues interpret data and apply lessons learned to day-to-day implementation in the school and classroom
• Assist in the implementation of the short cycle assessment process on the campus
• Assist in the operation of the small school governance teams
• Assist in the implementation of student leadership teams
• Provide leadership for contextualization of all professional learning opportunities
• Assist with the design and delivery of initiatives in collaboration with the community (i.e., critical issue discussions, mentorships, internships, Summer Bridge, etc.
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)

James Osborn will oversee the day-to-day fieldwork of the OPUS technical assistance coaches. In his position as director of National Field Operations for EdWorks, Osborn leads a group of nationally recognized technical assistance coaches and oversees the field-based application of coaching and technical assistance curricula. Osborn has more than 30 years of experience in public education, having served a teacher, coach, middle and high school principal and as a hearing officer.

EdWorks’ national coaching faculty is drawn from the ranks of teachers and education leaders nationwide who have demonstrated experience in education reform and a commitment to high expectations for all students. Over the past eight years, EdWorks has developed a solid coaching faculty which includes former superintendents, professors of education, National Board Certified teachers, principals and former leaders of other school improvement initiatives.

Specific coaches will be matched to Michigan sites as the need arises. All coaches implementing the EdWorks Model have backgrounds similar to the following:

Robin Kanaan – Assistant Director of Education Strategy and Senior Technical Assistance Coach: Kanaan was among the first Ohio educators to receive certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. She gained statewide and national recognition as a Critical Friends Group trainer for the National School Reform Faculty and was later a key force behind the emergence of the Ohio Center for Essential School Reform on the national scene as a leader in standards-based instruction and assessment. Kanaan’s 23 years of experience as a classroom teacher spanned middle and high school in both urban and suburban districts.

Randall G. Sampson, Ph.D. – Technical Assistance Coach: Sampson has experience at the 6-12 level both as an administrator and a teacher. His particular area of expertise in the area of closing the achievement gap has been honed through his work with the Harvard University Achievement Gap Initiative. Sampson’s analysis of data at his former high school enabled him to identify gaps in student enrollment in AP courses and corrective measures to improve enrollment. As a result, during Sampson’s time as an administrator, the number of African American students enrolled in AP courses increased by 600% and the number of Caucasian student enrolled in AP courses increased by 150%.

Rob McKinnie—Technical Assistance Coach: A Milken Family Foundation National Educator Awardee, McKinnie utilizes a unique skill set honed over nearly twenty years of secondary school service and leadership in public education. Prior to joining EdWorks, McKinnie served as an Assistant Superintendent of Secondary Education in the Cleveland Metropolitan School District. He also served as a classroom teacher, middle school principal and high school principal in three urban districts.
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