

SECTION B

5 Year Budget Option 1

LEA Application - School Building Level Information

MICHIGAN SIG COHORT V

APPLICATION COVER SHEET

COMPLETE IN ENTIRETY FOR EACH SCHOOL APPLYING FOR A GRANT

School Building Information

Legal Name of School Building: **Henry H. North School**

School Building Code: **06662**

Mailing Address: **333 E. Miller Rd. Lansing, MI 48911**

School Building Contact for the School Improvement Grant

Name: **Ariel Rodriguez-Pena**

Position and Office: **Principal**

Contact's Mailing Address: **333 E. Miller Rd. Lansing, MI 48911**

Telephone: **517-755-1710**

Fax: **517-755-1719**

Email address: **ariel.rodriquez-pena@lansingschools.net**

Ariel Rodriguez-Pena

517-755-1711

Ariel Rodriguez-Pena
Building Principal (Printed Name)

517-755-1711
Telephone

Ariel Rodriguez-Pena
Signature of the Building Principal

7/13/16
Date

The LEA, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State 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.

Identify the Intervention Model Used in This School:

- Transformation Model
- Turnaround Model
- Evidence-Based Whole-School Reform Model
- Closure Model
- Restart Model

Intervention Model: Turnaround Model

Identification Status of the School (Priority or Focus): Priority

NOTE: Narratives should follow the sequence of the grant application.

1. Analysis of Need

When preparing responses, the school should consider evidence of need by focusing on improvement status; all core content achievement results, as measured by the state and local assessments, poverty level, graduation data, extended learning opportunities, special populations, etc. Refer to the School Data Analysis, EdYES! Report, and results of the Data Dialogues facilitated by the Intervention Specialist (IS) or District Improvement Facilitator (DIF). Consider how subgroups within the school are performing and possible areas to target for improvement. The narrative should include, at a minimum:

- **Identified data source(s)**
- **Relevant student achievement data**
- **Connection(s) to student achievement data and targeted areas of improvement.**

a. Based on the information above, describe the school and LEA’s method and rationale for how and why the implementation activities of the selection intervention model were identified. (maximum length 1 page)

1a: A comprehensive review of wide-ranging data (i.e., AIMSweb, DRA II, MEAP, – from previous years, M-Step, WIDA and ILC data) demonstrates that Henry H. North (identified as Priority in 2013) students continue to struggle in foundational academic areas including mathematics and reading. Most recently, data have been obtained from M-STEP results. The target areas were identified through a total of eight facilitated data dialogues during the past two years including the principal, teacher-leaders, district representatives, and ISD partners. **Table 1a** details target areas, subgroups, data sources, and implementation activities that are the focus of interventions and supports provided through the Turnaround Model. These dialogues also shed light on the need for additional data (i.e., screeners and diagnostic measures), supplemental curriculum, and support of the four domains of English acquisition. As such, Henry H. North School (along with district representatives) collaboratively decided to apply for SIG V and augment our state-approved Turnaround Plan with focused interventions for academic improvement (reading and mathematics).

Table 1a: Henry H. North School Analysis of Need

| Targeted Area | Subgroups | Data Sources | Implementation Activities |
|---|--|--|--|
| English Language Acquisition (Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing) | 55% of total student population is English learner | WIDA; AIMSweb; Let's go! And Moving up! (2013-2014, 2014-2015 and 2015-2016) | Intervention Specialist, After School Tutoring, Extended Year, PD, ESL Supplemental Curriculum, Family/Community Engagement, and SIOP/Data Coach. |
| Mathematics (Basic Computation) | Bottom 30% & Economically Disadvantaged | MEAP (2013-2014); M-STEP (2014-2015, 2015-2016) AIMSweb M-Comp; and Z-Scores (2013-2014); Moving with Math (Foundations) | Intervention Specialist, After School Tutoring, Extended Year, PD, ESL Supplemental Curriculum, Family/Community Engagement, and SIOP/Data Coach. |
| Mathematics (Reasoning & Application) | Bottom 30% & Economically Disadvantaged | MEAP (2013-2014);); M-STEP (2014-2015, 2015-2016); AIMSweb M-Comp; and Z-Scores (2013-2014); Moving with Math (Foundations) | Intervention Specialist, After School Tutoring, Extended Year, PD, ESL Supplemental Curriculum, Family/Community Engagement, and SIOP/Data Coach. |
| Foundations in Mathematics (Number ID and Fluency) | Lower Elementary (i.e., PK-1) & Economically Disadvantaged | AIMSweb M-Comp;); M-STEP (2014-2015, 2015-2016); ILC Data (K-Pals and Rocket Math); Moving with Math (Foundations) | Turnaround Intervention Specialist, After School Tutoring, Extended Year, PD, Math Supplemental Curriculum, Family/Community Engagement, and Data Coach. |
| Reading (Comprehension) | Bottom 30% & Economically Disadvantaged | MEAP (2013-2014);); M-STEP (2014-2015, 2015-2016); DRA II; WIDA; Study Island (2014-2015 and 2015-2016); Raz-Kids (2013-2014, 2014-2015, 2015-2016) | Intervention Specialist, After School Tutoring, Extended Year, PD, Reading Supplemental Curriculum, Family/Community Engagement, and Data Coach. |
| Foundations in Reading (Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, and Vocabulary) | Lower Elementary (i.e., PK-1) & Economically Disadvantaged | DRA II; AIMSweb (LNF and LSF); WIDA; Raz-Kids Scores (2013-2014, 2014-2015, 2015-2016) | Intervention Specialist, After School Tutoring, Extended Year, PD, Reading Supplemental Curriculum, Family/Community Engagement, and Data Coach. |

There were several relevant factors that were considered when selecting the implementation activities for this application. First, we ensured that all of the activities would align to data-based needs of our students. Second, we ensured that the activities were allowable and in accord with the requirements of the Turnaround Model. Third, we wanted to be able to connect implementation activities to on-going work underway. As an example of this third point, the data coaching and instructional support provided through SIG V will be tied to the iCollaborate (the capture of instructional process data through the EDU-SNAP tool) initiative already underway throughout the district (Title II).

b. Describe the LEA's process for involving parents and the community in selecting the reform model. (maximum length 1 page)

1b: Because of the relatively short timeline associated with the SIG V grant application, parents and community members were recruited to participate and provide input through existing channels and networks. Building-based PTAs or PTSAs served as the primary conduit for the recruitment of parents and community members. Members were invited to participate by the building principal. Representatives from the district-level Parent Community Advisory Council (PCAC) were also invited to provide input into the selection of the Turnaround Model. Input and guidance was solicited and collected at two planning meetings (each approximately 60 minutes) in which each of the models were described. Parents and community members were asked to provide input about the model that they would most like to see implemented based on (a) the model requirements, (b) the data-based needs of our students, and (c) alignment with district and building initiatives.

Parent and community member input, comments, and questions were collected and considered by the SIG V planning and writing team when determining which intervention to select. One example of an area in which parent and community input shaped the nature of our reform model decision and implementation activities concerned the role of the Family & Community Liaison. In this application we are augmenting our existing Turnaround plan. The role of the Family & Community Liaison (see Job Description in Attachment H.3) to complete home visits and offer “Parent University” was shaped by direct feedback and input collected during the planning meetings.

2. **Baseline Data (Attachment A)**

Complete the baseline data worksheet.

x Completed and uploaded into MEGs.

3. **Intervention Model – provide narrative on the following:**

a. Describe in detail the appropriate interventions that will be implemented for the selected reform model using (Attachment B).

X Completed and included as **Attachment B**.

b. Describe how the school, to the extent practicable, will implement one or more evidence-based strategies in accordance with the selected SIG reform model. (maximum length 1 page)

3b: Note: Due to space constraints this narrative will address in detail just one of the evidence-based strategies (EBS) that will be implemented through SIG V. For a complete list of the EBSs please see **Table 3b** and for a comprehensive description please see **Attachment B**.

One evidence-based strategy we will implement through SIG V is SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol). SIOP is an evidence-based model of sheltered instruction successfully used across the U.S. for over 15 years. The SIOP Model helps teachers plan/ deliver lessons that allow ELs to acquire academic content as they develop language proficiency. Implementation with fidelity and efficiency supports this SIG reform model at Henry H. North. This SIG reform model approach will be implemented by building a consistent school-wide instructional foundation which includes the following: a) train all staff in SIOP; b) conduct walkthroughs with a framework checklist to provide immediate feedback to teachers; c) develop a PD calendar to provide on-going opportunities to adjust instruction with newly learned strategies based on feedback; d) collect data that will be interpreted within the Instructional Learning Cycle (ILC) format to maximize impact on English acquisition and student academic achievement; and, e) utilize SIOP strategies in after school tutoring and extended learning opportunities. In addition, the current school principal is SIOP certified as a trainer of trainers by the MDE and the CAL. This is a strong asset to the implementation of this EBS through this SIG reform model.

References

Echevarria, Jana J. (et.al) *Making Content Comprehensible for Elementary English Learners: The SIOP® Model*. 2nd Edition. Pearson, 2013.

Table 3b: Evidence-Based Strategies (SIG V)

| EBS | Description | Turnaround Model Requirement |
|--|--|--------------------------------|
| Professional Development: SIOP | SIOP is a model to help teachers plan and deliver lessons that allow English learners to acquire academic knowledge as they develop English language proficiency. | Requirement #6 & #9 |
| EDU-SNAP Data Collection | The systemic collection of instructional process data. | Requirements #6, #8 & #9 |
| EDU-SNAP Data Coaching | Site-based coaching to support teachers in improving instructional practices. | Requirements #6, #8 & #9 |
| Response to Intervention | RTI is a multi-tier approach to the early identification and support of students with learning and behavior needs. The RTI process begins with high-quality instruction and universal screening. | Requirements #8, #9, #10 & #11 |
| After School Tutoring | Supplemental learning opportunities designed on research based language acquisition and academic strategies. | Requirements #8, #9 & #10 |
| Extended Year | 16 days of additional instruction in core academic areas during the summer. | Requirements #8, #9 & #10 |
| Partners in Education: A Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships | The Dual Capacity-Building Framework was formulated using the research on effective family engagement and home-school partnership strategies and practices, adult learning and motivation, and leadership development. | Requirement #11 |
| Parents as Educational Partners (PEP) | PEP is an ESL curriculum to educate language minority parents about the USA, local school systems, parent engagement and increase English Language Proficiency. | Requirement #11 |

c. Describe how the implementation of the SIG will be evaluated for effectiveness. (maximum length 2 pages)

3c: The Lansing School District (LSD) has extensive capacity and experience in evaluating the effective use of school improvement funds and program impact. As noted in the LEA section of this application, the district has an effective central office team that provides support in the area of grant management, program evaluation, and monitoring. Grants fund expenditures are managed to ensure that they meet grant intent, provide the best value added for the schools and students of the district, and are consistent with grant regulations. Program evaluation and monitoring capacity has been built over the past several years through the careful and intentional development of policies and procedures for monitoring program implementation and completing robust program evaluations. The LSD Department of Improvement and Innovation(DII) will ensure that the district representatives, building leaders, and teachers have timely and creditable data to support informed decision-making and program evaluation. Below is a description of the program evaluation process that will be used to continually monitor SIG outcomes and effectiveness.

Step 1: Engage Stakeholders – DII(Department of Improvement and Innovation) will convene an initial meeting to clarify the goals and objectives of the SIG. They will engage in a discussion with key stakeholder about the intent of the grant in order to clarify how the grant is expected to lead to the stated goals and outcomes. Key stakeholders will be involved early in the evaluation process to ensure a variety of perspectives. Key stakeholders could include district and building leaders, teachers, students, family members, and other members of the grant’s target audience.

Step 2: Describe the Program – DII will then articulate (in writing) what the grant does and what it is supposed to accomplish. This description should answer questions such as: What is the goal of

the grant? Which activities are essential to pursue in order to reach the grant goal? How many people is the grant expected to serve? What are the interim indicators of grant success? Etc. It is important to note that program planning and evaluation go together. It is good practice and, in fact, recommended that key stakeholders articulate a shared understanding of the conceptual model prior to implementation.

Step 3: Focus the Evaluation - The evaluations can be either summative or formative in nature. DII can focus on different aspects or programs within the grant as well as goals (i.e., did we meet the desired outcome) or both. DII will consider purpose and timing of the evaluation by considering questions such as, how will the evaluation information be used? What data-gathering methods are best suited for the evaluation? What constraints are present (i.e., time, money, availability of key stakeholders)? Once there is clarity and shared understanding about these questions, DII will create a focused evaluation plan.

Step 4: Gather Evidence - Qualitative and quantitative data are the two main forms of data will be collected. Qualitative data offers descriptive information that captures perception, opinions, feelings, or observable phenomena. Three commonly used methods for gathering qualitative evaluation data are: interviews, focus groups, and participant observation. Quantitative data refers to information that may be measured by numbers or tallies. Methods for collecting quantitative data include numerical based systems such as assessments, attendance rates, and disciplinary referrals, as well as, scale-based surveys and questionnaires.

Possible metrics for measuring SIG effectiveness include:

- All of the academic and behavior data included in the Baseline Data Table (see **Attachment A**) included in this application;
- Building leader and teacher perception surveys;
- Student, family, and community partner surveys;
- Parental attendance at SIG-related evening functions;
- Changes in instructional processes (as measured by EDU-SNAP); and
- Changes in student achievement (as measured by local and state assessments such as DRA II and AIMSweb, M-STEP and WIDA).

Step 5: Draw Conclusions - In this step, DII will attempt to answer essential program evaluation questions. Is the grant or program having the intended impact? Are the desired goals or outcomes being achieved? Why or why not? DII will use data to show trends, gaps, strengths, and weaknesses. Compare evaluation data with a) targets set for the grant or program, b) against standards established by stakeholders, and/or c) make comparisons with other grants and initiatives.

Step 6: Share Lessons Learned - It is important that the work put into evaluations is used for grant and program improvement. DII will present findings and recommendations to a broad set of relevant stakeholders (including district and building leaders, teachers, students, and family and community members). Findings will be sharing in written and presentation format at evening parent activities and on-going data dialogues.

Table 3c details the individuals that will be involved in continuously monitoring and evaluating SIG effectiveness.

| Table 3c: Evaluated SIG Effectiveness | |
|--|--|
| Division/Department/School | Leads |
| LSD Instructional Division | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dr. Mark Coscarella – Deputy Superintendent for Instruction ▪ Mr. Ben Botwinski – Executive Director of School Improvement ▪ Mr. Sergio Keck – Director of Special Populations |
| LSD Department of Improvement and Innovation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mr. Ben Botwinski – Executive Director of School Improvement ▪ Ms. Bethany Deschaine – State/Federal Compliance Officer |
| LSD Department of Finance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ms. Kim Adams – Director of Finance ▪ Mr. Jon Laing – Accounting Manager ▪ Mr. Nick Claeys – Senior Grant Accountant ▪ Ms. Latisha Wolf– Accountant |
| School | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Building Principal ▪ Buildig Assistant Principal ▪ SIG Coordinator – TBD ▪ Teachers ▪ Students ▪ Family and Community Partners |
| Michigan Department of Education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SIG Monitor ▪ OEII – SIG Program Supervisors |

For additional details about how the school will meaningfully engage parents and community partners in the implementation of the reform model, please see **Section 3e**.

d. Title VI Rural Schools Element Modification

- i. If the LEA receives rural school funding Title VI, it is allowed to modify one element of the transformation or turnaround model. Indicate which element the school will modify, and describe how it will meet the intent and purpose of the original element. NOTE: this modification does not apply to the other models. (maximum length 1 page) If the LEA does not receive Title VI rural school funding, mark section 6.d as “N/A.”**

N/A ... as it applies to this application.

e. Describe how the school and district will meaningfully engage families and the community in the implementation of the reform model on an ongoing basis.

3e: Our work engaging family and community partners in the implementation of the reform model began in earnest after our school was identified as “priority”. At that time several efforts were made to meaningfully engage families and community partners in wide variety of reform related activities. Because of the diverse languages spoken by parents, it is necessary to communicate with them in their primary language. Cultural brokers provide interpretation/translations in the top ten spoken languages. Evidence of work underway would be: newsletters, parent-teacher conference attendance; automated parent phone calls, updated web pages; family theme nights; diversity celebration events; the involvement of volunteer organizations; and community mentoring programs.

In regards to specific reform model and interventions described in this application, parents and community partners have already had a chance to provide input and guidance about the selected model and many of the interventions. In addition, as described above, parents and community partners will be included in the continuous monitoring and evaluation of the SIG. Having said that, there is always good work to be done. As such, we have chosen to focus on the following categories of family and community involvement:

- **Building Caring Relationships:** The quality of relationships at the school is among the strongest known predictors of student achievement and teachers career satisfaction (Hattie, 2009; Grayson & Alvarez, 2008);
- **Creating Opportunities for Meaningful Participation:** Meaningful participation at school helps cultivate student autonomy, classroom engagement, and commitment (Leithwood & Mascall, 2008);
- **Cultivating School Connectedness:** Despite challenges at home and in neighborhoods, connected youth look forward to seeing their friends, families, and neighbors at school because they feel valued, respected, and supported (Goodenow, 1993).

The following parent programs are proposed to be implemented through SIG V:

- **Partners in Education: A Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family–School Partnerships**

This is a new framework for designing family engagement initiatives that build capacity among educators and families to partner with one another around student success. Based in existing research and best practices, the “Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family–School Partnerships” is designed to act as a scaffold for the development of family engagement strategies, policies, and programs. This is not a blueprint for engagement initiatives, which must be designed to fit the particular contexts in which they are carried out. Instead, the Dual Capacity-Building Framework should be seen as a *compass*, laying out the goals and conditions necessary to chart a path toward effective family engagement efforts that are linked to student achievement and school improvement.

Retrieved from: <http://www2.ed.gov/documents/family-community/partners-education.pdf>

- **Parents as Educational Partners (PEP)**

PEP is an ESL curriculum to educate language minority parents about the USA, local school systems, parent engagement and increase English Language Proficiency.

The Parents as Educational Partners (PEP) program promotes parent involvement in the school community for parents whose primary language is not English. PEP program participants attend classes to learn about the educational system in the United States and LSD, gaining information that will enable them to be decision makers and advocates in their children’s education. This curriculum has also an instruction component to help parents acquire English language skills in the areas of listening, speaking, reading and writing.

Retrieved from: <http://www.thecenterweb.org/alrc/family-pep.html>

To this end, here are 3 specific strategies we will implement to foster greater meaningful family and community engagement in the implementation of the reform model.

- School-based SIG Steering Committee. The steering committee will be composed of five to seven members including teachers, family members, and community partners. This committee will meet, at least, quarterly to review SIG related data, share perceptions about implementation, and provide feedback about on-going program adjustments. The committee could also participate in periodic school walk-throughs and formal monitoring of SIG-related program implementation.
- Parent University. In collaboration with the district, our ISD colleagues, and several community partners. The school will offer a series of workshops that parents can attend to share best practices. Tentative topics include: Parenting Awareness - these offerings will provide information that can empower parents to raise confident, educated children; Helping Your Child Learn in the 21st Century – these offerings will provide parents information about how to support children’s academic opportunities and challenges today; Health and Wellness – these offerings will help families build healthy lifestyles physically as well as emotionally; and Personal Growth – these offerings will help parents to grow personally and professionally, so they can become the most effective advocates for their children. Through the Parent University both proposed programs for parents will be implemented.
- Parent and Community Data Wall. In order to make transparent to parents and community members we will create a data (in a highly visible area of the building) which depicts aggregate data related to key metrics of success related to the grant.

4. Resource Profile

a. Describe how the district will leverage state and federal funds and coordinate resources to implement the selected intervention model. As you develop your response, consider how SIG funds will be used to supplement and support other funding resources such as general funds, Title I, Part A, Title II, Part A, IDEA special education funds, and Michigan Section 31a At-Risk funding. (maximum length 1 page)

4a: The LSD has a demonstrated track record of aligning resources (i.e., local, state, federal, and other) in order to ensure implementation fidelity and effectiveness. In such cases input from a variety of stakeholders (i.e., district, building, family, and community) is sought early in the planning and implementation process. In the case of this grant, multiple funding sources will be leveraged to support the implementation of the selected intervention model (i.e., Turnaround Model). As an example, state funding streams such as the foundation allowance (in combination with Title I) are already being used to provide all students in the district with a full day of kindergarten. In addition, we also have a robust Pre-K program (GSRP) in place and Title III funds to supplement English acquisition to new Americans. As noted above, in order to ensure coherence and maximize impact decisions about use of local, state, federal, and other funds are driven by data-based student needs and evidence-based best practices. Reform plans (and the Unpacking Tool) also serve to ensure program and intervention coherence. **Table 4a** depicts how some of the major funding sources will be leveraged in support of the implementation of the Turnaround Model.

| Table 4a: Funding Source Alignment | | |
|--|---|---|
| Current Intervention | Funding Source | SIG Supplement/Alignment |
| Full Day Kindergarten | (State) Foundation Allowance (Federal) Title I | Extended Year |
| After School Tutoring | (Federal) Title I & Title III | Extended Year |
| Bilingual Instructional Assistant | (Federal) Title I Priority & Title III | Extended Year |
| iCollaborate – the systematic collection of instructional process data | (Federal) Title II (Federal) Title I PRIORITY | Site-Based Data Coach, use of EDU-SNAP tool |
| Literacy & Math Specialists – Tier 2 & Tier 3 Student Support | (Federal) Title I & (State) 31a | Supplemental materials, curriculum, and technology |
| Student Assistance Provider – provide social and emotional student support | (Federal) Title I & PEACE Grant | Family & Community Liaison & Parent University |
| High-quality PD aligned to selected reform model, PLCs | (Federal) Title I and Title II | Early Childhood Learning & Brain Research PD & Site-Based Coaching |
| Physical Education and Nutrition | (Federal) PEAK Grant | Supplemental Services to support whole child |
| Community in Schools | (Federal) Title I Priority | Assesses students’ needs and connects community resources accordingly |

b. The MDE requires the district to have three SIG- funded positions working at the building level as a condition of receiving the grant. These positions are:

- 1. The SIG coordinator**
 - 2. Data coach**
 - 3. Family liaison coordinator/director**
- ii. The school principal or assistant principal cannot perform any of the duties outlined above.**
- iii. The recommended Full-Time Equivalencies (FTEs) for each of these positions are based on the enrollment on each school. These are detailed below:**
- 1. Building enrollment of 250 students or less: should not exceed 0.5 FTE per position.**
 - 2. Building enrollment of 251 to 500 students: should not exceed 0.7 FTE per position.**
 - 3. Building enrollment of 501 or more students: should not exceed 1.0 FTE per position.**
- iv. Districts applying for multiple schools may combine FTEs. For example:**
- 1. Two buildings with enrollment of 250 or less students are applying. They could have:**
 - a. 1.0 FTE SIG coordinator to cover both buildings.**

b. 1.0 Data Coach to Cover both Buildings.

- 2. These are examples only. The school and district must decide how best to leverage the recommended FTEs to meet their unique needs.**
- v. In a single building, any of the three positions may be combined at the building level. For example:**
 - 1. One individual could be 0.5 FTE as the SIG coordinator and 0.5 FTE as the Data Coach.**
 - 2. This is provided as an example only. The school and district must decide how best to leverage the recommended FTEs to meet their unique needs.**
- vi. Describe how these positions will be operationalized, how they will be funded, how the appropriate FTEs will be assigned at the school level, and how they will support the SIG. (maximum length 2 pages)**

NOTE: SIG positions funded at the building level may not be duplicated at the district level. Some district costs for oversight of the SIG are allowable. See LEA level application for more information.

4b: Note: This school has more than 500 students.

SIG Coordinator: The SIG Coordinator position will be a **1.0 SIG-Funded FTE**. This individual will work with the school principal, the district's Executive Director of School Improvement, Director of Special Populations, and teacher leaders to support and oversee all aspects of the reform plan implementation and monitoring. In addition, the SIG Coordinator will work with the school administrators to plan and coordinate program budgets in accordance with SIG guidelines and federal regulations. The SIG Coordinator will also work with the MDE SIG Monitor to coordinate and complete SIG monitoring and compliance mandates and reports (e.g., leading and lagging, quarterly, and annual), ensure alignment between SIG and turnaround plan, as well as other district and building improvement efforts, and support the development of tools and mechanisms to assess SIG implementation and impact. The SIG Coordinator will also communicate, coordinate, and support the work with external service providers on the implementation of SIG. We have support personnel at the district level (i.e., Executive Director of School Improvement, Director of Special Populations, State and Federal Compliance Officers, etc.) to provide assistance to the SIG Coordinator.

Data Coach: Because of our specialized vision for the data coaching role (i.e., be trained in the EDU-SNAP data collection instrument), the data coach will be a **.5 SIG-Funded FTE** at Henry H. North. This individual will work with building principal, Executive Director of School Improvement, Director of Special Populations, and teacher leaders planning and conducting staff development activities that focus on the use of data and assessments to enhance learning and collaborative instructional planning. The data coach will work with small groups of teachers and/or instructional leaders in analyzing data and using data to differentiate instruction and make data-driven decisions. He/She will facilitate meetings of Professional Learning Communities with a focus on data-driven dialogues, support teachers in the use of state and local assessment data, support the development of data-driven tools and mechanisms to assess SIG implementation and impact, and

work with the building principal, SIG coordinator, and teacher leaders to develop and disseminate data-based information on the School Improvement.

As previously noted, the LSD has a cadre training data coaches that have been working in support of our district-wide iCollaborate Initiative. Based on the success of the iCollaborate initiative in reflecting on and changing teacher practice, we will expand this process at Henry H. North School and go into more depth with language acquisition, data analysis, and connection to student achievement. Specifically, the data coaches will conduct targeted classroom observations using the EDU-SNAP instrument, and data will be shared at the school level, grade level, and across grade levels. A process of collaborative inquiry will be used with a focus on teachers making decisions that are not judgmental or evaluative. Individual teachers will use their own data to examine practice. Opportunities for change will be identified and action plans developed and put into practice. The data coach will follow up with classroom visits and conversations about practices. Video will be used to share practices with other teachers. Walkthroughs by other teachers and the principal will incorporate components of EDU-SNAP so there is coherence and a common language between observation instruments. The data coach will also coordinate classroom visits to view other grade levels to help create seamless transitions between grades, and finally an analysis of EDU-SNAP and student achievement data will be completed. In order to ensure the highest quality candidate for this position, the selection and hiring process will mirror the process described in **Section 1B** of the LEA portion of this application. The school principal will be closely involved in the selection of the Data Coach.

Family & Community Liaison / Resource Coordinator: In addition to the mandatory position of Family and Community Liaison, the job duties of a Resource Coordinator will be added to this position to work with the *Community in Schools* (already in place at North) program to streamline and add capacity to resources available to our school, students, and parents.

Because of the exceedingly important connection between school and home, the Family & Community Liaison/Resource Coordinator will be a **1.0 SIG-funded FTE**. The Family and Community Liaison will assist in recruiting parents as volunteers within the school (e.g., classroom volunteers) for the purpose of increasing parent participation and student achievement. The Liaison will also collaborate with school staff and community partners to develop programs and classes to support parents and students outside of school (i.e., Parent University); facilitate outreach to low income communities, non-English speakers, community leaders and organizations for the purpose of developing resources and building partnerships with community members; assist in the preparation of a variety of written materials (e.g., newsletters, reports, logs, memos, handouts) for the purpose of documenting activities and program implementation; provide written reference and/or convey information; provide appropriate referrals and advocacy for families as needed and provide follow up to determine the outcome of services provided for the purpose of supporting families in working toward their goals; provide data for a variety of reports (e.g., program participation, activity) for the purpose of meeting program, district, state and federal requirements; confer with teachers, parents and/or appropriate community agency personnel for the purpose of assisting in evaluating student progress and/or implementing student objectives; participate in a variety of presentations, meetings, workshops and committees for the purpose of conveying and/or gathering information required to perform functions and remaining

knowledgeable with current professional program regulations. Finally, this position will develop and coordinate a volunteer management system that will recruit, train, and evaluate volunteers to work with the school and families. In order to ensure the highest quality candidate for this position, the selection and hiring process will mirror the process described in **Section 1B** of the LEA portion of this application. The school principal will be closely involved in the selection of the Family and Community Liaisons.

c. The district may choose to employ staff or contract for mental health services to support SIG receiving schools.

- i. Indicate whether or not the school will provided mental health services.**
- ii. If providing these services, indicate if the services will be provided by a staff member or if the district will contract for the services.**

NOTE: Contracted mental health services should be for an amount that is in line with the FTE requirements based on enrollment outlined in 3.b.iii above (i.e. the school enrollment is 250 or less, so the amount for the contracted service must be equal to or less than what it would cost for 0.5 FTE of an employee performing the same service).

- iii. Describe how this work will be operationalized, how it will be funded, how the appropriate FTE will be assigned at the school level, and how it will support the SIG. If not providing this service, no response is necessary. (maximum length 1 page)**

4c: In the Lansing School District, we understand that the social and emotional needs of our students must be met in order for them to achieve at high levels. As such, we have proactively taken steps to ensure the social and emotional support students need is place in our schools. Through the use of Title I Priority and 31a funds, every school in Lansing is provided a Student Assistance Provider (SAP). The SAPs are funded at 1.0 FTE. SAPs are required to have a Masters Degree in Social Work (or the equivalent). Because we have already taken this bold step, we are confident that the social, emotional, and mental health support our students need is already in place. We have opted to **not** allocate SIG V funds towards a Mental Health Specialist.

d. Professional development must be provided throughout the school year (late start, early releases, school days without students, etc.) at least 8 hours per month for all professionals in the building including the administrators and support staff. All professional development cannot occur during the summer. Professional development should be job-embedded and tied to demonstrated need.

Describe how student data will be used to identify content of professional learning and how the school will deliver the required professional development throughout the year. Provide a draft professional development calendar for year 1 of the grant (Attachment C) (Narrative maximum length is 1 page; the Year 1 PD calendar does not have a length limit)

4d: The changes we need require a comprehensive and systemic approach to supporting meaningful professional learning. With our focus on implementing SIG in order to increase academic excellence and improve climate and culture we will utilize **nine hours** of monthly teacher collaboration time. Eight of these hours will occur during weekly (two hours each Wednesday morning) delayed starts and one additional hour for grade-level PLCs. This time will be used to expand high-quality instructional strategies, data-based collaboration, and develop skills among the instructional and non-instructional staff to meet the needs of our students. During these 9 hours the staff will utilize a closely monitored and facilitated PLC model that will support the implementation of our reform strategies. Detailed below are three specific areas we will devote on-going, job-embedded, professional learning time:

- Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP): All teaching staff will be trained on the SIOP model by a certified trainer. From there, ongoing follow up and coaching for lesson planning and delivery will be implemented on a monthly basis by grade level. The SIOP coaching will also be embedded in the Instructional Learning Cycle (ILC) and the fidelity of this protocol will be monitored by gathering evidence of classroom observations, walk throughs, and student work. For this purpose, the SIOP Checklist will be used by a coach and trained administrators.
- iCollaborate: The iCollaborate initiative has become an important catalyst for improvement in our schools for the past 3 years. It is an initiative to improve instructional effectiveness while building a culture of collaborative inquiry where educators feel safe to reflect on their practice, adopt a mindset of continuous improvement, and a willingness to use data as the impetus for discussion and exploration. As previously noted, classroom observations are conducted in each classroom by a trained data coach with the web-based EDU-SNAP observation instrument (Ritchie, Wisner, Mason, Holland, and Howes, 2010). The information permits teachers to reflect critically on their instructional practices. Driven by this data, job-embedded support and is provided to teachers in the form of instructional/data coaching. This data also guides professional learning communities in order to increase students' exposure to quality instruction. It should be noted that iCollaborate will be aligned with SIOP efforts.
- Tiered Support: The staff will also be trained on an evidence-based, three-tiered model of prevention and intervention (IIBlocks). The implementation of IIBlocks is right in line with Turnaround Model and ensures that students receive high quality instruction and interventions matched to their needs. In this model, teachers monitor progress frequently to make decisions about changes in instruction or goals and apply student response data to important educational decisions. The IIBlock structure allows staff to make instructional decisions in general, remedial, and special education tiers, creating a well-integrated system of instruction/intervention guided by student outcome data. Based on students' performance data and student work samples further training in appropriate interventions, for SIOP, will be provided during the 9 hours of monthly collaboration time. The data collected on walkthroughs and progress monitoring will be analyzed during the weekly "delayed start" team meetings.

For additional information and details about professional learning in Year 1, please see **Attachment C**.

5. External Service Provider Selection (maximum length 2 pages)

Describe the process the building and district has used or will use to screen and select external service providers (ESPs) or Whole School Reform Model Developer from the MDE approved ESP list. Include the following:

- **How the individuals, team, or committee responsible for vetting and selecting ESP was determined**
- **Process used to research provider and review evidence of effectiveness**
- **A description of the decision making process (i.e. voting or staff consensus)**

NOTE: The school may choose not to work with an external service provider; however the SIG final requirements state the application must still include the information above. Responses that consist of a statement such as "the school will not work with an external service provider" or "N/A" will receive a score of zero.

5: The selection of an External Service Provider (ESP) is not one that is taken lightly. Ideally, an ESP serves as a true partner in the implementation of the SIG reform model, assisting in the planning, implementation, and monitoring of grant outcomes and goals. Because the Lansing School District has been previously awarded a SIG (two schools were awarded in the SIG III cohort and four schools in SIG IV) we have had some experience screening and selecting ESPs. Initial screening and selection is completed early in the process by the SIG planning and writing team (composed of members from the central office and schools). Members of this team are selected based on previous SIG experience, professional specializations (i.e., knowledge of state and federal regulations), and/or knowledge of the SIG reform interventions and strategies. The initial screening and selection of an ESP is driven by (a) a review of our data-based needs, (b) a review of MDEs Preferred ESP list (no longer available), (c) the requirements embedded in the specific reform model selected for implementation (the Turnaround Model), (d) recommendations from colleagues that have previously worked with a given ESP, and (e) review of evidence of prior effectiveness. Specifically we asked the ESP to provide documentation of previous work, similar in scale and scope, along with evidence of impact data. Ultimately when selecting an ESP we strive for district and building-level consensus.

Fortunately, the Lansing School District has enjoyed successful experience working with Ingham ISD (IISD) as an external provider to Priority Schools. The selection of Ingham ISD (IISD) as an external provider allows for the continuity of practice needed to achieve the goals and strategies identified in the SIG. IISD has been willing to be flexible to school based needs, has provided on-going technical assistance and monitoring related to the Instructional Learning Cycles, as well as site-based support through content coaching. The Lansing School District schools have a strong and well planned model for rapid turnaround and IISD has proven responsive to that model with methods and strategies that meet the specific demographic and organizational needs of our students and families.

In order to best serve our schools and students, and because we are submitting a targeted application that augments our existing Turnaround Plan. We have submitted a SIG V application with a streamlined budget but are asking MDE to consider continued RAG funding. This would allow us to leverage RAG funds to (a) continue the highly impactful work which began during the 2015-2016 school year and (b) add the much needed support and coordination of English language acquisition.

2015-2016 RAG Success and Why RAG should Continue at Henry H. North School

- Implementation of comprehensive math interventions for all students.
 - Through the implementation of Rocket Math and Vanderbilt's University's K-Pals, LSD priority schools experience aggregate gains K-6 in foundational mathematic skills including math computation and math comprehension. Specifically in kindergarten classrooms, LSD priority schools saw an average of a 20% increase in oral counting, early numeracy, and math computation as measured by AIMSweb fall and spring benchmark assessment.
- Intervention Blocks
 - Implemented supplemental intervention time outside of core time to target specific data driven evidence-based interventions based on the individual needs of each students.
 - All certified staff assignments were prioritized to place the most skilled staff with the neediest students.
- Content Coaching
 - Teachers experienced both on-site and ISD driven professional coaching and development towards better instructional practices.
- Building Walkthroughs
 - ISD personnel partnered with district personnel to conduct frequent walk-throughs to progress monitor and provide immediate feedback of RAG funded initiatives.

Proposed SIG/RAG Funding for 2016-2017

- LSD and IISD administration will collaboratively prioritize SIG and RAG funding to ensure that efforts are sustainable and have a high impact within each the classroom.
 - By utilizing both SIG and RAG funds, it is the goal of LSD and IISD to develop a sustainable and transferable K-6th grade model that can be reproduced throughout Lansing and all 12 Ingham County Districts to support this specific population of learners.

The LSD has established a comprehensive process for monitoring and accountability. The support provided by an ESP is subject to the same intensive scrutiny and oversight. The ESPs, working with central office and building level support, analyze the impact of services on core metrics and use disaggregated data from several sources to monitor service and program impact on measurable goals and outcomes. ESPs working with SIG-funded schools and the District Executive Director of School Improvement (Title I funded) developed a comprehensive plan of support based on data and unique building needs. The ESP then executes the plan and (in collaboration with district and building leaders) monitors outcomes. In addition to our on-going monitoring efforts, our relationships with ESPs is formalized through a written contract (i.e., a Contract Service Agreement) that specifies costs, deliverables, a timeline for services and supports, and a termination/non-renewal clause that allows the district to terminate the relationship if the district is not satisfied, in any way, with services and supports being provided.

6. Increased Learning Time (maximum length 1 page)

- a. Describe how increased learning time (lengthening the school day, week or year) will be scheduled.**
- b. Describe how increased learning time will be spent engaging students in learning, not just adding clock time to a schedule.**
- c. Indicate whether or not an agreement with the union will be required to support increased learning time, and if so, will the agreement be signed prior to the start of the school year?**

6a: In order to mitigate summer learning loss (i.e., the summer slide) we have documented using AIMsweb and DRA II data, using SIG V funds, we will increase the school year by 16 days. Specifically, we will add four four-day weeks throughout the summer. This is an extended year model that we have found to be effective in our schools in the district.

6b: In this model we will provide 64 hours of additional support in core academic areas for all students, including those needing English language acquisition. Rather than being set-up as an extension of the school year, during these weeks students are placed in multi-grade/age classrooms based on their academic competence and language proficiency. The program delivery will be through a project-based learning model. Project-based learning is a dynamic approach to teaching in which students explore real-world problems and challenges. With this type of active and engaged learning, students are inspired to obtain a deeper core content knowledge and develop skills in the four domains of the language. A tentative list of projects for students to explore include: environmental education, composting, physics in motion, web design, health and wellness, graphic novels, civic engagement, cultural sensitivity and awareness, etc. All students will be invited to attend the extended year program which will take place in June through August. In addition to the building-based (SIG-funded) extended year program, the LSD also offers 16 days of extended year programming (again using a project-based learning model) that students will also be able to participate in. This program is funded through a combination of Title I and Title I Priority funds and is offered through the summer months. Between these two programs students will have six weeks (or approximately 132 hours) of summer extended learning time opportunities. Also during the 2016-2017 school year the LSD will continue provide a district-wide delayed start on Wednesday mornings. As previously noted, this will allow for considerable teacher collaboration time each week (approximately 120 minutes). However, in order to accommodate for this change in schedule, 25 minutes were added to each school day. This results in a small net increase in learning time for students and 72 hours of teacher collaboration time (this entire change in schedule is cost-neutral and, as such, will not be reflected SIG budgets).

6c: In order to provide the summer extended year program detailed in this section of the application, no specific contract deviations, amendments, or MOUs will be required. Our current contract does have existing language related to compensation rates for teachers beyond the normal academic year. The delayed start and addition of minutes to each school day does require a signed MOU which is already in place for the 2016-2017 school year.

7. Timeline

- a. **Attach a comprehensive five-year timeline for implementing the selected intervention (Attachment D). Identify who is responsible for each implementation activity. (PRIORITY SCHOOLS ONLY): For year one, note which activities have already occurred due to being previously identified as a priority school.**

Completed and included as **Attachment D**.

8. Annual Goals

- a. **Determine the school's student academic achievement goals in the core content areas for each of the next five years as determined by local and state assessments. Take into account the changing state assessments and how that will affect goal setting. At a minimum, mathematics and reading must be included. For example, if the present proficiency rate in mathematics is 18%, what will it be at the end of years one through five? (Attachment E)**

Completed and included as **Attachment E**.

- b. **Describe how data will be used for continuous improvement, and how often it will be analyzed. (maximum length 1 page)**

8b: On-going student data analysis will occur at monthly facilitated grade-level PLCs. In order to ensure continuous improvement, staff will review and refine existing student data to examine individual student progress and overall grade-level success. Staff will determine whether instructional interventions are being successful. This data will be used as a basis for guiding differentiated instruction and will be discussed and shared widely with stakeholders, at least monthly, at building-level PLC meetings and principal-led data conferences. Below is a list of assessments that are currently in use in the building.

Reading Assessments:

- Kindergarten – DRA II, Raz-Kids, WIDA, and AIMSweb (Note: We are exploring kindergarten screeners for future implementation)
- First & Second grade – DRA II, WIDA, Raz-Kids, and AIMSweb
- Third grade – DRA II, WIDA, AIMSweb, Raz-Kids, and M-Step
- Fourth through Sixth grade - WIDA, AIMSweb, Raz-Kids, and M-Step

DRA data is collected three times per year for benchmarking and every four weeks for progress monitoring. WIDA is an annual assessment. AIMSweb is collected three times per year for benchmarking.

Math Assessments:

- Kindergarten – AIMSweb and K-Pals (Note: We are exploring kindergarten screeners for future implementation)
- First & Second grade – AIMSweb, Rocket Math, Foundations
- Third through Sixth grade – AIMSweb, Rocket Math, Foundations, M-Step

AIMSweb is collected three times per year for benchmarking and every four weeks for progress monitoring. K-Pals and RocketMath is collected three times/week as part of an intensive math intervention. Foundations is collected on unit based progress.

Other Data/Metrics: In addition, we are also systematically collecting attendance, behavior, and suspension data (every two weeks) to guide our continuous improvement process. The lead team collecting this data includes the Student Assistant Provider, administrators, PEACE grant and Restorative Justice personnel.

iCollaborate data (collected at twice per year) will give teachers and administrators a keen sense of ways to improve the "how" and increase meaningful instructional time. As noted, classroom observation data is conducted in each classroom by a trained data coach with the web-based observation instrument. This data provides teachers with valuable, quantifiable information regarding how children spend their day. The data permits teachers to reflect critically on their instructional practices. Driven by this data, job-embedded support is provided to teachers in the form of instructional/data coaching. A similar process of data collection will be used to evaluate SIOP implementation with fidelity. This practice will inform teachers about their lesson planning and delivery process.

9. Sustaining Reforms (maximum length 2 pages)

Describe how the reforms from the selected intervention will be sustained in this school after the funding period ends. How will capacity be increased as a result of receiving the grant, and what commitment(s) will be made to sustain reforms after the grant period ends?

9: Sustainability and building capacity are the result of a well-planned and purposeful comprehensive program design with coherence, and careful planning. The interventions and strategies described in this plan are grounded in relevant school data, and are steeped in a comprehensive rapid turnaround. The selection of the Turnaround Model (to augment the existing Turnaround plan) was not arbitrary, and as resources and conditions change, as they most certainly will, consistency in programming and the structures supporting this work is assured. The interventions and strategies outlined in this application are aligned with school and district Title I, Title II, Title III, Section 31a, and Regional Assistance Grant allocations, as well as the DIP which ensures multiple viable funding streams after the grant period ends.

Capacity building in the leaders (district and building) as well as other members of the staff will be developed through the site-based support of highly-skilled members of the SIG team. These members have been selected after careful revision of credentials, areas of expertise and prior involvement with SIG implementation in other schools throughout the district. They include SIG III and IV Coordinators, Data Coaches, and Family and Community Liaisons, School Principal, Director of Special Populations, Executive Director of School Improvement and IISD coaches. The on-going, job-embedded, training and support provided by these individuals over the first five years of full implementation will result in new knowledge and skill acquisition by members of the leadership team and staff. Additionally, a solid foundation for changes in the structure and day-to-day operations of the school (i.e., PLCs, IIBlocks, Multi-Tiered Support System, ESL strategies and the use of data) will remain after the grant period ends.

The SIG V sustainability plan was the launching off point for how this grant application was written and developed. The plan was developed by the SIG V writing and planning team, that is comprised of district and building leaders, as well as community partners. As the grant process continues to unfold additional stakeholders will be invited to assist us in refining and improving our sustainability plan. Those stakeholders will be selected based on (a) their knowledge of plan components, (b) their professional expertise (e.g., state and federal funding regulations, and (c) their connection to the school and community. As noted elsewhere in the application, we anticipate Ingham ISD providing support as the ESP. And by utilizing both SIG and RAG funds, it is the goal of LSD and IISD to develop a sustainable and transferable K to 6th grade model that can be reproduced throughout Lansing and, perhaps, the county. Because we are submitting a targeted application that augments an existing Turnaround plan with the Turnaround Model, we are submitting a SIG V application with a streamlined budget but are asking MDE to consider continued RAG funding. This would allow us to leverage RAG funds to continue the highly impactful work which began during the 2015-2016 school year. Diversifying the funding streams, at the onset of the grant, will allow for greater long-term sustainability.

Our sustainability plan ensures that after the grant cycle has ended the leadership team will have the capacity, structures, and resources in place to support continuous improvement in teaching and learning. Additionally, the plan ensures that there will be multiple funding options available to ensure the most effective practices and supports remain in place. **Table 9** details some of the major components of the selected reform model and how they will be sustained after the duration of the grant.

| Table 9: Sustaining Major Components of the Plan | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| EBS | Description | Sustainability Plan | Continued Funding |
| SIG Coordinator | Responsible for grant management and oversight | Shift to the Executive Director of School Improvement and Director of Special Populations | Title I Priority |
| Family & Community Liaison/Resource Coordinator | Building relationships with families and community partners to support reforms | Capacity will be built in building principal and staff, funding for Communities in Schools Program | School Categorical Funds |
| Professional Learning (PLCs) | Facilitated teacher collaboration time to examine data and share best practices | PLCs will remain on Wednesday delayed start days | Title I & II |
| SIOP Coach | Support on going training and implementation | Capacity will be built in building principal | Title III |
| EDU-SNAP Data Collection | The systemic collection of instructional process data. | Capacity will be built in building principal and staff | Title II |
| EDU-SNAP Data Coaching | Site-based coaching to support teachers in improving instructional practices. | Fewer days of direct site-based support | Title II |
| Extended Year | 16 days of additional instruction in core academic areas during the summer. | Student would participate in district extended year | Title I & Title I Priority |
| Afterschool Programming | 4 hours for 30 weeks/year of supplemental instructional time (content area & language acquisition) | Afterschool programs will continue at a reduced capacity unless further outside grant funding becomes available | Title I, Title III, 31a, new grant resources |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| Partners in Education | Monthly workshops will be offered to parents following the Dual Capacity-Building Framework as suggested by the US Department of Education | Parent Advisory Council will be trained and asked to fundraise to support sustainability of program | School supported fundraising efforts |
| Parents as Educational Partners (PEP) | Monthly workshops will be offered to English Learner parents following the PEP program | Parent Advisory Council will be trained and asked to fundraise to support sustainability of program | School supported fundraising efforts |

The Lansing School District is committed to maintaining (and even scaling-up) those practices and structures which prove to have a positive impact on student achievement through the use of other available funding sources including local, state, and federal funds.

10. Budget Narrative and Preliminary Budget Overview

Provide narrative for this section that describes the following:

a. Description of appropriate staffing and activities to support the intervention model at the school level for the full five years of the grant. Indicate the school is selecting 5 year budget option 1 as detailed in 4.b below. (maximum length 1 page)

i. Appropriate FTEs by enrollment must be documented for SIG funded positions.

10a: SIG Coordinator: The SIG Coordinator position will be **1.0 SIG-funded FTE**. This position will coordinate, monitor and report on all services and programs pertaining to the implementation of the Turnaround Model. Additional SIG oversight and management will be provided by the Executive Director of School Improvement and Director of Special Populations. This individual will work with the building principal, school leadership team and staff to support and oversee all aspects of plan implementation and monitoring. For a detailed description of this position please see **Section 4b** or **Attachment H.1**.

Data Coach: Because of our specialized vision for the data coaching role (i.e., be trained in the EDU-SNAP data collection instrument), the data coach will be at the equivalent of a **.5 SIG-funded FTE**. The data coach will work with small groups of teachers and/or instructional leaders in analyzing data and using data to differentiate instruction. For a detailed description of this position please see **Section 4b** or **Attachment H.2**.

Family & Community Liaison/Resource Coordinator: Because of the exceedingly important connection between school and home (especially in the early years) the Family & Community Liaison/Resource Coordinator will be a **1.0 SIG-funded FTE**. The Family and Community Liaison/Resource Coordinator will assist in recruiting parents as volunteers within the school (e.g., classroom volunteers) for the purpose of increasing parent participation and student achievement. The Liaison will also collaborate with school staff and community partners to develop programs and classes to support parents and students outside of school (i.e., Parent University). For a detailed description of this position **Section 4b** or **Attachment H.3**.

Due to space constraints, we have opted to use the remaining space to detail only one of the several additional positions we are building into our plan. The other job descriptions and specific strategies and activities are included in subsequent areas of the grant application. See **Sections 3e, 4b, 4d, and 6** of this application and **Attachments H**.

SIOP Coach: This position will be a **1.0 SIG-funded FTE**. This individual will be responsible to support SIOP implementation with fidelity. The SIOP coach is responsible for improving the ESL Program Service Delivery to maximize comprehensive opportunities for the English learners (ELs) to achieve language acquisition and core content standards. Direct services include the following: collaborative planning instruction for the ELs; modeling strategies; demonstrating sample lessons; developing professional development sessions for teachers and administrators; making resources available; and monitoring ELs academic achievement. For a detailed description of this position please see **Attachment H.4**.

b. How the school’s yearly budgets and activities will differ over the five year period of the grant. Indicate at the beginning of the narrative the school will use option 1 detailed below. (maximum length 2 pages)

i. Option 1: 1 Year of pre-implementation/planning not to exceed \$500,000, 3 years of full implementation not to exceed \$750,000 annually, and 1 year of sustaining reforms not to exceed \$500,000.

1. How will the Year 1 pre-implementation and planning activities differ from what will be budgeted for full implementation in years 2-4 and sustaining reforms in Year 5?

NOTE: schools selecting this option may not use the pre-implementation/planning year to research and select the intervention model. The intervention model must have been selected prior to the start of the grant.

Schools choosing this option are required to submit a “*Plan for Full Implementation*” to the MDE by July 1, 2016. Funding for years 2-5 are dependent on MDE approval of the *Plan for Full Implementation*. More information will be provided at a later date.

10b: This application represents a coordinated and intentionally targeted grant application. It is intended to be funded in full in order to realize the resource efficiencies embedded in the implementation of the Turnaround Model as described throughout the application. Because so much of this work builds upon existing work underway we have decided to select **Option #1** with one year of pre-implentation, three years of full implementation and one year of sustainability.

Year 1 – 2016/17 (Pre-Implementation): The purpose of year 1 is to best serve our schools and students, both in the short-term (rapid change) and long-term (sustainability). We are submitting a targeted budget that augments the existing Turnaround plan with the Turnaround Model as such this budget reflects little district-level oversight and fiscal compliance costs. (Note: Oversight and fiscal compliance will be provided in-kind or through existing categorically funded positions within the district). At the district level only indirect at 4.51% is being taken out in order to streamline the budget and ensure that every possible dollar is used to support student and teachers in the implementation of the grant activities. Staffing constitutes the bulk of our SIG V budget. During Year 1, there will be a total of 3.5 FTEs added to the building between the SIG Coordinator, Data

Coach, Family/Community Liaison/Resource Coordinator, and SIOP Coach. These individuals will provide site-based support and build capacity within existing leadership and staff to sustain reform efforts. Contracted service line items have also been built in to support our use of the EDU-SNAP classroom observation tools, provide on-going job-embedded PD, and ESP support through Ingham ISD. Additional hours for 16 days of extended learning, 30 weeks of after school tutoring along with materials and supplies, and transportation have also been included. Finally, we have also built in line items for supplemental curriculum and assessment materials.

Years 2,3, & 4 – 2017/20 (Full Implementation): The parent component increases allocations to fully implement both areas of the program (native English speakers and newcomers). Bilingual Instructional Assistants, Cultural Brokers, contracted services, experiential learning opportunities, transportation, supplies and materials, refreshments and additional hours are all added to years 2 through 4. Note: Adjustments may be made based on the impact of interventions and student achievement.

Years 5 – 2020/21(Sustainability): The changes in the budget for Year 5 represent an intentional, and strategic, scaling-back of resources and support. As detailed in **Table 9: Sustaining Major Components of the Plan** many elements of the plan remain in place, but funding streams are shifted or the level of support is scaled back. Staffing will be scaled back with the district and ISD taking on much more of the grant management and oversight work. During year 5 (Sustainability) there will be a total reduction of .5 FTE through the elimination of half time of the Family & Community Liaison/Resource Coordinator. Contracted service line items are scaled back and ISD-based support would return to being funded largely through RAG. Extended learning opportunities would continue to be offered through the district-based extended learning program, and supplemental curriculum and assessment materials, as well as technology, would be scaled back. Of course, every attempt will be made to maintain support and resources at the levels needed based on data-identified needs. Note: Adjustments may be made based on the impact of interventions and student achievement.

Reiteration of potential SIG/RAG Split: In order to best serve our school and students, and because we are submitting a targeted application that augments an existing Turnaround Plan with the Turnaround Model, we are submitted a SIG V application with a streamlined budget but are asking MDE to consider continued RAG funding. This would also us to leverage RAG funds to (a) continue the highly impactful work which began during the 2014-2015 school year and (b) add the much needed support and coordination of English acquisition services.

2014-2015 & 2015-2016 RAG Success and Why RAG should Continue in These Schools

- Implementation of comprehensive math interventions for all students.
 - Through the implementation of Rocket Math and Vanderbilt’s University’s K-Pals, LSD priority schools experience aggregate gains K-6 in foundational mathematic skills including math computation and math comprehension. Specifically in kindergarten classrooms, LSD priority schools saw an average of a 20% increase in oral counting, early numeracy, and math computation as measured by AIMSweb fall and spring benchmark assessment.
- Intervention Blocks
 - Henry H. North school implemented supplemental intervention time outside of core time to target specific data driven evidence-based interventions based on the individual needs of each student.
 - All certified staff assignments were prioritized to place the most skilled staff with the neediest students.
- Content Coaching

- Teachers experienced both on-site and ISD driven professional coaching and development towards better instructional practices.
- Building Walkthroughs
 - ISD personnel partnered with district personnel to conduct frequent walk-throughs to progress monitor and provide immediate feedback of RAG funded initiatives.

Proposed SIG/RAG Funding for 2016-2017

- LSD and IISD administration will collaboratively prioritize SIG and RAG funding to ensure that efforts are sustainable and have a high impact within each the classroom.
 - By utilizing both SIG and RAG funds, it is the goal of LSD and IISD to develop a sustainable and transferable K to 6th grade model that can be reproduced throughout Lansing and all 12 Ingham County Districts that serve large EL population.

c. Complete the preliminary building level budget overview for all five years of the grant (Attachment F.2)

Completed and included as **Attachment F.2.**

Attachments

Attachment A: Baseline Data (to be uploaded as a separate Excel file into MEGS+)

Attachment B: Intervention Model

Attachment C: Professional Development Calendar

Attachment D: SIG Timeline

Attachment E: Annual Goals

Attachment F.2: Budget Narrative

Attachment G: Assurances and Certifications

Attachment H: Job Descriptions

- H.1 - SIG Coordinator
- H.2 - Data Coach
- H.3 - Family Liaison/Resource Coordinator
- H.4 - SIOP Coach
- H.5 - ESL Teacher
- H.6 - Bilingual Instructional Assistant

Attachment A: Baseline Data (to be uploaded as a separate Excel file into MEGS+)

The SIG V baseline data collection is to be uploaded into MEGS+ as a separate Excel document. Do not insert here.

X Completed and uploaded into **MEGS+**.

Attachment B.2: Turnaround Model

The following items are required elements of the model. Describe how each element will be met. Responses must be in the sequence of requirements as listed (maximum length 5 pages).

NOTE: If applying for the rural school exemption, reference your response to question 6.d. for the element that is being modified.

1. Replace the principal.

Mr. Ariel Rodriguez-Pena became North's principal in 2015-16. After an intensive interview and screening process.

2. Use locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet student needs.

Teachers in the Lansing School District are evaluated using the Charlotte Danielson model of teacher effectiveness and 25% of their teacher evaluation is based on student achievement (i.e., student growth) scores. Principals will be evaluated using an instrument (School Advance) collaboratively agreed upon with the administrators' union and will adhere to the same robust student achievement standards outlined in the teacher evaluation tool.

The student growth data collected includes both formative and summative assessments.

- Formative include (but are not limited to): Basal pretests, DRA II (as a reading level check and universal screener), curriculum embedded assessment and teacher-made assessments approved at the district level.
- Summative include (but are not limited to): Basal post-tests, AIMSweb, M-STEP, DRA II, end-of-year, and teacher-made assessments approved at the district level.

3. Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent.

The Lansing School District, in collaboration with the building leadership, screened staff for placement in the building in the fall of 2015 based on the following criteria: commitment to school vision, mission, and goals; previous teacher evaluation ratings; relevant/specialized training; and demonstrated ability to work effectively in the classroom with all students. Given that Henry H. North Elementary is located in an economically depressed urban environment and teachers are expected to work with students that have limited access to academic and social supports, and a high percentage of students (57% in 2015-2016) are English learners. The screening and hiring process at Henry H. North also factors in individuals' ability to work in a diverse environment and build strong relationships with students and families. The process used to screen staff is modeled after the process that was developed in the district to screen staff for our magnet schools. The screening process includes a compact, writing sample, interview, facilitated data dialogue, and lesson presentation.

4. Select new staff.

Actual recruitment strategies include posting positions on the district website, posting positions on a local consortium website which is viewed by individuals across the state and linked to professional organizations, and reaching out to individuals through personal networks and community organizations. Specifically, we consider cultural proficiencies and instructional strengths that match best practices related to the specific learning needs of EL students. The principal at Henry H. North has "right of assignment"

within the building, therefore he has the ability to assign personnel within his building to meet the unique needs of the students. Furthermore, the building principals and school improvement team are provided operational flexibility in regards to the use of building (and some district) set-aside funds. These funds can be used (if student need and data suggest appropriate) to provide supplemental support to buildings by recruiting individuals to serve as school assistance providers, behavior intervention monitors, content coaches in core academic areas, and math and literacy specialists, etc.

Specifically, the selection process includes: *Compact* – candidates sign a compact that outlines the major commitments, responsibilities, and expectations for the building staff; *Writing Exercise* – candidates complete three short-response questions which provide the selection committee with writing samples/information about the candidate’s approach to the work; *Group Data Exercise* – candidates participate in a facilitated conversation with a small group. The group will interpret data and develop strategies for providing targeted student interventions; *Lesson Explanation* – candidates complete a lesson explanation in which they showcase best practices and sound instructional planning; and *Interview* – candidates respond to a small set of questions developed by the selection committee in order to gather information about professional experience and expertise. While the selection process is coordinated by the Department of Human Resources, it is done in collaboration with building principals and the Instructional Division of the Central Office.

5. Implement strategies such as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions.

Because Henry H. North has opted for a Turnaround Plan, one of the most important retention incentives is the opportunity for teachers to design and build this program from the ground up. In addition, district and building leadership team members are exploring retention incentives such as increased opportunities to collaborate, access to high-quality classroom technology, and annual membership to the local YMCA. During the 2015-2016 school year, the Lansing School District did implement a district-wide teacher attendance incentive.

6. Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job embedded Professional Development aligned with instructional program and designed with school staff.

Professional development focuses on two instructional process instruments: Snapshot and CLASS. The Snapshot is a time interval instrument that codifies the students' classroom experience; percentage of time the student is in a particular activity setting, percentage of time in a particular content area; percentage of time a student is subjected to a particular teaching approach; percentage of time a student is not engaged in any kind of instruction. CLASS is a rubric-based classroom observation instrument that determines the extent to which there is positive/negative climate; development of content; and classroom productivity. The data from these two instruments serve as the focus for collaborative inquiry about how to improve instructional practices, increase learning time, and provide a seamless transition from one grade to the next.

With a focus on educating linguistically diverse students in an urban environment, we will utilize 90 minutes of focused collaboration and PD per week (captured through an early release one day per week). This time will be used to expand on effective instructional strategies and teacher collaboration to develop the skills among all staff in meeting the needs of a unique student population. In addition, Henry H. North will also make effective use of existing screening tools, progress monitoring tools, and system for analyzing student achievement data through their Multi-Tiers Systems of Support (MTSS).

SIOP Training (Related to Big Ideas #1 and #2)

SIOP is a research-based and validated model of sheltered instruction that has been widely and successfully used across the U.S. for over 15 years. Professional development in the SIOP Model helps teachers plan and deliver lessons that allow English learners to acquire academic knowledge as they

develop English language proficiency. Instructional staff is to be trained and certified in SIOP. Interventions will be driven by student achievement data. In order to scaffold teacher learning, SIOP training dates have been scheduled for the 2016-2017 school year for new staff and current staff who need additional support. Teachers will also receive opportunities to adjust instruction based on feedback from the SIOP Coach, their colleagues and building principal. Principal has SIOP implementation checklists and protocols for use during weekly walkthroughs.

Tier 1 Instruction (Related to Big Ideas #1 and #2)

The instructional program is aligned with the district pacing guides. The staff meets in grade level teams, content teams and with grades below and above to ensure consistency in the delivery of instruction, the implementation of instructional learning cycles, and creation of common assessments.

Intervention Blocks (Related to Big Idea #2)

Henry H. North can further increase student achievement and engagement through the effective use of existing screening tools, progress monitoring tools, and analyzing student achievement data. Staff will continue to be trained on a research-based, three-tiered model of prevention and intervention through an Instructional Intervention Blocks (IIBlock) practice of providing high quality instruction and interventions matched to student needs, monitoring progress frequently to make decisions about changes in instruction or goals and applying student response data to important educational decisions. The IIBlock structure allows staff to make instructional decisions in general, remedial and special education, creating a well-integrated system of instruction/intervention guided by student outcome data. The Professional Learning Communities also meet with building principal and ISD coaches to evaluate and assess student achievement and instructional strategies.

Please see PD Calendar for a description of training topics, timelines, and responsible parties.

7. Adopt a new governance structure. (May include turnaround office/turnaround leader who reports to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer.)

The Executive Director of School Improvement works closely in support of plan implementation. Job responsibilities for this individual include coordinating plan implementation between building and district leaders. This individual is tasked with monitoring plan implementation on a monthly basis in conjunction with the SRO monitor and ISD partners. Updates are provided regularly to district-level administrators through written reports and regular meetings. The Executive Director of School Improvement is also part of the school support team meetings which are coordinated through the intermediate school district, and is tasked with drafting the quarterly board reports. Adjustments to plan implementation and strategies are made based in an on-going manner, based on data (i.e., implementation indicator data, walkthrough data, outcome data, etc.).

Another governance structure already detailed in this document is the steering committee. The committee will be composed of five to seven members including teachers, family members, and community partners. This committee will meet, at least, quarterly to review SIG related data, share perceptions about implementation, and provide feedback about on-going program adjustments. The committee could also participate in periodic school walk-throughs and formal monitoring of SIG-related program implementation.

8. Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as with State academic standards.

A comprehensive review of wide-ranging data from previous years demonstrates the need to focus on the areas of increasing student engagement, improving core instruction, and helping students realize the purpose of schooling in order to create a cadre of college and career ready learners. Big ideas were identified through a series of facilitated data-based dialogues with the principal, teacher-leaders, district

representatives, and ISD partners. Data that was used included Golden Package MEAP results, AIMSweb screeners, DRA II, math fact tests and iCollaborate Snapshot and CLASS data. Most recently, focus has targeted M-STEP results and WIDA outcomes.

Henry H. North can also continue to increase student achievement and engagement through the effective use of Data Walls that are posted and shared in common areas of the school. The Data Walls are an effective way to visually communicate our school academic and behavior progress towards goal achievement not only to students and staff, but also to parents and stakeholders.

9. Promote continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction to meet student needs.

With assistance and monitoring of Lansing central office personnel, a partnership between the central office and North's Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) ensures that data is readily available and used effectively at all levels of decision-making and instruction. The staff at Henry H. North participates in weekly PLC driven, job-embedded PD with the use of late start Wednesdays. With a weekly meeting format and various forms of data, including summative assessments such as unit tests, AIMSweb, WIDA and M-STEP data, and formative assessments such as DRA, Raz-Kids, Foundations and Study Island, teachers employ data in whole-staff, grade-level, and subject-area collaborative time focused on examining performance trends among all students.

At Henry H. North, we also use SIOP Walkthrough Checklists and iCollaborate/Snapshot data to monitor the delivery of instruction and the degree of student engagement twice a year. Every 9 weeks, these data points inform general instruction, or Tier I, for what whole group content and skill need attentions, in addition to what targeted student-groups need more intensive instruction in Tiers II and III. This aggregate data is provided to the ILT in order to identify school-wide trends and also to assist in the ability grouping of students who need more intensive instruction.

10. Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time.

Student learning time increases in multiple ways. We maximize instructional time by increasing multiple modalities of instruction to allow for deep engagement in learning activities; minimize lesson transitions (via assigning academically-oriented tasks during transition time), use data-driven instruction, and implementing research-based MTSS interventions. In this way, we anticipate recapturing approximately 10 minutes of instruction per day.

Enrichment opportunities are addressed via emphasis on enrichment activities in all core areas. Enrichment provides students at Henry H. North with an opportunity to transfer learning in an interdisciplinary fashion. Monitoring this implementation is accomplished through PLC discussion and reporting out structures. Increased enrichment is required for all students. The Henry H. North school improvement team, continues to explore additional opportunities to provide enrichment through after school, extended year programming, and intersession opportunities. The district will use the 20% set-aside for this effort.

11. Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.

Complete wrap-around services and supports for all students are provided. The ILT assists the principal and SAP in coordinating supports and activities for students via monthly meetings. This time is used to discuss both individual students and school-wide needs for social, emotional, and community services.

The SAP continues to coordinate a behavior intake system (BIS) and child study team (CST) that closely monitor and assign supports to students referred by teachers. The collaboration of the BIS and CST

teams functions as an initial screener to direct additional instructional supports for teachers for assisting particular students and/or further referral to possible cognitive/emotional testing or out-side community services. In addition, the PEACE Grant provides expertise in the areas of culture and climate, trauma, and developing positive behavior skills.

There is a school wide focus on Culturally Responsive Positive Behavior Intervention System (CRPBIS). All students are given lessons to model expected positive behaviors in various areas of the school building, busses, playground, and lunch room, and they are rewarded for positive behaviors in many ways. There are numerous diversity fairs and common core curriculum nights that connect school to families in a positive way for behaviors and academic successes. A student-led leadership team mentors younger students and serves as role models. The entire staff will be trained in CHAMPS, and will conduct a book study through the PLC block of time.

We will conduct a monthly Parent Volunteer group training to enable them to support the IIBlock and to build continued partnerships. The Henry H. North staff will also have at least 3 dedicated all-staff collaboration sessions to enlist and develop strategies for community supports throughout the year. These sessions will be used as a vehicle for streamlining community supports via local churches, mental health centers, and community organizations.

For additional details, please refer to North's MDE approved (January 2015) Turnaround Plan.

Attachment C: Professional Development Calendar

Note: This calendar reflects a tentative set of topics and responsible parties associated with each of the weekly delayed start (120 minutes) PD opportunities.

| Professional Development Calendar for 2016-2017 | | |
|---|---|--|
| Month & Week | Tentative PD Topic | Who is responsible? |
| September (W1) | MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs) | Principal; SIT; ISD |
| September (W2) | iCollaborate (PLCs) | District; SIT; Data Coach |
| September (W3) | SIOP Training (PLCs) | Coach, Principal, ESL Steering Committee, Bilingual Department |
| September (W4) | MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs) | Principal; SIT; ISD |
| October (W1) | iCollaborate (PLCs) | District; SIT; Data Coach |
| October (W2) | SIOP Training (PLCs) | Coach, Principal, ESL Steering Committee, Bilingual Department |
| October (W3) | MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs) | Principal; SIT; ISD |
| October (W4) | iCollaborate (PLCs) | District; SIT; Data Coach |
| November (W1) | SIOP Training (PLCs) | Coach, Principal, ESL Steering Committee, Bilingual Department |
| November (W2) | MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs) | Principal; SIT; ISD |
| November (W3) | iCollaborate (PLCs) | District; SIT; Data Coach |
| November (W4) | Thanksgiving Break | |
| December (W1) | SIOP Training (PLCs) | Coach, Principal, ESL Steering Committee, Bilingual Department |
| December (W2) | MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs) | Principal; SIT; ISD |
| December (W3) | Winter Break | |
| December (W4) | Winter Break | |
| January (W1) | Winter Break | |

| | | |
|---------------|---|--|
| January (W2) | iCollaborate (PLCs) | District; SIT; Data Coach |
| January (W3) | SIOP Coaching & Grade /Proficiency Level Collaboration (PLCs) | Coach, Principal, ESL Steering Committee, Bilingual Department |
| January (W4) | MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs) | Principal; SIT; ISD |
| February (W1) | iCollaborate (PLCs) | District; SIT; Data Coach |
| February (W2) | SIOP Coaching & Grade /Proficiency Level Collaboration (PLCs) | Coach, Principal, ESL Steering Committee, Bilingual Department |
| February (W3) | MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs) | Principal; SIT; ISD |
| February (W4) | iCollaborate (PLCs) | District; SIT; Data Coach |
| March (W1) | SIOP Coaching & Grade /Proficiency Level Collaboration (PLCs) | Coach, Principal, ESL Steering Committee, Bilingual Department |
| March (W2) | MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs) | Principal; SIT; ISD |
| March (W3) | iCollaborate (PLCs) | District; SIT; Data Coach |
| March (W4) | SIOP Coaching & Grade /Proficiency Level Collaboration (PLCs) | Coach, Principal, ESL Steering Committee, Bilingual Department |
| April (W1) | Spring Break | |
| April (W2) | MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs) | Principal; SIT; ISD |
| April (W3) | iCollaborate (PLCs) | District; SIT; Data Coach |
| April (W4) | SIOP Coaching & Grade /Proficiency Level Collaboration (PLCs) | Coach, Principal, ESL Steering Committee, Bilingual Department |
| May (W1) | MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs) | Principal; SIT; ISD |
| May (W2) | iCollaborate (PLCs) | District; SIT; Data Coach |
| May (W3) | SIOP Coaching & Grade /Proficiency Level Collaboration (PLCs) | Coach, Principal, ESL Steering Committee, Bilingual Department |
| May (W4) | MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs) | Principal; SIT; ISD |
| June (W1) | iCollaborate (PLCs) | District; SIT; Data Coach |
| June (W2) | SIOP Evaluation (PLCs) | Coach, Principal, ESL Steering Committee, Bilingual Department |

Attachment D: SIG Timeline

| SIG IV 5-Year Timeline | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| Action Step | Person Responsible | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Success metric |
| Principal with HR and DSP establish job descriptions and postings for SIG-funded positions | Principal & DSP & HR | Within 2 week of notice of grant award | As needed | As needed | As needed | As needed | All positions filled within 60 days of grant notification |
| Align grant timelines with grant budget approval dates | Principal & DSP & SIG Coordinator | Within 2 weeks of notice of grant award | On-Going | On-Going | On-Going | On-Going | Grant timeline posted and communicated |
| * Develop contract service agreements & ESP Contract | DSP & Associate Superintendent & Building Principal | No later than 30 days after award notification | Annually evaluate & renewal as needed | Interventions and support will be operationalized 45 days after notification |
| * Finalize PD calendar and coordinate cross-building training | Building Principal & SIG Coordinator | No later than 30 days after award notification | Annually develop PD calendar - May | Shared PD Calendar |
| School-wide SIG orientation (new staff & families) | Building Principal & SIG Coordinator | Within 2 week of notice of grant award | Annually as needed | Annually as needed | Annually as needed | Annually as needed | Presentation; Flyers; and Informational Materials |
| Purchase SIG technology | Building Principal; DII; Finance; SIG Coordinator | Purchases submitted by school and posted on MEGS+ 90 days after notification | October 1 annually | October 1 annually | October 1 annually | October 1 annually | 80% of grant funded technology purchased by end of first semester annually - School SIG Inventory records |
| * Implement Tier I, II and III academic support interventions | Building Principal; Teachers; DSP; ISD | No later than 30 days after award notification | Annually evaluate & adjust as needed | All students will receive Tier I, II or III academic support based on performance data |
| Implement parent and community engagement strategies – Parent U | Building Principal & Family Liaison/Resource Coordinator | No later than 30 days after FCL is hired | September 15 annually | September 15 annually | September 15 annually | September 15 annually | 85 % of parents will be actively engaged in no fewer than 2 school activities |

| SIG IV 5-Year Timeline (continued) | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| Action Step | Person Responsible | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Success metric |
| SIG Staff Evaluation | Building Principal | Annual evaluation reports submitted spring | HR records show all staff evaluations completed |
| ESP Program review & Evaluation | DSP & Building Principal & DII | Quarterly with adjustments as needed | Written feedback for ESP and adjustments made within 30 days |
| Annual SIG Program Review & Evaluation | DSP & Building Principal & DII | Annually evaluate & adjust as needed - May | Annually evaluate & adjust as needed - May | Annually evaluate & adjust as needed - May | Annually evaluate & adjust as needed - May | Annually evaluate & adjust as needed - May | Written feedback from DII and adjustments |
| Weekly SIG grant update to Superintendent's ET | Executive Director of School Improvement | On-Going | On-Going | On-Going | On-Going | On-Going | Written reports and verbal updates to Superintendent as requested |
| Quarterly SIG grant update to BoE | Building Principal & SIG Coordinator | Quarterly | Quarterly | Quarterly | Quarterly | Quarterly | Written Quarterly Reports delivered to BOE and MDE |
| Monthly grant so spend down report for SIG director and SIG coordinators | Building Principal; DII; Finance; SIG Coordinator | First of the month | Timely reporting of grant fiscal status |
| Annual benchmark & leading indicators reports | Building Principal & SIG Coordinator | Annually as determined by MDE | Submission of data reports to MDE on time 95%+ |
| Align annual SIP, Title I, Title IIa reports and budgets to SIG plans | Building Principal; DII; SIG Coordinator | Annually as determined by MDE | Submission of data reports to MDE on time 95%+ |
| * Denotes activities, practices, structures, and procedures that are already in place due to previous priority school identification. | | | | | | | |

Attachment E: Annual Goals

| | Current Proficiency Rate 2015-2016 | Goal for 2016-2017 | Goal for 2017-2018 | Goal for 2018-19 | Goal for 2019-20 | Goal for 2020-21 |
|----------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Reading | 72% | 75% | 78% | 81% | 84% | ≥85% |
| Mathematics | 46% | 54% | 62% | 70% | 78% | ≥85% |
| Writing | 52% | 59% | 66% | 73% | 80% | ≥85% |
| Social Studies | 11% | 26% | 41% | 56% | 71% | ≥85% |
| Science | 9% | 24% | 39% | 54% | 70% | ≥85% |

| Henry H. North Elementary | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Local Formative Assessments | Fall Benchmark | Winter Benchmark | Spring Benchmark |
| AIMSweb | ≥60+% | ≥85% or ↑ from Fall | ≥85% or ↑ from Winter |
| DRA II | ≥60+% | ≥85% or ↑ from Fall | ≥85% or ↑ from Winter |

Attachment F.2:

Preliminary School Budget OPTION 1

NOTE: Preliminary budgets are for planning and review purposes only. **Initial approval** of the grant application **does not grant explicit approval to preliminary budget items**. Final approval of SIG budget items occurs in the Michigan Electronic Grants System Plus (MEGS+) and is subject to Title I rules of supplement vs. supplant, tests of allowability, and reasonable and necessary expenditures to support the approved reform model. **Inclusion of an item in the preliminary budget does not guarantee it will be approved as a line item submitted in MEGS+.**

LEAs may apply for School Improvement grants for each individual eligible school building within their jurisdiction. For the purposes of this grant, eligible school buildings are Title I eligible or Title I receiving Priority or Focus schools.

A separate budget overview is required for each building. Please use duplicate pages as necessary. The budget must cover the five-year period of the grant, with each year separate and distinct from the preceding year. Budgets that do not distinguish between the five years of the grant will be considered incomplete and will receive reduced scores accordingly.

There are two options allowed for the five-year grant period. These are detailed below:

Option 1 Overview:

- Year 1: Pre-implementation and planning not to exceed \$500,000. These activities comprise the budget for year 1.
- Years 2-4: Full implementation not to exceed \$1 million annually. Each year of implementation requires a separate budget.
- Year 5: Sustaining SIG funded reforms not to exceed \$500,000. Sustainable activities comprise the year 5 budget.

The following general guidelines must be adhered to in creating the school budget:

- External service provider expenditures should not exceed 30% of the total annual building award.
- Personnel expenditures should not exceed 30% of the total annual building award.
- Technology expenditures should not exceed 20% of the total annual building award.
- Professional development expenditures should not exceed 20% of the total annual building award.

Use the supplied template on the following page to complete the school level budget overview.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT PRELIMINARY BUDGET FORM

OPTION 1

Pre-implementation/planning in Year 1, full implementation in Years 2 - 4, and Sustaining Reforms in Year 5.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please complete a School Improvement Grant Preliminary Budget Overview **for EACH building**. Annual budgets are submitted in MEGS+ for final review and approval by MDE.

NOTE: Approval of the preliminary budget in the review process **does not guarantee** preliminary budget items will be **approved** in the final budget in MEGS+.

Legal Name of District Applicant Lansing School District

District Code: 33020

Budget Summary for: **Henry H. North School**

Building Code: **06662**

5 Year School Preliminary Budget Overview

| GRANT YEAR | MAXIMUM | SALARIES | BENEFITS | PURCHASED SERVICES | SUPPLIES & MATERIALS | OTHER EXPENDITURES | TOTAL EXPENDITURES |
|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | \$500,000 | 238515 | 153758 | 70150 | 9500 | 28077 | 500000 |
| 2 | \$750,000 | 365834 | 250336 | 84015 | 9000 | 40815 | 750000 |
| 3 | \$750,000 | 365834 | 250336 | 84015 | 9000 | 40815 | 750000 |
| 4 | \$750,000 | 365834 | 250336 | 84015 | 9000 | 40815 | 750000 |
| 5 | \$500,000 | 206015 | 131758 | 82550 | 9500 | 28077 | 457900 |
| GRAND TOTAL | \$3,250,000 | 1542032 | 1036524 | 404745 | 46000 | 178599 | 3207900 |

Year 1: Pre Implementation (may not exceed \$500,000)

| FUNCTION CODE | FUNCTION TITLE | SALARIES | BENEFITS | PURCHASED SERVICES | SUPPLIES & MATERIALS | CAPITAL OUTLAY | OTHER EXPENDITURES | TOTAL EXPENDITURES |
|----------------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 111 | Elementary | 43515 | 21758 | 11700 | 7500 | 0 | 3000 | 87473 |
| 112 | Middle/Junior High | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 113 | High School | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 118 | Pre-Kindergarten | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 119 | Summer School | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 211 | Truancy/Absenteeism Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 212 | Guidance Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 213 | Health Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 216 | Social Work Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 221 | Improvement of Instruction | 65000 | 44000 | 25200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 134200 |
| 225 | Instruction Related Technology | 0 | 0 | 16834 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16834 |
| 226 | Supervision and Direction of Instructional Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 227 | Academic Student Assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 233 | Grant Writer/Grant Procurement | 65000 | 44000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 241 | Office of the Principal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 249 | Other School Administration | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 250 | Support Services Business | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 257 | Internal Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 266 | Security Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 271 | Pupil Transportation Services | 0 | 0 | 11000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11000 |

| Year 1: Pre Implementation (may not exceed \$500,000) | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------|----------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| FUNCTION CODE | FUNCTION TITLE | SALARIES | BENEFITS | PURCHASED SERVICES | SUPPLIES & MATERIALS | CAPITAL OUTLAY | OTHER EXPENDITURES | TOTAL EXPENDITURES |
| 281 | Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 283 | Staff/Personnel Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 331 | Community Activities | 65000 | 44000 | 5416 | 2000 | 0 | 3500 | 119916 |
| | SUBTOTAL | 238515 | 153758 | 70150 | 9500 | 0 | 6500 | 478423 |
| | Indirect Costs 4.51% Restricted Rate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21577 | 21577 |
| | TOTAL | 238515 | 153758 | 70150 | 9500 | 0 | 28077 | 500000 |

| Year 2: Full Implementation (may not exceed \$750,000) | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------|----------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| FUNCTION CODE | FUNCTION TITLE | SALARIES | BENEFITS | PURCHASED SERVICES | SUPPLIES & MATERIALS | CAPITAL OUTLAY | OTHER EXPENDITURES | TOTAL EXPENDITURES |
| 111 | Elementary | 145391 | 106332 | 11700 | 5000 | 0 | 3700 | 272123 |
| 112 | Middle/Junior High | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 113 | High School | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 118 | Pre-Kindergarten | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 119 | Summer School | 10362 | 5182 | 0 | 1000 | 0 | 0 | 16544 |
| 211 | Truancy/Absenteeism Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 212 | Guidance Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 213 | Health Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 216 | Social Work Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 221 | Improvement of Instruction | 65000 | 44000 | 25200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 134200 |
| 225 | Instruction Related Technology | 0 | 0 | 20568 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20568 |
| 226 | Supervision and Direction of Instructional Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Year 2: Full Implementation (may not exceed \$750,000) | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|----------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| FUNCTION CODE | FUNCTION TITLE | SALARIES | BENEFITS | PURCHASED SERVICES | SUPPLIES & MATERIALS | CAPITAL OUTLAY | OTHER EXPENDITURES | TOTAL EXPENDITURES |
| 227 | Academic Student Assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 233 | Grant Writer/Grant Procurement | 65000 | 44000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 241 | Office of the Principal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 249 | Other School Administration | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 250 | Support Services Business | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 257 | Internal Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 266 | Security Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 271 | Pupil Transportation Services | 0 | 0 | 16900 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16900 |
| 281 | Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 283 | Staff/Personnel Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 331 | Community Activities | 80081 | 50822 | 9647 | 3000 | 0 | 4750 | 0 |
| | SUBTOTAL | 365834 | 250336 | 84015 | 9000 | 0 | 4750 | 16900 |
| | Indirect Costs 4.51% Restricted Rate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32365 | 32365 |
| | TOTAL | 365834 | 250336 | 84015 | 9000 | 0 | 40815 | 750000 |

| Year 3: Full Implementation (may not exceed \$750,000) | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|----------|----------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| FUNCTION CODE | FUNCTION TITLE | SALARIES | BENEFITS | PURCHASED SERVICES | SUPPLIES & MATERIALS | CAPITAL OUTLAY | OTHER EXPENDITURES | TOTAL EXPENDITURES |
| 111 | Elementary | 145391 | 106332 | 11700 | 5000 | 0 | 3700 | 272123 |
| 112 | Middle/Junior High | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 113 | High School | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 118 | Pre-Kindergarten | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Year 3: Full Implementation (may not exceed \$750,000) | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------|----------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| FUNCTION CODE | FUNCTION TITLE | SALARIES | BENEFITS | PURCHASED SERVICES | SUPPLIES & MATERIALS | CAPITAL OUTLAY | OTHER EXPENDITURES | TOTAL EXPENDITURES |
| 119 | Summer School | 10362 | 5182 | 0 | 1000 | 0 | 0 | 16544 |
| 211 | Truancy/Absenteeism Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 212 | Guidance Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 213 | Health Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 216 | Social Work Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 221 | Improvement of Instruction | 65000 | 44000 | 25200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 134200 |
| 225 | Instruction Related Technology | 0 | 0 | 20568 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20568 |
| 226 | Supervision and Direction of Instructional Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 227 | Academic Student Assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 233 | Grant Writer/Grant Procurement | 65000 | 44000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 241 | Office of the Principal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 249 | Other School Administration | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 250 | Support Services Business | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 257 | Internal Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 266 | Security Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 271 | Pupil Transportation Services | 0 | 0 | 16900 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16900 |
| 281 | Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 283 | Staff/Personnel Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 331 | Community Activities | 80081 | 50822 | 9647 | 3000 | 0 | 4750 | 0 |
| | SUBTOTAL | 365834 | 250336 | 84015 | 9000 | 0 | 4750 | 16900 |
| | Indirect Costs 4.51% Restricted Rate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32365 | 32365 |

| Year 3: Full Implementation (may not exceed \$750,000) | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| FUNCTION CODE | FUNCTION TITLE | SALARIES | BENEFITS | PURCHASED SERVICES | SUPPLIES & MATERIALS | CAPITAL OUTLAY | OTHER EXPENDITURES | TOTAL EXPENDITURES |
| | TOTAL | 365834 | 250336 | 84015 | 9000 | 0 | 40815 | 750000 |

| Year 4: Full Implementation (may not exceed \$750,000) | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| FUNCTION CODE | FUNCTION TITLE | SALARIES | BENEFITS | PURCHASED SERVICES | SUPPLIES & MATERIALS | CAPITAL OUTLAY | OTHER EXPENDITURES | TOTAL EXPENDITURES |
| 111 | Elementary | 145391 | 106332 | 11700 | 5000 | 0 | 3700 | 272123 |
| 112 | Middle/Junior High | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 113 | High School | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 118 | Pre-Kindergarten | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 119 | Summer School | 10362 | 5182 | 0 | 1000 | 0 | 0 | 16544 |
| 211 | Truancy/Absenteeism Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 212 | Guidance Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 213 | Health Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 216 | Social Work Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 221 | Improvement of Instruction | 65000 | 44000 | 25200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 134200 |
| 225 | Instruction Related Technology | 0 | 0 | 20568 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20568 |
| 226 | Supervision and Direction of Instructional Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 227 | Academic Student Assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 233 | Grant Writer/Grant Procurement | 65000 | 44000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 241 | Office of the Principal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 249 | Other School Administration | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 250 | Support Services Business | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Year 4: Full Implementation (may not exceed \$750,000) | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|----------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| FUNCTION CODE | FUNCTION TITLE | SALARIES | BENEFITS | PURCHASED SERVICES | SUPPLIES & MATERIALS | CAPITAL OUTLAY | OTHER EXPENDITURES | TOTAL EXPENDITURES |
| 257 | Internal Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 266 | Security Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 271 | Pupil Transportation Services | 0 | 0 | 16900 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16900 |
| 281 | Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 283 | Staff/Personnel Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 331 | Community Activities | 80081 | 50822 | 9647 | 3000 | 0 | 4750 | 0 |
| | SUBTOTAL | 365834 | 250336 | 84015 | 9000 | 0 | 4750 | 16900 |
| | Indirect Costs 4.51% Restricted Rate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32365 | 32365 |
| | TOTAL | 365834 | 250336 | 84015 | 9000 | 0 | 40815 | 750000 |

| Year 5: Sustaining (may not exceed \$500,000) | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|----------|----------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| FUNCTION CODE | FUNCTION TITLE | SALARIES | BENEFITS | PURCHASED SERVICES | SUPPLIES & MATERIALS | CAPITAL OUTLAY | OTHER EXPENDITURES | TOTAL EXPENDITURES |
| 111 | Elementary | 43515 | 21758 | 11700 | 7500 | 0 | 3000 | 87473 |
| 112 | Middle/Junior High | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 113 | High School | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 118 | Pre-Kindergarten | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 119 | Summer School | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 211 | Truancy/Absenteeism Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 212 | Guidance Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 213 | Health Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 216 | Social Work Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Year 5: Sustaining (may not exceed \$500,000) | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|----------|----------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| FUNCTION CODE | FUNCTION TITLE | SALARIES | BENEFITS | PURCHASED SERVICES | SUPPLIES & MATERIALS | CAPITAL OUTLAY | OTHER EXPENDITURES | TOTAL EXPENDITURES |
| 221 | Improvement of Instruction | 65000 | 44000 | 25200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 134200 |
| 225 | Instruction Related Technology | 0 | 0 | 29234 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29234 |
| 226 | Supervision and Direction of Instructional Staff | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 227 | Academic Student Assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 233 | Grant Writer/Grant Procurement | 32500 | 22000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 241 | Office of the Principal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 249 | Other School Administration | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 250 | Support Services Business | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 257 | Internal Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 266 | Security Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 271 | Pupil Transportation Services | 0 | 0 | 11000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11000 |
| 281 | Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 283 | Staff/Personnel Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 331 | Community Activities | 65000 | 44000 | 5416 | 2000 | 0 | 3500 | 119916 |
| | SUBTOTAL | 206015 | 131758 | 82550 | 9500 | 0 | 6500 | 478423 |
| | Indirect Costs 4.51% Restricted Rate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21577 | 21577 |
| | TOTAL | 206015 | 131758 | 82550 | 9500 | 0 | 28077 | 457900 |

Attachment G: ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: *Please review the assurances and certification statements that are listed below. Signatures on the application cover sheet indicate the applicant entity has read, understand, and agrees to the assurances and certifications herein.*

SPECIFIC PROGRAM ASSURANCES

The following provisions are understood by the recipients of the grants should it be awarded:

1. The LEA will use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in priority and focus school, which the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements.
2. The LEA will establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or priority and focus school, that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
3. The LEA will report to the MDE the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements, including baseline data for the year prior to SIG implementation.
4. The LEA will ensure that each priority and focus school that it commits to serve receives all of the State and local funds it would receive in the absence of the school improvement funds and that those resources are aligned with the interventions.
5. The grant award is approved and is not assignable to a third party without specific approval. Funds shall be expended in conformity with the budget. Line item changes and other deviations from the budget as attached to this grant agreement must have prior approval from the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation unit of the Michigan Department of Education.
6. The Michigan Department of Education is not liable for any costs incurred by the grantee prior to the issuance of the grant award.
7. Payments made under the provision of this grant are subject to audit by the grantor.
8. If the recipient implements a restart model in an eligible school, it must include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements.
9. The recipient must monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.
10. The recipient must monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and that it will provide technical assistance to schools on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING FOR GRANTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

No federal, appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of a federal agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any federal grant or cooperative agreement. If any funds other than federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member Of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form – LL*Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying*, in accordance with its instructions. The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the awards documents for all sub awards at all tiers (including sub grants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all sub recipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, INELIGIBILITY, AND VOLUNTARY EXCLUSION – LOWER TIER COVERED TRANSACTIONS

The prospective lower tier participant certifies, by submission of this proposal, that neither it nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participating in this transaction by any Federal department or agency. Where the prospective lower tier participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal. **OG-4929**

ASSURANCE WITH P.L. 111-117 OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION OMNIBUS APROPRIATION ACT OF 2010

When issuing statements, press releases, requests for proposals, solicitations, and other documents describing this project, the recipient shall state clearly: 1) the dollar amount of federal funds for the project, 2) the percentage of the total cost of the project that will be financed with federal funds, and 3) the percentage and dollar amount of the total cost of the project that will be financed by nongovernmental sources.

ASSURANCE CONCERNING MATERIALS DEVELOPED WITH FUNDS AWARDED UNDER THIS GRANT

The grantee assures that the following statement will be included on any publication or project materials developed with funds awarded under this program, including reports, films, brochures, and flyers: "These materials were developed under a grant awarded by the Michigan Department of Education."

CERTIFICATION REGARDING NONDISCRIMINATION UNDER FEDERALLY AND STATE ASSISTED PROGRAMS

The applicant hereby agrees that it will comply with all federal and Michigan laws and regulations prohibiting discrimination and, in accordance therewith, no person, on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, sex, marital status or handicap, shall be discriminated against, excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or otherwise be subjected to discrimination in any program or activity for which it is responsible or for which it receives financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education or the Michigan Department of Education.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA EQUAL ACCESS ACT, 20 U.S.C. 7905, 34 CFR PART 108.

A State or sub grantee that is a covered entity as defined in Sec. 108.3 of this title shall comply with the nondiscrimination requirements of the Boy Scouts of America Equal Access Act, 20 U.S.C. 7905, 34 CFR part 108.

PARTICIPATION OF NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

The applicant assures that private nonprofit schools have been invited to participate in planning and implementing the activities of this application.

ASSURANCE REGARDING ACCESS TO RECORDS AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

The applicant hereby assures that it will provide the pass-through entity, i.e., the Michigan Department of Education, and auditors with access to the records and financial statements as necessary for the pass-through entity to comply with Section 400 (d) (4) of the U.S. Department of Education Compliance Supplement for A-133.

ASSURANCE REGARDING COMPLIANCE WITH GRANT PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

The grantee agrees to comply with all applicable requirements of all State statutes, Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, policies and award conditions governing this program. The grantee understands and agrees that if it materially fails to comply with the terms and conditions of the grant award, the Michigan Department of Education may withhold funds otherwise due to the grantee from this grant program, any other federal grant programs or the State School Aid Act of 1979 as amended, until the grantee comes into compliance or the matter has been adjudicated and the amount disallowed has been recaptured (forfeited). The Department may withhold up to 100% of any payment based on a monitoring finding, audit finding or pending final report.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING TITLE II OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (A.D.A.), P.L. 101-336, STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provides comprehensive civil rights protections for individuals with disabilities. Title II of the ADA covers programs, activities, and services of public entities. Title II requires that, "No qualified individual with a disability shall, by reason of such disability be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by such entity." In accordance with Title II ADA provisions, the applicant has conducted a review of its employment and program/service delivery processes and has developed solutions to correcting barriers identified in the review.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING TITLE III OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (A.D.A.), P.L. 101-336, PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS AND COMMERCIAL FACILITIES

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provides comprehensive civil rights protections for individuals with disabilities. Title III of the ADA covers public accommodations (private entities that affect commerce, such as museums, libraries, private schools and day care centers) and only addresses existing facilities

and readily achievable barrier removal. In accordance with Title III provisions, the applicant has taken the necessary action to ensure that individuals with a disability are provided full and equal access to the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations offered by the applicant. In addition, a Title III entity, upon receiving a grant from the Michigan Department of Education, is required to meet the higher standards (i.e., program accessibility standards) as set forth in Title III of the ADA for the program or service for which they receive a grant.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING GUN-FREE SCHOOLS - Federal Programs (Section 4141, Part A, Title IV, NCLB)

The applicant assures that it has in effect a policy requiring the expulsion from school for a period of not less than one year of any student who is determined to have brought a weapon to school under the jurisdiction of the agency except such policy may allow the chief administering officer of the agency to modify such expulsion requirements for student on a case-by-case basis. (The term "weapon" means a firearm as such term is defined in Section 92` of Title 18, United States Code.)

The district has adopted, or is in the process of adopting, a policy requiring referral to the criminal or juvenile justice system of any student who brings a firearm or weapon to a school served by the agency.

AUDIT REQUIREMENTS

All grant recipients who spend \$500,000 or more in federal funds from one or more sources are required to have an audit performed in compliance with the Single Audit Act (effective July 1, 2003).

Further, the applicant hereby assures that it will direct its auditors to provide the Michigan Department of Education access to their audit work papers upon the request of the Michigan Department of Education.

ASSURANCE AGAINST TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS

The applicant assures that it adopts the requirements in the code of Federal Regulations at 2CFR 175 as a condition for this grant. You as a sub recipient under this award and your employees may not—

- I. Engage in severe forms of trafficking in persons during the period of time that the award is in effect,
- II. Procure a commercial sex act during the period of time that the award is in effect; or
- III. Use forced labor in the performance of the award or sub awards under the award,
- IV. Under this condition, the Federal awarding agency may terminate this grant without penalty for any violation of these prohibitions by the grantee, its employees or its sub recipients.

ASSURANCE REGARDING THE PROHIBITION OF TEXT MESSAGING AND EMAILING WHILE DRIVING DURING OFFICIAL FEDERAL GRANT BUSINESS

The applicant assures that it prohibits text messaging and emailing while driving during official grant business. Federal grant recipients, sub recipients and their grant personnel are prohibited from text messaging while driving a government owned vehicle, or while driving their own privately owned vehicle during official grant business, or from using government supplied electronic equipment to text message or email when driving.

Recipients must comply with these conditions under Executive Order 13513, "Federal Leadership on Reducing Text Messaging While Driving," October 1, 2009.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING UNIVERSAL IDENTIFIER REQUIREMENTS

The applicant or grant recipient certifies it will meet the requirement for supplying a Data Universal Numbering systems (DUNS) number. As a condition of a sub recipient of a federal grant award, you must supply a DUNS number to the MDE. No entity may receive a federal sub award without a DUNS number. The MDE will not make a sub award to an entity unless that entity has provided its DUNS number.

ASSURANCE REGARDING REPORTING SUBAWARD DATA FOR SUBRECIPIENTS

The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) is designed to increase transparency and improve the public's access to Federal government information. To this end, FFATA requires that sub award data be reported for all new Federal grants funded at \$25,000 or more with an award date on or after October 1, 2010.

IN ADDITION:

This project/program will not supplant nor duplicate an existing School Improvement Plan. In the case of priority schools already implementing a state approve reform/redesign plan, the grant will be used to supplement, expand, or otherwise substantially increase the efforts and work of the selected reform model. Grant funds shall not be used for a reform model that has not been approved by the Michigan Department of Education.

Attachments H: School Improvement Grant Funded Positions

Attachment H.1: SIG Coordinator

School Improvement Grant (SIG) Coordinator

Position Description

Qualifications Required:

1. Masters degree from an accredited college or university in education or an education-related field.
2. 5 to 7 years of successful teaching experience.
3. Prior experience leading school improvement planning, implementation, and progress monitoring.
4. Demonstrated knowledge of the state's accountability systems, categorical funding sources and regulations, and student achievement data.
5. Demonstrated knowledge of best practices and research related to Early Childhood Learning and Brain Research.
6. Demonstrated knowledge and understanding of research related to instructional strategies that support student achievement and engagement, especially for at-risk students.
7. Demonstrated ability to work with students, parents, school personnel, and community members to develop, and support the implementation of intervention strategies to increase student achievement and engagement.
8. Demonstrated ability to coordinate communication between district and school leaders, community members, and state and county partners to ensure timely implementation of school improvement initiatives.

Responsibilities:

1. Work with building principals, district transformation coordinator, and teacher leaders to support and oversee all aspects of SIG plan implementation and monitoring.
2. Work with the building principals to plan and coordinator program budgets in accordance with SIG and district guidelines.
3. Work with the Michigan Department of Education SIG Monitor to coordinate and complete SIG monitoring and compliance mandates and reports (e.g., leading and lagging, quarterly, and annual).
4. Ensure alignment between SIG and RR plans, as well as other district and building improvement efforts.
5. Support the development of tools and mechanisms to assess SIG implementation and impact.
6. Support categorical budget development and expenditures.

7. Work with the building principal, district transformation coordinator, and teacher leaders to develop and disseminate information on the School Improvement Grant.
8. Serve on any committees and councils concerned with the School Improvement Grant, as needed.
9. Communicate, coordinate, and support the work with external consultants on the implementation of SIG.
10. Facilitate parental involvement activities that meet SIG requirements with Family & Community Liaison.
11. Maintain a current and complete calendar of all SIG-related meetings.
12. Other SIG-related duties as assigned by the principal.

Data Coach

Contract Service

Qualifications Required:

1. Masters degree from an accredited college or university in education or an education-related field.
2. 5 to 7 years of successful teaching experience.
3. Prior experience leading school improvement planning, implementation, and progress monitoring.
4. Demonstrated knowledge of the state's accountability and student achievement data systems (i.e., mischooldata.org, etc.).
5. Demonstrated knowledge and understanding of research related to instructional strategies that support student achievement and engagement, especially for at-risk students.
6. Demonstrated ability to work with students, school personnel, and community members to develop, and support the implementation of data-driven strategies to increase student achievement and engagement.
7. Demonstrated ability to coordinate communication between district and school leaders, community members, and state and county partners to ensure timely implementation of data-driven improvement initiatives.

Responsibilities:

1. Work with building principal, district transformation coordinator, and teacher leaders planning and conducting staff development activities that focus on the use of data and assessments to enhance learning and collaborative instructional planning.
2. Coach small groups of teachers and/or instructional leaders in analyzing data and using data to differentiate instruction and make data-driven decisions.
3. Facilitate meetings of Professional Learning Communities with a focus on data-driven dialogues.
4. Support teachers in the use of state and local data.
5. Support the development of data-driven tools and mechanisms to assess SIG implementation and impact.
6. Work with the building principal, district transformation coordinator, and teacher leaders to develop and disseminate data-based information on the School Improvement Grant.
7. Serve on any committees and councils concerned with the School Improvement Grant, as needed.

8. Maintain a current and complete calendar of all SIG-related meetings relevant to the data coaching position.
9. Other data-related duties as assigned by the principal.

Attachment H.3: Family & Community Liaison/Resource Coordinator
Family & Community Liaison/Resource Coordinator
Position Description

Qualifications Required:

1. High school degree; bachelors preferred.
2. Preference will be given to applicants with 3 to 5 years of work or volunteer experience with children, families, and school systems.
3. Preference given to those with experience with Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS) and conflict resolution training.
4. Experience and knowledge of strategies to prevent absenteeism.
5. Evidence of successful experience in student/employee/parent relations.
6. Ability to communicate clearly and effectively, both orally and in writing.
7. Capacity to collaborate with community agencies and recruit volunteers.
8. Willingness to work a flexible schedule which includes some community and parent meetings and home visits.

Responsibilities:

1. Assist in recruiting parents as volunteers within the school (e.g., classroom volunteers) for the purpose of increasing parent participation and student achievement.
2. Collaborate with school staff for the purpose of developing programs and classes to support non-English speaking parents and students.
3. Facilitate outreach to low income communities, community leaders and organizations for the purpose of developing resources and building partnerships with community members.
4. Organizes family meetings and educational classes for program participants. (e.g., parenting skills, volunteer training, child growth and development) for the purpose of providing family members parenting classes and/or family support needs.
5. Participate in workshops, meetings, community events, etc. for the purpose of receiving and/or presenting information.
6. Prepare a variety of written materials (e.g., newsletters, reports, logs, memos, handouts) for the purpose of documenting activities, providing written reference and/or conveying information.
7. Provide appropriate referrals and advocacy for families as needed and provides follow up to determine the outcome of services provided for the purpose of supporting families in working toward their goals.
8. Provide data for a variety of reports (e.g., program participation, activity) for the purpose of meeting program, district, state and federal requirements.

9. Assist in coordinating with community leaders and organizations (e.g. businesses, landlords, shelters, law enforcement, etc.) for the purpose of building resources and expanding program capabilities to assist families.
10. Confer with teachers, parents and/or appropriate community agency personnel for the purpose of assisting in evaluating student progress and/or implementing student objectives.
11. Participate in a variety of presentations, meetings, workshops and committees for the purpose of conveying and/or gathering information required to perform functions and remaining knowledgeable with current professional program regulations.
12. Refer students and their families to outside agencies (e.g. state agencies, medical professionals, counselors, foundations, charities, etc.) for the purpose of ensuring the need of students and families are met.
13. Respond to inquiries from a variety of internal and external sources (e.g. parents, students, teachers, staff, outside agencies, etc.) for the purpose of providing information and/or direction as may be required.

Attachment H.4: SIOP Coach

SIOP Coach

Position Description

Qualifications Required:

1. Valid Michigan Teaching Certificate.
2. Bachelor's degree with certification in elementary education.
3. 5 to 7 years of successful full-time teaching at the elementary level.
4. Demonstrated ability to work cooperatively with the peers, community members, students, building and district administration, and other staff members.
5. Deep knowledge of, and experience in, establishing data-driven educational environments.
6. Expertise in research-based highly effective instructional strategies that engage students and yield positive academic achievement.
7. Ability to work in multi-ethnic and multi-cultural learning environment.
8. Experience providing professional development and job-embedded teacher support on research-based instructional strategies.
9. Demonstrated effectiveness in time management, organizational skills, and prioritization of work.
10. Demonstrated initiative, flexibility, and ability to work independently.

Responsibilities:

1. Promote enhanced literacy and math instruction and student learning by helping teachers develop more effective teaching practices that allow all students to reach high academic standards while improving English language proficiency levels.
2. Collaborate planning instruction for ELs, model strategies, demonstrate lesson plans, make resources available and monitor ELs academic achievement.
3. Model research-based best practices that address how students learn in core academic areas.
4. Collaborate with individual teachers through co-planning, co-teaching, and coaching.
5. Assist administrative and instructional staff in interpreting data and designing approaches to improve student achievement.
6. Promote teachers' delivery and understanding of the school curriculum through collaborative long-range and short-range planning and teacher coaching.

7. Facilitate teachers' use of research-based instructional strategies including differentiated instruction for diverse learners.
8. Work with Tier I and Tier II students, in one-on-one or small group settings, in core academic areas.
9. Facilitate professional learning communities and instructional learning cycles.
10. Complete, in a timely and accurate manner, all required records and reports.

Attachment H.5: ESL Teacher
English as a Second Language Teacher
Position Description

QUALIFICATIONS:

1. Completed Bachelor's Degree. Master's Degree on the ESL field is preferred.
2. Valid Michigan Teaching Certificate with appropriate ESL endorsement.
3. Successful teaching experience with English Learners is required.
4. Ability to support and promote academic instruction in the four domain of the English language.
5. Demonstrated ability to communicate fluently in both oral and written forms in one of the primary students' native languages of the district.
6. Demonstrated ability to work with students from a variety of culture and linguistic backgrounds, age, and language/academic proficiency levels.
7. Demonstrated ability to work independently and cooperatively with administrators, teachers, students, parents, and staff as well as under appropriate supervision.
8. Demonstrated ability to work well in fast paced environment with a high degree of flexibility is desired
9. Demonstrated ability to maintain standards of professional conduct and work ethics including attendance, punctuality and performance is required.
10. Demonstrated ability to actively seek opportunities to grow professionally is desired.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Assist with ESL instruction in content area courses and mainstream classroom(s) to help the English Learners (ELs) increase their language proficiency level and academic achievement.
2. Implement and deliver ESL instruction to Newcomers by language proficiency levels.
3. Assist in administering assessment procedures and instruments, both standardized and authentic, to evaluate EL students' language proficiency, development, and academic achievement.
4. Maintain accurate records and documentation of students for evaluation purposes and the monitoring of progress.
5. Work collaboratively with school administrators, counselors, teachers and parents to identify the student learning styles and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.
6. Work collaboratively with school administrators, counselors, teachers to provide opportunities that support the cognitive, physical, emotional, social, and communication development of the ELs students.
7. Work in coordination with designated staff in the building to ensure that the procedures to welcome new ELs are observed and followed.
8. Facilitate and encourage a learning environment that fosters successful social and academic experiences related to grade level expectations and acculturation processes.

9. Facilitate communication among parents, guardians, and all school personnel involved in the education of ELs.

**Bilingual Instructional Assistant
Position Description**

Qualifications Required:

1. High school diploma or equivalent and an Associate's Degree OR passing of WorkKeys Assessment in reading, applied mathematics and writing OR 60 credits or more
2. Must have experience working with English Learners
3. Ability to speak one of the following languages; Somali, Arabic, Swahili or Nepali
4. Successful experience supporting teachers in the classroom
5. Excellent collaborative skills
6. Work as an interdisciplinary team across content areas to meet state and local curricular requirements
7. Work closely with administration and teachers to collaboratively lead the school through shared decision making process
8. Ability to support and promote sound instruction
9. Willing to engage community and business partners as a resource in curriculum development and student products

Responsibilities:

1. Support English language and academic content areas of newcomers.
2. Facilitate communication with school staff, students and families.
3. Assist students with cultural adjustment by providing a proper role model, emotional support, and general guidance.
4. Confer with teachers concerning programs and materials to meet student needs and academic gaps due to language barriers.
5. Prepare, administer, correct and record tests, papers, essays and homework assignments as directed; prepare homework packets as assigned; call students and parents to follow up on absences as assigned.
6. Direct group activities of students as assigned.
7. Participate in meetings, in-service training programs and field trips as assigned.
8. Maintain regular attendance.