

**Michigan Statewide System of Support  
Applicant Conference  
February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2009**

## **Suggested Proposal Organization**

### **Cover Page**

**Overall Evaluation Approach:** An overview of the proposed evaluation approach, including the rationale for the use of the proposed approach, the evaluation framework, and how the evaluation questions will be addressed.

### **Evaluation Study Design**

Includes a detailed description of the overall methodology to be used to address evaluation questions, including a description of the specific concepts and variables to be studied and for which data will be collected, the proposed instrumentation and data collection strategies (including sampling frame) to be used in various portions of the evaluation, and the relationships among the variables and the proposed evaluation framework.

### **Work Plan**

Provides a detailed description of project activities and timelines for each aspect of the evaluation, including task responsibilities, indicators and benchmarks, and related outcomes/deliverables for each year of the three-year scope of work.

### **Management and Staffing**

A management, staffing and budget plan for the internal management of the grant work that will ensure accomplishment of the tasks.

### **Knowledge and Experience**

This section must include:

1. A description of the applicants experience in providing services required, including discussion of previous related work;
2. At least two samples of research and evaluation reports developed and prepared by the applicant. The applicant provides at least three copies of such products.
3. A complete list of clients for the past two to three years and two client references relevant to the scope and complexity of the services required by the grant. These references include a description of the services performed; the date of these services, and the name, address, telephone number and email address of the client reference.

### **Budget and Budget Narrative**

A detailed budget and budget narrative that corresponds to the work plan.

**Proposal formatting specifications:** Please use 11 point Verdana font, single space, and 1 inch margins. Proposals narratives must be limited to 20 pages, excluding the budget, budget narrative, and appendices and attachments.

**Michigan Statewide System of Support  
Applicant Conference  
February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2009**

**Proposal Evaluation Guidelines**

**Competency Levels**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Explanation</b>	<b>Points</b>
Distinguished	Demonstrates a superior degree of competence	4
Proficient	Demonstrates a high degree of competence	3
Capable	Demonstrates an average degree of competence	2
Emergent	Demonstrates a limited degree of competence	1

**Evaluation Areas**

<b>Area</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
Clarity and comprehensiveness	Evaluation of the overall clarity and comprehensiveness of the grant in demonstrating a conceptual understanding of the evaluation question.
Approach and study design	Evaluation of the soundness of the investigation and study design (including triangulation framework, experimental design, identification of hypotheses, sample size and statistical power) in evaluating the question.
Assessment and measurement	Assessment of the quality of instruments, data collection techniques, success indicators, adjustment procedures, and statistical significance testing in providing data analysis and synthesis for generating findings that will address the evaluation question (and ensure that measurement is precise, accurate and unbiased). The degree of awareness of any conceptual or methodological problems surrounding the project and ways to address these problems.
Work plan	Evaluation of the clarity, specificity and feasibility of the work plan in response to the evaluation question and study design (including the extent to which the work plan includes well defined indicators and benchmarks).
Staffing plan and timeline	Judgment of the adequacy of the staffing plan and the degree to which it ensures the efficient operation of the project. Assessment of the degree of specificity and feasibility of the proposed task initiation and timeline (including the extent to which it reflects adequate time commitment to each task) and the appropriateness and applicability of experience and expertise of proposed staff for proposed tasks.

**Michigan Statewide System of Support  
Applicant Conference  
February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2009**

**Evaluation Scoring Chart**

	<b>Evaluation Question</b>	<b>Clarity</b>	<b>Design</b>	<b>Measurement Quality</b>	<b>Work Plan</b>	<b>Staffing Plan</b>	<b>Total Possible</b>
Implementation	How well are the five program components being implemented annually and over the course of the evaluation?	[Points]	[Points]	[Points]	[Points]	[Points]	<b>20 Points</b>
	To what extent are the program components being implemented with fidelity?						<b>20 Points</b>
System Components	How do the various program components work together as implemented?						<b>20 Points</b>
	To what extent are there interaction effects among and between the various program components?						<b>20 Points</b>
Impact	To what extent do the schools receiving services through the SSOS improve students' academic achievement and make AYP?						<b>20 Points</b>
System Influence	What are the major system challenges and constraints that influence the effectiveness of the SSOS?						<b>20 Points</b>
System Coherence	Is the SSOS sound? Does it contribute to system coherence across and within levels of the system?						<b>20 Points</b>
Total Points:							<b>140 Total Points</b>

**Michigan Statewide System of Support**  
**Applicant Conference**  
**February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2009**

**Implementation Data Elements**

1. **Identification and notification of schools** – evidenced through formal notification and correspondence
2. **Hiring, assignment and/or placement of key individuals, such as Coaches, Process Mentors, Auditors, pairing of Coaches and Principals (Yes/No)** – evidenced through formal notification and assignment
3. **Training conducted for Coaches, Process Mentors, Principals, Auditors (Yes/No)** – evidenced through agendas, materials, attendance lists
4. **Quality and usefulness of training elements** – Survey to assess quality and usefulness
5. **Initial technical implementation** (or roll-out) by component (e.g., Auditors visit schools and report; Process Mentors visit schools; Coaches spend 100 days in schools)
6. **Short-term implementation benchmarks and data elements, by component:**
  - a. Process Mentors – The SIP is approved and communicated to school staff
  - b. Audits – Improved consistency of audit reports
  - c. Principals Fellowship – Principals begin to implement and use strategies for establishing professional learning communities
  - d. Coaches – the principal feels better supported in the overall initiative; coaches use an inquiry model (or approach) when working with principals; staff leadership increases capacity to develop program coherence; and the school leadership team uses the coach as a resource
  - e. ISD/RESA Capacity Building – an implementation timeline and budget is developed and communication; relevant needs assessment data is used the writing of the plan
7. **Long-term implementation benchmarks and data elements**
  - a. **Principal and teacher awareness** of AYP status and the actual needs of the school, including systems in place to address AYP issues
  - b. **The development of a Professional Learning Community** in which there is increased collaboration, collegiality and a “learning community” in the school (e.g., the school is a place where both students and adults learn).
  - c. **Increased principal and school use of data** (including needs assessment data) to make decisions and shifts in the school improvement plan to the key indicators
  - d. **Increased planning and resource alignment** – school improvement plan with resources, professional development, and instructional practices
  - e. **Increased instructional coherence** – instruction, assessment, content and professional development
  - f. **Increased ability of the principal to serve as the school’s instructional leader** (e.g., the principal spends increased time on instructional issues and in the classroom)
  - g. **Increased ability of the principal to address and solve difficult issues** and engage in difficult conversations needed to move the school forward
  - h. **Evidence of implementation of strategic plans and actions** (e.g., the principal’s action plan is implemented)
  - i. **Increased coordination and targeting of resources**, including a better understanding of overall school needs within MDE and improved communication and collaboration between MDE, ISD and high priority schools