

SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

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



Electronic Application Process

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

davidsonk1@michigan.gov

Applications will be received on an ongoing basis and will be reviewed in the order in which they are submitted.

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

Technical support will be available Monday – Friday, from 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

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

Contact Information

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

Kristine Davidson
Consultant
Office of Education Improvement & Innovation

OR

Gloria Chapman
Consultant
Office of Education Improvement & Innovation

Telephone: (517) 335-4226
Email: davidsonk1@michigan.gov

EXTERNAL PROVIDERS: BACKGROUND & APPROVAL PROCESS

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

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

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

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

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

Applications will only be **reviewed** if:

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

Applications will only be **approved** if:

1. The above conditions are met for review;
2. The total application score meets a minimum of 70 points

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

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

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

- Section 1 15 points
- Section 2 10 points
- Section 3 10 points
- Section 4 10 points
- Section 5 10 points
- Section 6 10 points Section 6 must be completed by all applicants.

APPLICATION OVERVIEW

The Application is divided into four sections.

Section A contains basic provider information.

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

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

Section D Attachments

SECTION A: BASIC PROVIDER INFORMATION

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

Instructions: Complete each section in full.

1. Federal EIN, Tax ID or Social Security Number		2. Legal Name of Entity			
		Michigan State University Contracts and Grants Administration			
3. Name of Entity as you would like it to appear on the Approved List					
Fellowship of Instructional Leaders, Michigan State University					
4. Entity Type:		5. Check the category that best describes your entity:			
<input type="checkbox"/> For-profit <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-profit		<input type="checkbox"/> Business <input type="checkbox"/> Community-Based Organization <input type="checkbox"/> Educational Service Agency (e.g., RESA or ISD)			
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Institution of Higher Education <input type="checkbox"/> School District <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____			
6. Applicant Contact Information					
Name of Contact Dr. Barbara Markle		Phone 517-353-8950		Fax 517-432-6202	
Street Address 253 Erickson Hall		City East Lansing		State MI	Zip 48824
E-Mail markle@msu.edu		Website www.educ.msu.edu/k12			
7. Local Contact Information (if different than information listed above)					
Name of Contact		Phone		Fax	
Street Address		City		State	Zip
E-mail		Website			
8. Service Area					
List the intermediate school district and each individual district in which you agree to provide services. Enter "Statewide" ONLY if you agree to provide services to any district in the State of Michigan.					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Statewide					
Intermediate School District(s):			Name(s) of District(s):		

9. Conflict of Interest Disclosure

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

Yes

No

What school district are you employed by or serve:

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

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

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

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

- Change in service area
- Change in services to be offered
- Change in method of offering services

SECTION B: PROGRAM DELIVERY AND STAFF QUALIFICATION NARRATIVES

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

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

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

- Support systems to ensure student and teacher success and sustain improvement
- Content and delivery systems and mechanisms proven to result in dramatic and sustained improvement linked to student achievement
- Job embedded professional development at leadership, teacher and support levels to increase internal capacity for improvement and sustainability linked to student achievement
- Comprehensive short cycle and summative assessment systems to measure performance and goal attainment linked to the building school improvement plan.

Exemplar 1 Narrative Limit: 4 pages (insert narrative here)

The Fellowship of Instructional Leaders

The Fellowship of Instructional Leaders was developed and is offered by the Office of K-12 Outreach Programs in the Michigan State University College of Education. The Fellowship provides principals and their instructional leadership teams with essential knowledge, skills, experiences and support that enable them to lead systematic instructional improvement and increased student achievement. This customized three-year program has been developed as a central component of the Statewide System of Support (SSOS), the Michigan Department of Education's strategy for supporting high poverty, low performing schools. The Fellowship will continue to coordinate with the other elements of the SSOS to insure a coherent, effective approach to a school's external support.

The goal of the Fellowship is to increase the capacity of the school principal and instructional leadership team in the following areas:

- leadership for change
- instructional program coherence
- the instructional core
- multiple sources and uses of data for instructional improvement
- the knowledge base for teaching
- shared understanding about effective teaching and what it looks like in practice
- models of effective turnaround practice
- changing the culture of a school to include internal accountability

Work throughout the three-year cycle of the Fellowship focuses on Talk, Task and Text. Schools need to develop shared and specific language to describe what effective practice looks like, both in the content being presented and in the work students are asked to do. Rather than an off-the-shelf program, the Fellowship is designed to build the collective capacity of the adults within a school and its particular context. The organization of the Fellowship work ensures that principals have both the fundamentals to begin and sustain instructional improvement in their buildings and the practical tools and skills to identify which changes will translate into significant gains in student achievement.

Three Year Program Example

Year One: Beginning the Work

- Creating a culture of improvement, including an accountable professional community
- Creating a shared vision of what is possible, including a shared understanding of effective instruction
- Understanding well the data available to inform decisions about instructional improvement
- Learning about the change process and how it affects staff, students and families
- Introducing the four-step cycle of instructional improvement (description, analysis, prediction and evaluation of next steps) in which classroom teachers and administrators learn how to connect the work in classrooms to their own improvement goals.
- Expanding the capacity to recognize effective practice

Year Two: Deepening the Work

- Increasing skills in using data and in helping others become adept in data analysis
- Continuing to learn about how to manage complex changes in schools
- Identifying an appropriate problem of practice and theory of action in order to provide focus for school improvement efforts that will leverage the greatest student improvement
- Expanding the accountable professional community to include feeder schools and central offices

Year Three: Sustaining the Work

- Advancing the four-step cycle of instructional improvement
- Establishing data proficiency as part of the culture of the school
- Increasing the consistency of the implementation of new practices across classrooms
- Planning for continued progress

Participants in the Fellowship of Instructional Leaders should include a leadership coach as part of their reform plan and budget. Just as principals are the key mechanism for improving instructional quality in schools, leadership coaches are the key mechanism for providing on-site support that builds the capacity of school leaders. Specifically, the role of a leadership coach is to increase the capacity of school leaders to develop and exercise practices related to visionary, instructional and operational leadership, as well as the cross-cutting skills needed to exercise leadership in all areas. The Office of K-12 Outreach has developed a cadre of highly trained leadership coaches focused on building the capacity of principals to turn around struggling schools. Leadership coaches are the key mechanism for providing the on-site support necessary to build the capacity of FIL participants to lead instructional improvement.

Effective coaches have developed both a mindset (a way of approaching and thinking about coaching) and a skill set-specific competencies related to coaching practice that equip them to

help principals and other school leaders build the capacity to turn around troubled schools. They leverage their knowledge, skills, experience and demonstrated expertise in building the capacity of principals to lead systematic instructional improvements and turn around high priority schools.

The Reasoning behind the Fellowship of Instructional Leaders Approach

Dedicated, dynamic and skilled principals are a key to successful schools (Fullan, 2006; Drago-Severson, 2005). Leaders are most effective in raising student learning and achievement when they focus school improvement efforts on improving the quality and coherence of instructional programs (Newmann, Smith et al, 2001) and cultivate professional community through building relational trust (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). Leadership training for school leaders can be an effective approach to school improvement when it is anchored in the central issue of improving classroom instruction (Elmore, 2008). Additional research suggests the knowledge and skills required for effective school leadership can be learned, and that professional development is most effective when it is on-going, intensive and embedded in the everyday practice of principals.

In order to build the capacity of principals to lead the systematic improvement of instructional practice necessary to raise student achievement in high priority schools, MSU's College of Education Office of K-12 Outreach Programs, as part of the SSOS, established the Fellowship of Instructional Leaders (FIL). The FIL engages principals and additional school leaders - through a week-long residential summer institute, a series of one-day institutes throughout the school year, in-school application exercises between institutes, and the provision of electronic resources - around a systems framework aimed at helping participants focus on the quality of classroom practice. Specifically, the FIL engages participants in learning designed to help them 1) increase the coherence of the school's instructional programs, 2) build and develop professional community, and 3) utilize existing resources and respond to requirements through clarity of vision and strategy. This approach is represented in the Leadership for Coherence: A Systems Perspective framework developed at MSU.

The heart of the Leadership for Coherence framework is the instructional core-the interactions of teachers and students in the presence of content. Systematically improving the quality of the instructional core is the only way to increase student learning over time (Elmore, 2008). However, it is insufficient to focus efforts on improving one element of the core, a common approach in educational reform (e.g., implementing a new curriculum). Rather, changing one element (such as curriculum materials) requires changes in the other two (teacher practice and the work students are asked to do) if student achievement is to improve.

The FIL uses the instructional core to help participants develop a common language to describe classroom practice, clarify what they mean by "instructional quality," and guide classroom observations. A key principle of the instructional core is that we learn to improve instruction by

doing the work, not by hearing from experts or attending seminars. The FIL uses the framework of the instructional core to engage principals and additional school leaders in developing the knowledge and skills necessary to improve the quality of day-to-day classroom instruction.

Coherent instructional programs support both adult and student learning (Newmann et al, 2003). The coherence of an instructional program is determined by the degree of alignment among instructional strategies, curriculum and assessments (think about this as within classroom coherence) and between the instructional frameworks that teachers use, the goals set by the school, and the professional development in which teachers and administrators engage (program or cross-classroom coherence). While some regional districts, local districts, schools and departments create curriculum maps-and some take this work further by developing aligned assessments-the work of increasing instructional program coherence demands that school leaders take on instructional practice as well. The FIL provides tools for school leaders to assess instructional program coherence and engages them in asking tough questions about the connection between school improvement initiatives and their relationship with each other and the instructional core.

Successfully increasing instructional program coherence requires constructively challenging the norm of complete teacher autonomy. The bottom line is that, in order to systematically improve the quality of day-to-day classroom instruction, teachers need to develop some commitments regarding their practice and to work in ways that -over time- help them learn together in refining their approach. This requires the presence of a professional community characterized by trust, shared values and a commitment to work collaboratively on instructional improvement (Platt, Tripp et al, 2008). The FIL facilitates the development of professional community by engaging participants in conducting classroom observations. Then, in institute settings and using structured protocols, the FIL helps them analyze the resulting data in ways that raise questions about instructional quality, the coherence of instructional programs, and the school's use of resources. Professional community, we have learned, is the fuel behind systematic instructional improvement.

Schools exist in complex, often turbulent district, state and federal environments (Hatch, 2009). Conflicting signals and demands in such contexts challenge instructional improvement because they (often) undermine coherence. In some systems, securing additional resources signals effective leadership. Managing and leveraging resources and requirements is a critical skill for leading instructional improvement. Indeed, how resources are used and how leaders respond to a multitude of external requirements-especially for Title I schools-can make or break efforts to improve instruction. Through the FIL, participants analyze existing initiatives, identify and stay focused on a limited number of priorities and, when necessary, buffer staff from requirements that may distract them from their core work: improving the quality of day-to-day classroom instruction.

Exemplar 2: Use of Scientific Educational Research
(15 points possible)

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

- The applicant should provide detailed data that supports successful performance in utilizing research and evidence-based practices in the delivery of systems and services, especially as applied to secondary school settings.
- Cite and reference available research studies (as appropriate) and **provide data** that indicate the practices used have a positive impact on the academic achievement of students in the subjects and grade levels in which you intend to provide services.

Exemplar 2 Narrative Limit: 3 pages (insert narrative here)

Like the cure for cancer, the solution for persistently low-performing schools has yet to be found. Like its medical equivalent, there is likely to be no single cure for struggling schools because the malady presents itself in many different forms, and because the context informs both the nature of the problem and the nature of the solution.

Nevertheless, solid research is making progress on both fronts, and the core principles of the Fellowship are rooted in some of the best, peer-reviewed research using longitudinal data samples from large urban districts. These core principles include:

1. the essential role principals play in school improvement (Waters et al, 2003; Bryk et al, 2010);
2. the importance of building collective capacity in schools (Fullan, 2010; Sanders & Rivers, 1996);
3. the need for instructional program coherence (Newmann et al, 2001); and
4. the centrality of the instructional core (Elmore, 2004; City et al, 2009).

Researcher Jim Waters and his associates at McREL undertook a comprehensive meta analysis of three decades of education research around school improvement to sort weaker research from stronger and to determine the relative effects of various school characteristics on student achievement. One of the strongest positive effects McREL identified was the leadership of the school principal. Similarly, Bryk and his team of researchers with the Consortium on Chicago School Research analyzed extensive longitudinal data from the Chicago Public Schools. Their results identify 14 indicators of five essential supports for school improvement and conclude, "School leadership sits in the first position" (p. 197).

Even great leaders, however, cannot do it all. Michael Fullan describes collective capacity as the ability to "mobilize and engage large numbers of people who are individually and collectively committed [to] and effective at getting results relative to core outcomes" (Fullan, 2010, p. 21). His data – mostly collected in Canada and so not as familiar to most educators here - show dramatic, positive impact that collective capacity can have on students in urban settings. In this country, the value-added studies in Tennessee and Texas conducted by William Sanders and June Rivers and others demonstrate the cumulative effect instructional quality (or the lack of it) has on future student achievement. Building the collective capacity of teachers in a school to work together to solve problems of practice can transform the culture of a building from one that impedes individual growth to one that promotes growth in both students and educators.

Leadership and increased human capacity succeed best when focused on a common goal. Fred Newmann and colleagues developed the concept of instructional program coherence to describe conditions in effective schools in which the researchers found strong alignment among instructional strategies, curriculum and assessments (think about this as within classroom coherence) and between the instructional frameworks that teachers use, the goals set by the school, and the professional development in which teachers and administrators engage (program or cross-classroom coherence). Their data, based on large samples from the Chicago Public Schools, indicate strong connections between instructional program coherence and improved student achievement.

Exactly what that common goal should be is the focus of the work of Richard Elmore and his colleagues at Harvard's Graduate School of Education. Elmore's research in District #2 in New York City and urban and suburban districts in Connecticut, which he has expanded with his colleagues Elizabeth City, Sarah Fiarman and Lee Tietel, centers around the instructional core, which they define as the interaction between student and teacher in the presence of content. The only way to achieve school improvement at scale is to improve the curriculum presented to students, the knowledge and skills of the teachers presenting that content, and the quality of the tasks students are asked to undertake. This instructional core of teacher, student and content provides a common focus for improvement efforts and a clear test of the coherence of any particular improvement effort.

Based on these four core principles, the Fellowship of Instructional Leaders aims to improve the leadership knowledge and skills of the participating principals and instructional team leaders. Bryk's data (2010, pgs. 109-112) show that four times as many schools with strong leadership (43 percent versus 11 percent) improved substantially in reading as schools without it. Similar data supports the FIL emphasis on quality professional development (37 percent versus 25 percent), on building an accountable professional community (43 percent versus 11 percent) and on instructional program coherence (45 percent versus 10 percent). The data show similar improvements in mathematics among schools with strong leadership (42 percent versus 6 percent), quality professional development (36 percent versus 24 percent), professional community (38 percent versus 11 percent) and curricular alignment (40 percent versus 8 percent).

The approach of the Fellowship is to build the capacity, first within the principal and instructional leadership team and eventually throughout the entire school, to create and sustain a common commitment to a shared understanding of what effective practice is and what practices need to change to produce improved student outcomes. This shared understanding comes through a combination of new knowledge about adult and student learning, the use of a shared and specific language to talk about issues of teaching and learning, and the creation of a new culture within the school predicated on the belief that all students and adults are capable of growth, a culture focused on maximizing that growth for all.

Relevant Research:

Bryk, A., P. S. Sebring, E. Allensworth, S. Luppescu and J. Q. Easton. 2010. *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. University of Chicago Press.

City, E. A., R. F. Elmore, S. E. Fiarman, L. Teitel. 2009. *Instructional rounds in education: A network approach to improving teaching and learning*. Cambridge, MA. Harvard Education Press.

Fullan, M. 2010. *All systems go: The change imperative for whole school reform*. Thousand Oaks, CA. Corwin.

Waters, J. T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. A. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

Newmann, F. 2001. *Instructional Program Coherence: What It Is and Why It Should Guide School Improvement Policy*. In *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, Winter 2001, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 297-321.

Sanders, W. L. & Rivers, J. C. (1996, November) *Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future student academic achievement*. (Available from UTVARC, 225 Morgan Hall, P.O. Box 1071, Knoxville, TN 37901-1071).

Exemplar 3: Job Embedded Professional Development
(15 points possible)

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

- The applicant should provide detailed data that supports successful performance in developing job-embedded professional development plans for:
 - principals
 - school leadership teams
 - teachers
 - support staff

Exemplar 3 Narrative Limit: 2 pages (insert narrative here).

One of the guiding principles of the concept of the instructional core is that “we learn to do the work by doing the work, not by telling other people to do the work, not by having done the work at some time in the past, and not by hiring experts who can act as proxies for our knowledge about how to do the work” (City et al, 2009, p. 23). This means, among other things, that the Fellowship is not a program in the sense of a pre-packaged or pre-specified product or textbook series or 12-step solution to school improvement. Instead, the FIL works by presenting new ideas and ways of thinking to school leaders, then supports them as they build collective capacity to practice these new ideas back in their schools. Some of these new ideas represent significant changes in teacher practice (such as having teachers observe each others' teaching through the use of instructional rounds); others include changes in leader practice (through the use of protocols in working with specific staff on specific issues).

Currently the Fellowship brings together a school’s principal, the principal’s leadership coach, and up to six others chosen by the principal to be the school’s instructional leadership team. These school teams work together at Fellowship institutes to master the materials presented and determine how to apply these new ideas, tools and techniques in their daily work in school.

At the end of every FIL training session, participants are given an application exercise tailored to the ideas that were the focus of the session. Leadership coaches have been prepared beforehand to facilitate the learning at the institute and the completion of the application exercise afterwards back at the school.

The central purpose of the Fellowship is to help principals and instructional leadership teams improve student achievement by improving what happens within the instructional core; the primary strategy to do this is through the use of instructional rounds. The concept of instructional rounds is based on the medical model of clinical rounds in which groups of practitioners observe the same situation and then talk about what they see (observation) and what sense they make of it (analysis). Instructional rounds follow a four-step cycle of observation, analysis, prediction and evaluation of next steps, each step of which is complex and powerful in what it can tell those who practice it about how best to improve student learning. However, the skills necessary to reap the value of instructional rounds are not typically taught to or used by principals or teachers. A goal of the FIL is to develop these skills in principals and members of their instructional leadership teams so that they in turn can help develop them throughout the entire school.

Two other key concepts of the Fellowship are the identification of a problem of practice and the development of a theory of action. A fundamental challenge to improvement in persistently low-performing schools is not knowing where to start. FIL participants learn how to work with their school’s staff to identify a particular problem of practice to tackle and a theory of action about how to tackle it. This strategy enhances the likelihood that people in the building will take ownership of the problem and take on the effort needed to resolve it, because it connects directly to their daily work. A theory of action is an "if-then" statement (or a series of statements) that connects a specific course of action related to the problem of practice to a measurable result.

Fundamental to identifying an appropriate problem of practice is a leader's and a staff's ability to understand and use student, classroom, school, district and community data, whether from informal, formal, formative or summative assessments or from perception or demographic surveys. The Fellowship provides both training and support in knowing what data are available, where to find it and how to use it.

All of this work to improve student achievement takes place within a particular school and its professional culture. Recognizing and improving this culture is an essential first step in sustainable school improvement. The FIL helps principals and their leadership teams create a professional culture of shared learning and mutual accountability for student and adult performance. The use of instructional rounds is an effective way to open up teaching practice to collaborative inquiry and improvement.

Exemplar 4: Experience with State and Federal Requirements (15 points possible)

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

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

Exemplar 4 Narrative Limit: 2 pages (insert narrative here)

The Office of K-12 Outreach Programs in the College of Education at Michigan State University has extensive experience with state and federal programs and their requirements. K-12 Outreach has worked closely with the Michigan Department of Education for many years, notably in both the development of and the release and dissemination of the Grade Level Content Expectations, the High School Content Expectations, and the Michigan Merit Curriculum. K-12 Outreach has received and successfully administered several Title I and Title II grants over the past decade, including the ABCS Coaches Institute in 2003, concurrent grants for the Fellowship, The Michigan Coaches Institute and MI Excel. K-12 Outreach has the considerable advantage of being able to rely upon Michigan State University's Office of Contracts and Grants Administration, which monitors the grant requirements of hundreds of millions of dollars in state, federal, philanthropic and industry grants. Michigan State University as an institution and the Office for K-12 Outreach Programs in the College of Education are well versed in IDEA generally and Section 504 in particular concerning accommodations for students with special needs.

The Fellowship, which can be customized to the context of individual schools, uses Michigan's School Improvement Framework, the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and the school improvement plans of participating schools as the context with which to work with school principals and their instructional leadership teams. Our connections to and familiarity with state programs runs deep: Assistant Dean Barbara Markle was part of the original development team of the Michigan Curriculum Framework developed in the 1980s and MDE's first administrator of Public Act 25.

Exemplar 5: Sustainability Plan

(15 points possible)

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

- The applicant should demonstrate significant knowledge and experience in developing sustainability plans.

Exemplar 5 Narrative Limit: 2 pages (insert narrative here)

The overarching mission of the Office for K-12 Outreach Programs in the College of Education at Michigan State University is to build capacity at all levels of the education system to improve student achievement. This type of capacity, which Fullan (2010) refers to as collective capacity, is the ultimate sustainability plan, in the sense that members throughout the system have the capacity - the knowledge, skills, dispositions, resources and opportunities - to do the work they need to do. Our goal in the Fellowship is to equip participants with the knowledge they need to make substantial improvement in student achievement, model for them and help them practice the skills and dispositions they need to change instructional practices in their schools, and help them identify resources and create opportunities to turn their schools around.

The third year of the FIL cycle focuses on how principals and instructional leadership teams can institutionalize and sustain the work they have undertaken during Years 1 and 2. It is important to note again that the FIL is not an external provider of direct service to students. Instead, it facilitates the professional growth of the principal and other existing school staff, a real if intangible asset to school improvement and student achievement that remains long after the grant is finished.

An important aspect of the sustainability of the progress schools make through the Fellowship is embodied by the name itself: participants will establish a set of relationships that mature throughout the Fellowship 3-year cycle that they can maintain long into the future. Both within an individual school and across schools, principals and instructional team members will build an active, meaningful professional learning community of like-minded and similarly prepared educators working on common problems of practice and sharing successes with each other.

This evolving self-sufficiency is not to be underestimated, but it is not the only support participants can expect after the grant is finished. The Office for K-12 Outreach Programs provides regular opportunities for principals and other instructional leaders to continue their professional development in improving instruction for increased student achievement.

Our mission and heritage as Michigan's land-grant university is to address the needs of the citizens of Michigan, and our work in the Office of K-12 Outreach Programs is deeply rooted in the larger body of work of the faculty of the MSU College of Education, ranked #1 in the nation by U.S. News & World Report in elementary and secondary teacher preparation for 20 consecutive years and ranked #2 in curriculum and instruction. This combination of strengths represents a tremendous asset to the state's K-12 education system that the Office of K-12 Outreach Programs regularly calls upon in working with school leaders.

Exemplar 6: Staff Qualifications
(15 points possible)

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

- Staff qualifications and vitae should match with areas that the applicant wishes to serve. Staff should have extensive experience in implementation of all applicable areas.

Exemplar 6 Narrative Limit: 1 page plus vitae for personnel (insert narrative and vitae here)

Because the Fellowship of Instructional Leaders is now in its sixth year of operation, the staff who will be providing the content to the participants are already selected and in place. The FIL is led by Executive Director Dr. Barbara Markle, Assistant Dean for K-12 Outreach Programs in the College of Education at Michigan State University. Dr. Markle has more than 30 years' experience in school leadership training, school reform efforts and urban education reform. K-12 Outreach team members, Dr. Diane Jackson, Dr. Grant Chandler, Dr. Sean Williams and Cindy Ruble bring decades of expertise in school reform, central office administration, curriculum development and the facilitation of adult learners.

Several MSU faculty serve as members of the development team and as presenters. As an example, Dr. Susan Printy, Associate Professor of K-12 Educational Administration, researches distributive leadership and the relationship between principals and lead teachers. Her current work examines the professional impact of social learning that occurs within high school teachers' departmental communities. Dr. John Yun, Associate Professor in Educational Administration, has an extensive background in comprehensive school reform models and efforts. His research focuses on understanding the complex relationships among education policy, educational organization and large scale reform efforts.

Other MSU faculty contribute their expertise to particular aspects of the FIL program. Support in the content areas comes from Dr. William Schmidt, University Distinguished Professor and Director of the U.S. office of the Trends in Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). Support for issues related to data and assessment comes from Dr. Neelam Kher, Director of Data Services and Dr. John Yun. Support around community and student health issues comes from Dr. Sonya Gunnings-Moton, Assistant Dean for Student Support Services and Recruitment and Assistant Professor of Counseling, and Dr. Christopher Dunbar, Associate Professor of K-12 Educational Administration, whose areas of expertise include school administration, educational leadership and school violence.

Barbara Markle is Assistant Dean for the Office of K-12 Outreach in the College of Education at Michigan State University. Dr. Markle develops and implements programs for teachers, administrators, and policymakers that translate educational research to practice in schools and settings where education policy decisions are made. She directs several state and federal grants, including the University's work with MI Excel, the statewide system of support in Michigan for underperforming schools and their districts. Barbara also works closely with the Michigan Department of Education, the State Board of Education, and the state's professional education associations. Under her direction, the Office of K-12 Outreach sponsors conferences, trainings, and institutes designed to meet the needs of various audiences, international education study tours, and periodic forums for legislators and other policymakers. Dr. Markle has worked as a high school English teacher, guidance counselor and principal. She directed K-12 curriculum in Michigan's second largest school district where she also led school reform efforts. Dr. Markle was named Michigan's first female Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction in the Michigan Department of Education and was responsible for the statewide launch of Public Act 25, a major educational reform initiative. Her Ph.D. is in Educational Administration from Michigan State University.

Grant Chandler is a Professional Development Specialist in the MI Excel program in the Office of K-12 Outreach at Michigan State University. For over twenty-six years, Dr. Chandler has championed the cause of quality education for all students in public education. In the classroom, Grant taught French, English, Speech, Theatre Arts, Communications, Forensics, and Debate and was a national diamond award-winning speech and communications coach with the National Forensic League. He has served as a building administrator in a mid-sized urban district as well as a central office administrator and a dean of liberal arts, business, computer science, and new media technology at the community college level. Grant's pioneering work in professional development has been featured in Educational Leadership and he was tapped by the U.S. Department of Education and the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory as a national practitioner leader in school reform and redesign. His commitment remains steadfast: to improve the lives of all children through high quality education. In his spare time, he is writing his first children's novel and trains therapy dogs for animal-assisted activities.

Diane Jackson is Program Development Director for Coaching 101 and the Michigan Coaches Institute. She has over 35 years' experience in education and curriculum development, has extensive training and facilitation experience locally and nationally, and has practiced as a cognitive coach. Dr. Jackson served as a Program Supervisor/Least Restrictive Environment Specialist in the Office of Specialized Student Services for the Detroit Public Schools. In that role she was responsible for designing, organizing, presenting, and facilitating professional development for access to the general education curriculum. She has been a peer coach to general education and special education teachers in the language arts, and a staff development specialist, teacher, and coordinator for The Detroit Efficacy Elementary and Middle School City-Wide Program, as well as an adjunct professor at Wayne State University. Diane spent nine years as a national trainer and education consultant for The Efficacy Institute in Lexington, Massachusetts, where she was responsible for delivery and facilitation of the Efficacy Seminar to educational and human service institutions across the United States. She holds degrees in Special Education and Instructional Technology. Her Ph.D. is in Curriculum and Instruction with a cognate in Educational Psychology.

Cindy Ruble is the MI Excel Program Director. In this role, Ms. Ruble provides conceptual development and operational management to Michigan’s State-Wide System of Support. Prior to coming to MSU, Cindy spent over 35 years in Michigan as a teacher, principal, assistant superintendent, and superintendent. Ms. Ruble designed and implemented several grant-funded programs including one of 14 Race to the Top grants in the State of Michigan. As a result of her many leadership roles, Cindy is recognized throughout the state for her technical expertise in the area of educational reform. Ms. Ruble retired as Superintendent of Lakeview Public Schools in July of 2010 and subsequently served as Executive Director for the Educators’ Task Force (ETF)—an organization that represents all Battle Creek area public and private school leaders. In that role, Ms. Ruble developed a program to bring a systemic early childhood plan to support all Battle Creek area families from birth through age eight.

Sean Williams is the program coordinator of the Fellowship of Instructional Leaders program which is based out of the Office of K-12 Outreach at Michigan State University. In the Fellowship program, Sean works with school principals to develop their ability to design and implement substantive initiatives that improve student achievement. Through series of research-based strategies, Sean facilitates the development of coherent administrative practices that directly impact the overall functionality of the school system. Currently Sean works with school systems ranging from those located in large urban setting, to those in small rural setting. Sean has spent time in schools and classrooms to examine implications of urban education In the United Kingdom and Azerbaijan. Since joining the Office of K-12 Outreach, Sean has received a number of academic scholarships for his research and has been invited to national conferences to present his work on the role of principals in district support models and policy implementation. Before joining the Office of K-12 Outreach, Sean was an award-winning classroom teacher and a veteran middle school principal who led a low-performing school and increased his students’ overall achievement to the highest grade, “A,” in just three years. Sean holds a Ph.D. from Michigan State University in K-12 Educational Administration and Educational Policy. Sean’s most recent publications focus on school principals and their role in policy implementation. They will appear in forthcoming issues of the Journal of Education and the Journal of School Public Relations.

SECTION C: ASSURANCES

The applicant entity:

1. will follow all applicable legislation and guidance governing the Section 1003(g) school improvement grants.
2. will follow all applicable Federal, state, and local health, safety, employment, and civil rights laws at all times.
3. will comply with the MDE Standards for Monitoring Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants Preferred External Education Services Providers.
4. agrees to make all documents available to the MDE or LEA for inspection/monitoring purposes, and participate in site visits at the request of the MDE, the district, or facilitators/monitors for the SIG grant.
5. agrees to notify MDE and applicable district(s), in writing, of any change in the contact information provided in this application within ten business days.
6. ensures that it will provide written notification to MDE, when external preferred provider services will no longer be provided, thirty days prior to termination of services.
7. assures that they have accurately and completely described services they will provide to the LEA.
8. assures they will comply with SEA and LEA requirements and procedures.

SECTION D: ATTACHMENTS

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