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:

MDE-SSOS@michigan.gov

The application and all required attachments must be submitted before 5:00 p.m. on May 21, 2010 to be considered for the first list to be posted on the website. Applications will be received after May 21 on an ongoing basis and will be reviewed in the order in which they are received.

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

Please make sure you complete the application as early as possible so that we may help you correct any problems associated with technical difficulties. Technical support will be available Monday – Friday, throughout the application period, from 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

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

Contact Information

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

Mark Coscarella
Interim Supervisor
Office of Education Improvement & Innovation

OR

Anne Hansen or Bill Witt
Consultants
Office of Education Improvement & Innovation

Telephone:  (517) 373-8480 or (517) 335-4733
Email:  MDE-SSOS@michigan.gov
EXTERNAL PROVIDERS: BACKGROUND & APPROVAL PROCESS

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

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

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

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

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

Applications will only be reviewed if:

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

Applications will only be approved if:

1. The above conditions are met for review;
2. The total application score meets a minimum of 70 points
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplar</th>
<th>Total Points Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Description of comprehensive improvement services</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use of scientific educational research</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job embedded professional development</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Experience with state and federal requirements</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sustainability Plan</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Staff Qualifications</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points Possible</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Points Required for Approval</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Instructions:** Complete each section in full.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Federal EIN, Tax ID or Social Security Number</th>
<th>2. Legal Name of Entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Name of Entity as you would like it to appear on the Approved List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Entity Type:</th>
<th>5. Check the category that best describes your entity:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ Non-profit</td>
<td>☐ Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Community-Based Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Educational Service Agency (e.g., RESA or ISD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Institution of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Other (specify): Professional Development Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Applicant Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Bodrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12236 6 1/2 Mile Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jbodrie@hotmail.com">jbodrie@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.michigances.org">www.michigances.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Local Contact Information (if different than information listed above)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12236 6 1/2 Mile Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:millor@michigances.org">millor@michigances.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.michigances.org">www.michigances.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Service Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Statewide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Intermediate School District(s): | Name(s) of District(s): |
### 9. Conflict of Interest Disclosure

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

- [ ] Yes  
- [x] No

What school district are you employed by or serve: ____

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

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

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

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

- Change in service area
- Change in services to be offered
- Change in method of offering services
SECTION B: PROGRAM DELIVERY AND STAFF QUALIFICATION NARRATIVES

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

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

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

- Support systems to ensure student and teacher success and sustain improvement
- Content and delivery systems and mechanisms proven to result in dramatic and sustained improvement linked to student achievement
- Job embedded professional development at leadership, teacher and support levels to increase internal capacity for improvement and sustainability linked to student achievement
- Comprehensive short cycle and summative assessment systems to measure performance and goal attainment linked to the building school improvement plan.
Exemplar 1 Narrative Limit: 4 pages (insert narrative here)

Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools (MCES) has provided comprehensive improvement services to more than 50 schools over the past decade and achieved results in several underperforming urban secondary schools. MCES was a model provider for Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) and also partnered with Academy for Educational Development as a Middle Start CSR provider. Currently, MCES is the technical assistance and professional development provider for the Michigan Smaller Learning Communities Consortium serving 6 large high schools. Our Middle School Model follows the same format and processes used in the SLC grant, with accommodations appropriate to middle level structures and practitioners.

The MCES Middle School Model uses the National Association of Secondary School Principals’ Breaking Ranks in the Middle: Strategies for Leading Middle Level Reform as a framework for:

- Support systems to ensure student and teacher success and sustain improvement, and;
- Content and delivery systems and mechanisms proven to result in dramatic and sustained improvement linked to student achievement.

Breaking Ranks in the Middle engages schools in the process of change that will ensure success for every middle school student. Strategies fall into three core areas: Collaborative Leadership/Professional Learning Community; Personalizing Your School Environment; and Making Learning Personal: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment. These three core areas of reform lend themselves to alignment with the Relationships, Relevance, and Rigor focus espoused by Achieve, Inc., and Gates Foundation. The first set of Breaking Ranks II recommendations and tools focuses on the development of a professional learning community, wherein leadership throughout the institution refocuses its work on what will successfully support every student in their middle school experience. The second set of recommendations and tools focuses on the need to provide every student with meaningful adult relationships that can best support every student in feeling a sense of belonging, ownership over one’s learning, and one’s ability to recognize options and make wise choices. And the third set of recommendations and tools focuses on the development of personalized learning, where students see their learning as meaningful and relevant, as well as rigorous and challenging, ensuring their success both within and beyond middle school. Together, these recommendations and activities ultimately lead to the success of every student.

There are nine cornerstone strategies that cut across all three core areas’ recommendations and form the foundation for improving the performance of each student in the school:

1. Establish the academically rigorous essential learnings that a student is required to master in order to successfully make the transition to high school and align the curriculum and teaching strategies to realize that goal.
2. Create dynamic teacher teams that are afforded common planning time to help organize and improve the quality and quantity of interactions between teachers and students.
3. Provide structured planning time for teachers to align the curriculum across grades and schools and to map efforts that address the academic, developmental, social, and personal needs of students, especially at critical transition periods (e.g., elementary to middle grades, middle grades to high school).

4. Implement a comprehensive advisory or other program that ensures that each student has frequent and meaningful opportunities to meet with an adult to plan and assess the student’s academic, personal, and social development.

5. Ensure that teachers assess the individual learning needs of students and tailor instructional strategies and multiple assessments accordingly.

6. Entrust teachers with the responsibility of implementing schedules that are flexible enough to accommodate teaching strategies consistent with the ways students learn most effectively and that allow for effective teacher teaming, common planning time, and other lesson planning.

7. Institute structural leadership systems that allow for substantive involvement in decision making by students, teachers, family members, and the community and that support effective communication among these groups.

8. Align all programs and structures so that all social, economic, and racial/ethnic groups have open and equal access to challenging activities and learning.

9. Align the schoolwide comprehensive, ongoing professional development program and the Personal Learning Plans (PLPs) of staff members with the requisite knowledge of content, instructional strategies, and student developmental factors.

As noted in “Breaking Ranks: A Field Guide for Leading Change”, there are specific steps that lead to successfully implementing school-wide initiatives which follows our Cycle of Continuous Improvement. Those steps are:

1. Gathering and Analyzing Data to Determine Priorities
2. Exploring Possible Solutions
3. Assessing Readiness and Building Capacity
4. Creating and Communicating the Improvement Plan(s)
5. Implementing the Plan
6. Monitoring and Adjusting the Plan(s)

MCES delivers the Breaking Ranks in the Middle Framework as Comprehensive School Improvement: integrating best practice pedagogy with a content focus; referred to in the state School Improvement Framework as professional learning communities and collaborative groups to look at student work. Coaching is a relatively new intervention that has demonstrated effectiveness in research by NSDC, Coalition of Essential Schools, various literacy models and is now a major component of the Statewide System of Support.

Our Theory of Change includes alignment of several interventions found in the MCES turnaround model:

- Professional development and coaching on best instructional practice in the content areas and on-site leadership coaching for developing professional learning communities (PLC), effective structures, and aligning all school improvement work with Breaking Ranks in the Middle.
• Critical Friends Groups, professional learning communities, that focus on improving classroom practice by looking at content-focused student work as the products of instruction. Teacher-leaders from the school site are trained to be facilitators of collaborative, reflective, inquiry-based groups that use the Cycle of Continuous Improvement to identify the state standards and content expectations, analyze data as to how their students measure up to the standards, examine curriculum and lesson design to align instruction with the standards, design formative assessments, examine student work, engage in lesson study and peer observations. These groups provide accountability that’s an important part of the Theory of Change where teachers receive frequent feedback and are motivated to continue the process of improvement as they see increases in student success.

• Coaching by content area experts in numeracy and literacy across the curriculum who are also expert in the pedagogy that has been identified as research-based best practice. Secondary literacy strategies are a blend of WestEd’s Reading Apprenticeship and MCES Real Reading in the Middle (RRIM). Coaches would work with the Critical Friends Groups as well as individual teachers and others working specifically with the targeted populations.

Two days of professional development on the best practice frameworks of instruction (Newmann, Warnock, Marzano, Daniels and Hyde) and effort-based education (Lauren Resnick- Institute for Learning, U. of Pittsburg) are provided at the school site. Using Breaking Ranks in the Middle as a framework, provides a path for any middle school to rise to the challenge of addressing disengaged students and the achievement gaps related to gender, income, special needs or race as well as increasing overall student performance and success.

Delivery systems include School Improvement Teams, Leadership Teams, Critical Friend Groups, Advisory Committees, Curriculum Committees, planning times and various staff meetings to implement the Breaking Ranks in the Middle recommendations within the existing school improvement plan.

Essential components/mechanisms of this intervention include:

• Broad-Based Support - Securing support from a variety of stakeholders including teachers, students, staff, site-based and district administrators, school board members, community partners and parents.

• Common Goals - Acknowledging the need for comprehensive school improvement, middle school redesign, improved student success and the significance of smaller learning communities in achieving those.

• A Focus on Student Learning - Establishing student learning as the end goal and providing effective teaching as the means with instruction aimed at high expectations and improved academic outcomes for all students.

• Professional Development - Investing in quality, on-going professional development that is aligned with the needs identified by the school improvement process and consistent with the MCES middle school model strategies and interventions.

• Shared Leadership and Decision-Making - Practicing decision-making and leadership that is shared among stakeholders; decisions are based upon school data and current research.
• Data-driven Decisionmaking and Planning - Using the school improvement process to engage stakeholders to complete the planning and implementation process. Plans are based upon ongoing needs assessment and evaluation of student progress by using the Cycle of Continuous Improvement.

Job embedded professional development at leadership, teacher and support levels to increase internal capacity for improvement and sustainability linked to student achievement.

The Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools (MCES) will provide teachers with the professional development, coaching, regular opportunities for collaboration with peers, and other supports needed to implement a rigorous curriculum and provide high-quality instruction. The NSDC Professional Development Standards and Guidelines (also embedded in the School Improvement Framework) are adhered to in this model and described in more detail in section 3. of this application.

Comprehensive short cycle and summative assessment systems to measure performance and goal attainment linked to the building school improvement plan.

The intervention will be articulated and embedded in the Michigan School Improvement Framework and will address many of the standards, benchmarks and key characteristics from each of the five SIF strands. Teaching and student learning will be at the center as school practices will change to include best practice instructional methods, data-driven decision-making, as well as collaborative and reflective design of curriculum, instruction, and assessment. At the foundation will be the creation and practice of Professional Learning Communities with teachers engaged in job-embedded professional development.

In addition to the all required NCLB/ED YES/AYP data collection tools, other evaluation tools and methods include Keys to Excellence for Your Schools (KEYS) is a comprehensive, research-based, data-driven program for continuous school improvement (CSI). The Cycle of Continuous Improvement monitors all progress routinely through the year.

Support systems to ensure student and teacher success and sustain improvement

Fidelity for this intervention will be supported and monitored in multiple ways including:

(1) Consistent, ongoing coaching by the MCES to support the implementation of the Breaking Ranks in the Middle structures and strategies.
(2) Connecting the school with a state and national network of secondary (middle schools and high schools) schools implementing similar projects to provide support and shared accountability.
(3) Setting high expectations for implementation.
(4) Requiring evidence of success by measuring results frequently and sharing those results with all stakeholders
(5) Inviting, expecting and building commitment from all stakeholders
(6) Acknowledging and linking results to rewards/consequences
(7) Continuously evaluating effectiveness.
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.
Comprehensive School Reform

MCES partnered with the Academy for Educational Development (AED) and Michigan Middle Start (MMS) to deliver Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) in two separate rounds of grant funding. In research conducted by Steve Mertens and Nancy Flowers from CPRD at the University of Illinois, the results were promising. 1) Schools engaged in high levels of middle school practices, such as teaming, demonstrate greater student achievement gains. 2) Compared to a more affluent sample of schools, higher poverty schools engaged in the Middle Start comprehensive school reform model exhibited greater student achievement over time. 3) Two years after their grants expired, Middle Start schools were able to demonstrate continued gains in student achievement. The research noted that teaming and common planning time had a clear positive impact on the schools ability to implement and sustain elements of middle school reform and ultimately student achievement. (Middle Grades Research Journal, Vol.1, No.1, 2006, Middle Start’s Impact on Comprehensive Middle School Reform, Steve Mertens & Nancy Flowers)

MCES CSR schools comprised elementary-high school. Marquette Elementary in Muskegon and Northeast Elementary in Jackson both serve high-poverty populations and struggled with making AYP. Integrating Best Practice with a Content Focus was a key intervention in their huge increases in MEAP scores and their making of AYP. Union City school district, Covert Schools, and Hope of Detroit Academy are also MCES former Comprehensive School Reform sites that are sustaining the structures and strategies that support the state’s school improvement process. Most recently, components of this approach were implemented in the Inkster School District with evidence of initial success. It should be noted that in all of these schools, Middle Start and MCES, components of Critical Friends Groups, such as the use of protocols in studying student work were used. Also, middle schools and high schools used our secondary literacy program.

Professional Learning Community

An analysis of school reform research and the School Improvement Frameworks Key Performance Indicators strongly supports that sustainability is dependent upon the development of professional learning communities (PLC). Research indicates that schools most effective in terms of student achievement operate as professional learning communities characterized by: 1. Shared norms and values; 2. Collective focus on student learning; 3. Collaboration; 4. De-privatization / making practice public; and 5. Reflective dialogue (Newmann, et al. 1996). Richard DuFour, a recognized national expert in PLCs, finds that “To create a professional learning community, focus on learning rather than on teaching, work collaboratively, and hold yourself accountable for results. PLC’s make a significant contribution by encouraging the staff to collectively undertake activities and reflection in order to constantly improve their students’ performance.” Because PLC’s change how educator’s approach their work, the disciplined practice of PLC’s becomes embedded in the school culture. Furthermore, by creating an intentional alignment between the practice of PLC’s and the content of the Michigan School Improvement Framework as
well as Breaking Ranks in the Middle, sustainability can be embedded into the culture of the school.

Critical Friends Groups

In reviewing the research on CFGs, it was found that 1) CFGs foster a culture of community and collaboration. 2) CFGs enhance teacher professionalism. 3) CFGs have the potential to change teacher’s thinking and practice. 4) CFGs have the potential to impact student learning. Multiple research studies substantiate 1 and 2. The claims in 3 and 4 are dependent on complex contextual issues which make them more difficult to directly align with CFGs. (Do They Make a Difference? A Review of Research on the Impact of Critical Friends Groups, Ellen Key, PA State University, presented at the National School Reform Faculty Research Forum, January 2006)

MCES Secondary Literacy Program

In order to master reading and writing in specific content areas, explicit The Michigan Coalition of Essential School’s Secondary Literacy Program is based on the Cognitive Strategies of Proficient Readers research conducted by David Pearson et al during the 1970’s. In this research, Pearson studied students who were competent readers to learn what they did as they read. The reading process was then understood to be much more complex, involving knowledge, experience, thinking and teaching. WestEd’s Reading Apprenticeship draws its work from many theories in areas of literacy and learning, adolescent literacy development and teacher learning and change to support its process of literacy development and content. All of these theories are based on qualitative and quantitative research.

- Literacy is social, cultural and cognitive, shaped by the content and context in which it is used (Scribner and Cole, 1983, Street, 1995)
- Learning advanced mental processes like reading and writing is facilitated when a mentor models making thinking visible (Vygotsky, 1978 and Rogoff, 1989)
- Through the metacognitive process, all skills connected with reading take hold more easily and allow students to take control of their own learning. (Flawell, 1976 and Bransford, Brown, and Cocking, 2000)
- Being explicit about purposes and thinking processes is a necessity in helping diverse learners to understand (Delpit, 1995)
- With adolescent readers it is necessary to use prereading strategies to make them effective, strategic readers (Alverman, 2002) (Heath and McLaughlin, 1995)
- Activities that guide, support, and allow for questioning of students who perceive selves as nonreaders can move their identity to that of a reader and promote acquisition of advanced skills. (Davidson and Copenhagen, 1993)
- Adolescents need many supported opportunities to read with appropriate material. (Fielding and Pearson, 1994)
- Activities must be given that highlight that content and the processes inherent. (Borasi and Seegal, 2000) (Wineburg, 2001)
- Making comparisons and contrasting, summarizing, using nonlinguistic representations, cooperative learning, generating and testing hypotheses are all used in Secondary Literacy as fundamental tools (referenced in Classroom Practice that
Works, Marzano, Pickering, Pollock, 2001)
• Add to those, Metacognitive strategies, use of authentic experiences, and reflective assessment (Teaching the Best Practice Way, Daniels and Bizar, 2005) (Methods that Matter, Daniels and Bizar, 1998)
• (Strategies that Work Harvey and Goudvis)

Reading Apprenticeship is one of six nationally approved models for Striving Readers. A two-year study from 2004-2006, showed AYP gains for below-proficient readers of 2 years in 7 months, a jump of 24%. Those who were in an RA English class made a jump of 60%. Washtenaw ISD has many examples of a rise in DRP scores and in student attitude about learning.

Results in high poverty schools using Real Reading in the Middle (our pilot project for Secondary Literacy) showed improvement in reading scores.
• 18/20 middle schools showed increases in reading and many were double digit increases with the greatest increase of 44% on MEAP
• Between 2004-2007, five high schools received training and improved in reading

Additional Research
In addition to the researchers and authors listed earlier, the intervention has been informed by the work of Saphier, Haley-Specca, and Gower. Their book, The Skillful Teacher is a handbook used by MSU in the Michigan Principals Fellowship as is Lauren Resnick’s research on effort-based education and Elmore’s research on Instructional Rounds.

There were numerous studies referred to in the research of Elmore, Marzano, Newmann, and the others listed earlier that were based on evaluation standards and guidelines of the various professional evaluation associations. The elements of evidence that emerged from these various studies shaped the logic model and Theory of Change underlying the intervention. MCES evaluation tools were developed by a third party (FERA) to be used as a formative assessment and to capture all aspects of the MCES Comprehensive School Reform Model. That model included CFGs and Best Practice professional development and other interventions aligned with a Theory of Change or Action from Dick Elmore’s research on School Reform. The evaluation process included surveys, analysis of MEAP data, focus group interviews, and classroom observations. There were at least three cohort groups of schools participating in the evaluation. The evaluations showed consistent positive results when schools implemented with integrity and staff leadership remained stable.
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).

The Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools (MCES) will provide teachers with the professional development, coaching, regular opportunities for collaboration with peers, and other supports needed to implement a rigorous curriculum and provide high-quality instruction as well as implement Breaking Ranks in the Middle structures and strategies. One cornerstone strategy is to align the school-wide comprehensive professional development with the content knowledge and instructional strategies required to prepare students for high school success. With a focus on the needs of students caught in the inequitable conditions of many traditional school settings, high-quality professional development will be provided throughout the project period to advance the practice of teachers, administrators, and other school staff of effective, research-based instructional strategies for improving the academic achievement of students (particularly students with academic skills that are significantly below grade level) and provide the knowledge and skills staff need to participate effectively in the development and implementation of our middle school model.

Professional Development will occur through professional learning communities collaboratively investigating “best practice” instruction including literacy and numeracy strategies across content areas, formative assessment, extended instructional time, skills for catching up, curriculum development for academic support, use of a Continuous Improvement Cycle for data-driven decision making (including student work and other authentic assessments), identification of students needing support, and differentiated instruction. The MCES professional development approach aligns with the National Staff Development Council’s characteristics of high quality professional development adopted by the State Board of Education. It is job-embedded and ongoing delivered in a multiple of ways: primarily through on-site workshops that occur during professional development release time days, during staff meetings, and/or during common planning time or release time where small groups of staff members are rotated through workshops or provided collaborative work time facilitated by the school redesign coach.

MCES has a cadre of consultant/coaches available to do professional development and coaching on a larger scale. For example: during the peak of Comprehensive School Reform (CSR), MCES provided technical assistance for up to 30 schools in overlapping cohorts as model providers for both the CES (Coalition of Essential Schools) and the Middle Start models.

Fidelity for this strategy or professional development model, comes from the structure of having multiple teams engaged in a cohort of schools that hold one another accountable. Consistent coaching by MCES supports the implementation of the professional development model- its structures and strategies. This approach starts with the Cycle of Continuous Improvement from the SIF so schools can describe the current reality for student achievement at their school. They then describe the gap between that reality and their vision (students achieving proficiency on state tests). Their data analysis becomes more focused on classroom instruction and the impact on students’ daily work and on how instructional strategies are aligned with
content expectations.

MCES has provided this model (including literacy coaches) to several cohorts of schools over the past decade and has the staff and team of consultants to provide the professional development and coaching at the school sites. Math content coaches were successfully added for the Smaller Learning Communities grant and will continue in the MCES Middle School Model.

The implementation of the School Improvement Planning process including the Cycle of Continuous Improvement becomes embedded in the school culture and the way teachers go about their collaborative work to improve student achievement. The Critical Friends Group (CFG) structure and strategies is so empowering to teachers that they will not give it up even when external resources are diminished. They find ways to reallocate time so that they continue to collaborate and have student-focused and reflective dialogue.
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 Smaller Learning Communities intervention will be articulated and embedded in the Michigan School Improvement Framework. The MCES Middle School Model intervention addresses a predominance of standards, benchmarks and key characteristics from each of the five SIF strands. Specific Breaking Ranks in the Middle recommendations and strategies aligned with the Michigan School Improvement Framework include but are not limited to the following:

**Strand I. Teaching For Learning**
- Each school will identify a set of essential learnings—in literature and language, writing, mathematics, social studies, science, and the arts—in which students must demonstrate achievement in order to graduate.
- Each school will present alternatives to tracking and to ability grouping.
- The school will reorganize the traditional department structure and foster the use of teacher teams provided with ample common planning time.
- The content of the curriculum, where practical, should connect to real-life applications of knowledge and skills.
- Teachers will know and be able to use a variety of strategies and settings that identify and accommodate individual learning styles and engage students.
- Each teacher will have a broad base of academic knowledge with depth in at least one subject area.
- Teachers will integrate assessment into instruction so that assessment is accomplished using a variety of methods that do not merely measure students, but become part of their learning process.
- Recognizing that schooling is a continuum, educators must understand what is required of students at every stage and ensure a smooth transition academically and socially for each student from grade to grade and from level to level.
- Schools will develop a strategic plan to make technology integral to curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

**Strand II. Leadership**
- The principal will provide leadership in the school community by building and maintaining a vision, direction, and focus for student learning.
- Each school will establish a site council and accord other meaningful roles in decision making to students, parents, and members of the staff to promote student learning and an atmosphere of participation, responsibility, and ownership.
- A school will regard itself as a community in which members of the staff collaborate to develop and implement the school’s learning goals.
- Every school will be a learning community in which professional development for teachers and the principal is guided by a Personal Learning Plan.
- The school community will promote policies and practices that recognize diversity will offer ongoing professional development to help educators appreciate issues of diversity and expose students to a rich array of viewpoints, perspectives, and experiences.
- Schools will build partnerships with institutions of higher education to provide...
teachers and administrators at both levels with ideas and opportunities to enhance the education, performance, and evaluation of educators

- Schools will develop political and financial relationships with individuals, organizations, and businesses to support and supplement educational programs and policies

- Each student will have a Personal Plan for Progress that will be reviewed often to ensure that the school takes individual needs into consideration and to allow students, within reasonable parameters, to design their own methods for learning in an effort to meet high standards.

- Each student will have a Personal Adult Advocate to help him or her personalize the educational experience.

- Teachers and administrators will convey a sense of caring so that students know that their teachers share a stake in their learning.

- Each school will develop flexible scheduling and student grouping patterns to meet the individual needs of students and to ensure academic success.

- The school will engage students’ families as partners in the students’ education.

- The school community, which cannot be values-neutral, will advocate and model a set of core values essential in a democratic and civil society.

Strand III. Personnel and Professional Learning - Professional Development is ongoing, collaborative, job embedded and research based

- Professional Development is supported by site-based instructional coaches

- Critical Friends groups (collaborative teams) are created to examine student work on a regular basis for the purpose of informing classroom instructional practice

- Professional development needs are based on the evidence and the analysis of data

Strand IV. School and Community Relations - The school will promote service programs and student activities as integral to an education, providing opportunities for all students that support and extend academic learning

- The academic program will extend beyond the school campus to take advantage of learning opportunities outside the four walls of the building

- Each school will establish a site council and accord other meaningful roles in decision making to students, parents, and members of the staff to promote student learning and an atmosphere of participation, responsibility, and ownership

- The school will engage students’ families as partners in the students’ education

Strand V. Data and Information Management - Consistent use of the “Cycle of Continuous Improvement”

- Data is collected regularly from a variety of sources

- All instructional personnel practice “data-driven decision making”

- Analysis of multiple forms and sources of data

- Priority placed on student achievement data

- Support is provided to assist staff with data analysis
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)
See Attached Sustainability Plan Table
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)

Nancy Fenton has been a 4th.-6th grade teacher, a middle school principal, and is presently Assistant Director for the Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools. She has served in a coaching capacity for MCES schools, Michigan Middle Start schools, and Institute for Student Achievement schools, and is certified to train in NASSP’s Breaking Ranks in the Middle. Nancy also has done extensive professional development in leadership, professional learning community, Critical Friends Groups, Thinking and Reflection, Lesson Study, Student Community Exhibition, and learning/instructional strategies. Nancy was on the Board for The National Forum to Accelerate Middle Grades Reform, was a member of its Executive Board for two terms, and has served on the Michigan STW Committee since its inception.

James Bodrie currently serves as the Director of the Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools as well as the Project Director for the Michigan Smaller Learning Communities Consortium. Mr. Bodrie is an experienced, knowledgeable educator with 40 years of educational practice in positions as a classroom teacher, K-12 principal, high school principal and central office administrator and educational consultant/coach. He has participated in professional development directly aligned with high school reform and creating smaller learning communities. Those activities include (1) Breaking Ranks Training and Workshops; (2) NWREL Small School Design Studio; (3) NWREL/USDOE Technical Assistance Workshop; (3) CSSR/NASSP Smaller Learning Communities Workshops; and the (4) CES National Small Schools Project Workshop. In addition, Mr. Bodrie is very active in Michigan school improvement and high school redesign efforts. He served a Lead Coach in the state’s Principal Fellowship that is designed to “turn-around” schools that are in AYP phases 3 or more. Recently, he also served as a Leadership Coach as part of Detroit Public Schools efforts to “turn-around” high schools.
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.
• **Licensure**: Applicants must attach a copy of their business license or formal documentation of legal status with respect to conducting business in Michigan (e.g., certificate of incorporation, proof of 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status). Schools, school districts, and ISDs/RESAs may substitute documents that include address/contact information and the appropriate building or district code as found in the Educational Entity Master (EEM).

• **Insurance**: Applicants must provide a proof of their liability insurance or a quote from an insurance agency that reflects the intent to obtain general and/or professional liability insurance coverage.

**LICENSURE AND INSURANCE DOCUMENTS ARE ON FILE WITH MDE**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cornerstone Strategy</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish the academically rigorous essential learnings that a student is required to master in order to successfully make the transition to high school and align the curriculum and teaching strategies to realize that goal</td>
<td>• Align all curriculum with MCF  • Identify Power Standards  • Deliver PD on higher order thinking and essential learnings  • Use vertical planning in content areas to determine requisite learning for HS  • Assess technology integration &amp; develop a plan</td>
<td>• Teachers refine instructional and assessment strategies &amp; tech. use to meet all student needs  • PD continues in best instr. Practices &amp; all staff held account.  • Teachers use many types of data to ascertain student needs and successes</td>
<td>• Curr. &amp; instruction reviewed continuously against high stan- dards and adjust where necessary  • Integrated units designed when feasible to promote relevancy  • A variety of assessments are used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create dynamic teacher teams that are afforded common planning time to help organize and improve the quality and quantity of interactions between teachers and students.</td>
<td>• Plan developed for small teams of students &amp; teachers, 25/1  • Teams balanced equitably by SES, gender, race, sped, language &amp; achievement  • Team has plan for heterogeneous-ous flexible grouping</td>
<td>• Teaming implemented &amp; notes kept of all meetings  • Admin. attends periodically  • Most time is spent on CIA and student development  • Teachers practice getting into each other’s classrooms</td>
<td>• Teachers serve as critical friends to each other, study student work  • Teams use CoFCI in reviewing all of their work  • Cont. PD determined by teams based on needs, delivered by team members w/MCES coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide structured planning time for teachers to align curriculum across grades and schools and to map efforts that address the academic, developmental, social, and personal needs of students, esp. at critical transition periods.</td>
<td>• Plan in place for 4 prds. of com-mo. plan, time for each team  • Plan in place that prepares teachers to use cpt effectively focusing on curriculum, instruction, assessment, and student developmental needs  • A plan is in place for transitions  • Training has started for CFGs</td>
<td>• CPT implemented &amp; resources in place for continuation  • Plan implemented for depts.. to meet 1/mo.  • Transition plan implemented and reviewed regularly  • CFG training cont. and staff has started CFG groups  • Invest. Serv. Lrng. &amp; dev. a plan</td>
<td>• LT aligns resources &amp; calendar to support CPT, Dept.Mtgs., &amp; goals of SIP  • Staff meets w/HS 2x/yr to inform their practice  • Implement &amp; assess service learning activities/projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a comprehensive advisory that ensures that each student has frequent and meaningful opportunities to meet with an adult to plan and assess the student’s academic, personal, and social development</td>
<td>• Extensive professional develop. Is given on advisories  • An advisory plan is developed with appropriate curriculum for each grade level with small ratio of students to teacher  • Some plan is in place &amp; being used for at-risk students</td>
<td>• Advisory plan is implemented and reviewed monthly  • An extensive plan is developed with a variety of resources to meet the needs of all students  • Individual Student Plans become a part of all student portfolios  • Plan dev. for parent engagement</td>
<td>• All advisories implementing plan to engage parents &amp; community  • Data, includ. parent &amp; student surveys reviewed regularly to determine prog. Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that teachers assess the individual learning needs of students and tailor instructional strategies and multiple assessments accordingly</td>
<td>• The Cycle of Continuous Improvement is understood and used by LT and entire staff  • Appropriate assessments &amp; stan- dards are determined  • Teachers begin est.of CFGs and begin looking at student work</td>
<td>• Cof CI is used routinely by all teams  • PD in best practice instr. &amp; CFGs cont. with expected implementation</td>
<td>• Progress Assessments given routinely to determine student mastery of standards &amp; instruct. adjusted accordingly  • CFGs routinely study student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrust leaders with the responsibility of implementing schedules that are flexible enough</td>
<td>• A schedule has been dev. that allows for teaming, advisories, cpt &amp; team flexibility in scheduling &amp;</td>
<td>• Schedule is implemented with teacher practice &amp; sharing of flexible scheduling experiences</td>
<td>• Teams spend time in reflection on goal accomplishment  • Teams use CoFCI routinely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplar 5 Table Attachment Middle School</td>
<td>decision making</td>
<td>Cont. monitoring with notes, admin. visits, and MCES coaching</td>
<td>Teams study student work together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to accommodate teaching strategies consistent with the ways students learn most effectively and that allow for effective teacher teaming, common planning time, and other lesson planning</td>
<td>• PD is delivered by MCES on using cpt effectively</td>
<td>• Teams cont. review their work against the goals they have set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute structural leadership systems that allow for substantive involvement in decision making by students, teachers, family members, and the community, and that support effective communication among these groups</td>
<td>• A school leadership team has been ident. &amp; is fully functioning</td>
<td>• LT representative of all stakeholders is fully functioning</td>
<td>• LT routinely reviews practices &amp; systems for effectiveness and modifies if necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A system is dev. and implemented for communication of the plan to all stakeholders</td>
<td>• A two-way communication plan has been implemented</td>
<td>• Stakeholder surveys continue to be given and reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An avenue is developed and implemented for soliciting input from all stakeholders</td>
<td>• All effective PLC strategies are used in all mtg, scenarios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PLC is understood and practiced</td>
<td>• Cof Ci is used routinely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Norms are est. &amp; modeled</td>
<td>• Stakeholder surveys are developed, given, and reviewed to improve process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align all programs and structures so that all social, economic, and racial/ethnic groups have open and equal access to challenging activities and learning</td>
<td>• A common need and vision are built around Breaking Ranks in the Middle</td>
<td>• Review and modify SIP and school vision</td>
<td>Cont. with prior LT practices &amp; refine as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Roadblocks are identified and solutions determined</td>
<td>• Cont. with internal and external reviews</td>
<td>Cont. with MCES leadership coaching where responsibility will gradually be turned over to the team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Align SIP w/ BRIM</td>
<td>• Place all programs &amp; activities through equity sieve</td>
<td>Cont. internal and external review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Internal &amp; external review of school dev. &amp; admin. in spring</td>
<td>• Cont. w/MCES leadership coaching and PD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align the schoolwide comprehensive, ongoing professional development program and the Personal Learning Plans of staff with the requisite knowledge of content, instructional strategies, and student developmental factors</td>
<td>• PD started on numeracy, literacy, some CFG work, leadership, data collection, adolescent character-istics, HOTS and teaming w/ expected beg. implementation</td>
<td>• PD with coaches and MCES will continue with expected implementation</td>
<td>PD continues with coaches and MCES based on staff input and requirements of model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some advisory, CFG, &amp; best practice PD is off-site with MCES staff</td>
<td>• PLPs for staff will be implemented and routinely reviewed w/ admin.</td>
<td>Staff PLPs cont. with review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PD plan for year 2 determined and aligned with SIP</td>
<td>• PD plan will be reviewed and year 3 plan determined based on SIP and staff needs</td>
<td>PD plan reviewed &amp; year 4 plan determined based on SIP and staff needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nancy M. Fenton

**Education**

Western Michigan University:
Master in Educational Leadership – August, 1988

Albion College:
Bachelor of Arts Degree – June, 1970

**Professional experience**

**Assistant Director**-Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools, 12236 61/2 Mile Rd., Battle Creek, MI 49014, January 2008-present

**Co-Director**- Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools, 400 S. Jackson Street, #2, Jackson, MI, 49201, March 2001-January 2008

**Associate Director** – Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools, 209 East Washington, Suite 224, Jackson, MI, 49201, August 1999-March, 2001

**Principal** – Springfield Middle School, Battle Creek Public Schools, 3 West VanBuren, Battle Creek, MI, 49016, October 1992-1999

**Principal/Teacher** – Territorial Sixth Grade School, Lakeview School District, 15 Arbor Street, Battle Creek, MI, 49015, July, 1992-October, 1992

**Teacher** – Grade 6, Territorial Sixth Grade School, Lakeview School District, 15 Arbor Street, Battle Creek, MI 49015, 1991-1992

**Teacher** – Grades 4-6, Minges Brook Elementary School, Lakeview School District, Lincoln Hill Drive, Battle Creek, MI 49015, 1970-1991

**Trainer** – Effective Instruction, Lakeview School District, 1985-1990

**Teacher** – Preschool Play School, Lakeview School District, 15 Arbor, Battle Creek, MI, 49015, Summers 1971 and 1972

**Administrative experience**

Co-Direct a small non-profit organization with five full-time employees

Coordinate Programs and Coach in instruction, literacy, and leadership in the Inkster Public Schools
Coordinate curriculum design and instruction and Train leadership at Willow Run Secondary Complex

Conduct Comprehensive School Audits in two Detroit Public Schools and two Detroit Charter Schools

Coach for the Institute of Student Achievement in a Small Schools initiative for Osborn University of Mathematics, Science, and Technology in the Detroit Public Schools

Coach leadership in advisories, Critical Friends Groups, and leadership facilitation at Inkster High School through a Small Learning Communities Grant

Coordinate the Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools (MCES) and the Michigan Middle Start (MMS) Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) program in Benton Harbor

Design and Implement training for site visit participants for Schools to Watch (STW) and Collaborative Peer Review (CPR modeled after School Self Assessment for Michigan Middle Start)

Lead STW, CPR, and MCES Affirmation site visits

Coordinate the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) program for the Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools (MCES)

Coach directly for MCES, Michigan Middle Start, and Institute for Student Achievement

Plan and Conduct training for coaches and leadership seminars for school leadership teams for MCES and MMS CSR schools

Plan and Conduct workshops on instruction, data collection, reading comprehension strategies, learner outcomes, teaming, middle school philosophy and structure, integrated units, looking at student work, professional learning community, curriculum mapping, cycle of continuous improvement, lesson study, inquiry, and student exhibition.

Plan and Facilitate Critical Friends Groups (CFG)

Manage, supervise, and lead a 50 member staff and 400 students in a city middle school, grades 4-8

Plan and implement transition from junior high school to middle school

Prepare and manage a Middle Start Grant

Design the plan and organize the implementation of a district-wide grade level re-alignment, 9th. Grade center, and middle school

Supervise and evaluate instructional staff

Develop Individual Development Plans (IDP) for instructional staff

Promote equity within the school culture
Supervise five special education programs and their transition to inclusion

Recruit, interview, and recommend staff for hire

Develop and manage building budgets

**Awards received**

W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Excellence in Education, $1,000 Incentive Award, 1995, Attended ASCD Workshop, “Increasing Academic Achievement”, Ann Arbor, MI


Superintendents’ Task Force Thinking Skills Committee, Grant to attend the “Tenth Annual Intermediate Conference on Critical Thinking and Educational Reform”, Sonoma State University, CA

W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Excellence in Education $1,000 Incentive Award, 1986, Attended “Essential Elements of Effective Instruction Workshop”, Buena Park, CA

**Professional memberships and National Affiliations**

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

National Middle School Association

Michigan Middle Start

National Forum to Accelerate Middle Grades Reform, Board Member, Executive Board

National Adolescent Literacy Coalition

CES National Regional Directors

National Staff Development Council

National School Reform Faculty

ABCS Coach for state of Michigan

National Reading Association

International Reading Association

Michigan Schools to Watch, State Committee and Coordinator for Application Process
References

Dr. Thomas Maridada, Superintendent of Pontiac School District, 47200 Woodward Ave., Pontiac, MI 48342, (248) 451-6800

Ms. Carolyn McKanders, Co-Director of the Center for Adaptive Schools, 11512 Wilson, MI 48111, (313) 378-5078

Patrick Montesano, Vice President and Director, Center for School and Community Services, Academy for Educational Development, 100 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10011, (212) 367-4573

Mr. Steve Hoelscher, Coordinator for Michigan Middle Start, Academy for Educational Development, 20 Elizabeth, Battle Creek, MI, 49017, (616) 963-2660 or (248) 249-3265

Ms. Sharalyn Brandell, (Former Director Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools), 125 Wa Wee Nork Dr., 1B, Battle Creek, MI 49015, (269) 317-9664

Ms Barbara Bleyaert, (Former Director of the Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools), Assistant Professor, Department of Leadership and Counseling, Eastern Michigan University, John W. Porter Building, Suite 304, Ypsilanti, MI 48197, (734) 487-7120 x2591
RESUME

JAMES F. BODRIE
1900 Catalina Drive #426
Muskegon, Michigan 49444
231-730-7007
jbodrie@hotmail.com

EDUCATION AND CERTIFICATION

Certification
Michigan State University
Michigan Principal’s Fellowship
Principal Leadership Coach
2007

Certification
Michigan State University
Alliance for Building Capacity in Schools
School Improvement Consultant
2005

Certification*
Michigan School Business Officials Association
Chief Financial Officer
(*Pending Completion of 4 Accounting Credits)

Masters
Central Michigan University
Educational Administration and Leadership
1990

Masters
Central Michigan University
Secondary School Personnel
1983

Bachelors
Michigan State University
Industrial / Vocational Education and Mathematics
1971

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Educational Consultant
Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools
Jackson, Michigan
2002 to present

Director of Business and Personnel Services
Orchard View Schools
Muskegon, Michigan
2000 to 2002
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Principal</td>
<td>Orchard View Schools</td>
<td>Muskegon, Michigan</td>
<td>1997 to 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Principal and Athletic Director</td>
<td>Northport Public Schools</td>
<td>Northport, Michigan</td>
<td>1990 to 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Athletic Director</td>
<td>Northport Public Schools</td>
<td>Northport, Michigan</td>
<td>1986 to 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Coach</td>
<td>Clare Public Schools</td>
<td>Clare, Michigan</td>
<td>1977 to 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Coach</td>
<td>Alma Public Schools</td>
<td>Alma, Michigan</td>
<td>1971 to 1977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRESENTATIONS**

Michigan Educational Leadership Collaborative  
“Innovative Scheduling”  
Spring Conference – 1996

Michigan Association for Supervision and Curriculum  
“Structural Options for Increased Learning”  
Fall Conference – 1995

Michigan Institute for Educational Management  
“Exhibitions of Mastery”  
“High School Class Projects”  
Classroom Assessment Conference  
Spring – 1995

Coalition of Essential Schools  
“Alternative Assessments”  
National Conference  
Fall – 1994

Middle Cities Education Association  
“Emerging Assessments to Address Broad Based Student Exit Outcomes”  
Classroom Assessment Professional Development Program  
April – 1993
SPECIAL RECOGNITION

State Board of Directors Officer
Secretary
Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools
1999 - 2002

State Board of Directors Trustee
Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools
1995 - 1999

National Congress Delegate
Coalition of Essential Schools
1996 – 1997

Outstanding Person in Education Award
Traverse Bay Area Intermediate School District
1988

President
Northport Education Association
1988 – 1990

Vice-President
Northport Education Association
1987 – 1988

Commission on Excellence in Education Delegate
Mid-Michigan Education Focus Group
1980

Building Representative
Clare Education Association
1981 – 1986

Regional Coach of the Year
Michigan Baseball Coaches Association
1976 and 1977
REFERENCES

Sharilyn (Shug) Brandell
Co-Director
Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools
269-968-4427 (H)
269-317-9664 (M)

Nancy Fenton
Co-Director
Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools
269-317-9911

Mitch Zaleski
Curriculum Director (Retired)
Orchard View Schools
Muskegon, Michigan
231-780-3185
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:

**MDE-SSOS@michigan.gov**

The application and all required attachments must be submitted before 5:00 p.m. on **May 21, 2010** to be considered for the first list to be posted on the website. Applications will be received after May 21 on an ongoing basis and will be reviewed in the order in which they are received.

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

Please make sure you complete the application as early as possible so that we may help you correct any problems associated with technical difficulties. Technical support will be available Monday – Friday, throughout the application period, from 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

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

**Contact Information**

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

Mark Coscarella  
Interim Supervisor  
Office of Education Improvement & Innovation  

OR

Anne Hansen or Bill Witt  
Consultants  
Office of Education Improvement & Innovation

Telephone: (517) 373-8480 or (517) 335-4733  
Email: MDE-SSOS@michigan.gov
EXTERIAL 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplar</th>
<th>Total Points Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Description of comprehensive improvement services</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use of scientific educational research</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job embedded professional development</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Experience with state and federal requirements</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sustainability Plan</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Staff Qualifications</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points Possible</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Points Required for Approval</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

- Section 1: 15 points
- Section 2: 10 points
- Section 3: 10 points
- Section 4: 10 points
- Section 5: 10 points
- Section 6: 10 points

Section 6 must be completed by all applicants.
APPLICATION OVERVIEW

The Application is divided into four sections.

**Section A** contains basic provider information.

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

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

**Section D** Attachments
## SECTION A: BASIC PROVIDER INFORMATION

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

**Instructions:** Complete each section in full.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Federal EIN, Tax ID or Social Security Number</th>
<th>2. Legal Name of Entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[redacted]</td>
<td>Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Name of Entity as you would like it to appear on the Approved List**

Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools

4. **Entity Type:**
   - [ ] For-profit
   - [x] Non-profit

5. **Check the category that best describes your entity:**
   - [ ] Business
   - [ ] Community-Based Organization
   - [ ] Educational Service Agency (e.g., RESA or ISD)
   - [x] Institution of Higher Education
   - [ ] School District
   - [ ] Other (specify): Professional Development Organization

6. **Applicant Contact Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Contact</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Bodrie</td>
<td>231-730-7007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12236 6 1/2 Mile Road</td>
<td>Battle Creek</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>49014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jbirdie@hotmail.com">jbirdie@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigances.org">www.michigances.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **Local Contact Information** (if different than information listed above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Contact</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Miller</td>
<td>269-967-2086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12236 6 1/2 Mile Road</td>
<td>Battle Creek</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>49014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:miller@michigances.org">miller@michigances.org</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigances.org">www.michigances.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

- [x] Statewide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate School District(s):</th>
<th>Name(s) of District(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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)

Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools (MCES) has provided comprehensive improvement services to more than 50 schools over the past decade and achieved results in several underperforming urban secondary schools. MCES was a model provider for Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) and also partnered with Academy for Educational Development as a Middle Start CSR provider. Currently, MCES is the technical assistance and professional development provider for the Michigan Smaller Learning Communities Consortium serving 6 large high schools. Jim Bodrie, MCES and SLC project director convened the consortium, submitted the grant that was recently awarded continuation funding for years 4 and 5. The SLC grant uses the National Association of Secondary School Principals Breaking Ranks II: Strategies for Leading High School Reform as a framework for:

- Support systems to ensure student and teacher success and sustain improvement, and;
- Content and delivery systems and mechanisms proven to result in dramatic and sustained improvement linked to student achievement.

The overarching priority is to Prepare All Students to Succeed in Postsecondary Education and Careers. This priority is supported and achieved by implementing the Breaking Ranks II Cornerstone Strategies and Recommendations as well as the Michigan School Improvement Frameworks. To meet this priority, the high school will:

1. Provide intensive interventions to assist students who enter high school with reading/language arts or mathematics skills that are significantly below grade level to catch up quickly and attain proficiency by the end of 10th grade;
2. Enroll students in a coherent sequence of rigorous English language arts, mathematics, and science courses to equip them with the skills and content knowledge to succeed in postsecondary education and careers without need for remediation;
3. Provide tutoring and other academic supports to help students succeed in rigorous academic courses;
4. Deliver comprehensive guidance and academic advising to students and their parents that includes assistance in selecting courses and planning a program of study that will provide the academic preparation needed to succeed in postsecondary education, early and ongoing college awareness and planning activities, and help in identifying and applying for financial aid for postsecondary education; and
5. Increase opportunities for students to earn postsecondary credit through Advanced Placement courses, International Baccalaureate courses, or dual credit programs.
6. Provide Common Planning Time for Teachers. To meet this priority, the common planning time must be used for one or more of the following activities:
   1. Structured examination of student work and outcome data.
   2. Collaborative professional development and coaching, including classroom observation.
   3. Identifying instructional and other interventions for struggling students.

Breaking Ranks II strategies fall into three core areas: Collaborative
Leadership/Professional Learning Community; Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment; and Personalizing Your School Environment. These three core areas of reform lend themselves to alignment with the Relationships, Relevance, and Rigor focus espoused by Achieve, Inc., and Gates Foundation. The first set of Breaking Ranks II recommendations develops professional learning community, wherein leadership throughout the institution refocuses its work on what will support every student in their high school experience. The second set of recommendations provides meaningful adult relationships that can best support every student. And the third set of recommendations develops personalized learning, where students see their learning as meaningful and relevant, as well as rigorous and challenging, ensuring their success both within and beyond high school.

There are 7 cornerstone strategies that cut across all three core areas’ recommendations and form the foundation for improving the performance of each student in the school:

1. Core Knowledge: Establish the essential learnings a student is required to learn to graduate, and adjust the curriculum and teaching strategies to realize that goal.

2. Connections with Students: Increase the quantity and improve the quality of interactions between students, teachers, and other school personnel by reducing the number of students for which any adult or group of adults is responsible.

3. Personalized Planning: Implement a comprehensive advisory program that ensures each student has frequent and meaningful opportunities to plan and assess his or her academic and social progress with a faculty member.

4. Adapting to Differences: Ensure teachers use a variety of instructional strategies and assessments to accommodate individual learning styles.

5. Flexible Use of Time: Implement schedules flexible enough to accommodate teaching strategies consistent with the ways students learn most effectively and that allow for effective teacher teaming and lesson planning.

6. Distributed Leadership: Institute structural leadership changes that allow for meaningful involvement in decision making by students, teachers, family members, and the community and that support effective communication with these groups.

7. Continuous Professional Development: Align comprehensive, ongoing professional development and individual Personal Learning Plans of staff members with the content knowledge and instructional strategies required to prepare students for graduation.

As noted in “Breaking Ranks: A Field Guide for Leading Change”, there are specific steps that lead to successfully implementing school-wide initiatives. 1. Gathering and analyzing data to determine priorities, 2. Exploring possible solutions, 3. Assessing readiness and building capacity, 4. Creating and Communicating the Improvement Plan(s), 5. Implementing the Plan, 6. Monitoring and Adjusting the Plan(s).

MCES delivers the Breaking Ranks II Framework as Comprehensive School Improvement: integrating best practice pedagogy with a content focus; referred to in the state School Improvement Framework as professional learning communities and collaborative groups to look at student work. Research by Elmore, Fullen, McNulty, and others cite integrated best practice as an effective school improvement strategy with much of the research coming from the Annenburg Institute and now the National School Reform
Faculty and the National Staff Development Council. Coaching is a relatively new intervention that has demonstrated effectiveness in research by NSDC, Coalition of Essential Schools, various literacy models and is now a major component of the Statewide System of Support.

This intervention is based on a specific logic model for professional learning (NSDC-Joellen Killion) acknowledging that to improve student learning, change must occur in instruction, and school-wide practices that support instruction. This model integrates all of the elements of comprehensive school improvement and the instructional core as identified in the research by Richard Elmore (2001) and others:

1. There are clear and ambitious goals matched with such indicators of results as coherent education standards and sound measures of student achievement. 2. There is a change in the nature and organization of instructional practice (instructional core) defined as the interactions of students, teachers, content, and the environment. 3. There is extensive investment in continuing professional development, strong curricula, and leadership in the school and system. 4. There are incentives and accountability providing a focus that increases both the energy devoted to instruction and the personal satisfaction gained from enhanced student learning.

This Theory of Change includes alignment of several interventions found in the MCES turnaround model:

- PD and coaching on best instructional practice in the content areas and applicable to special education classrooms that really addresses the instructional core interactions of teacher, student, and content,

- Critical Friends Groups, professional learning communities, that focus on improving classroom practice by looking at content-focused student work as the products of instruction. Teacher-leaders from the school site are trained to be facilitators of collaborative, reflective, inquiry-based groups that use the Cycle of Continuous Improvement to identify the state standards and content expectations, analyze data as to how their students measure up to the standards, examine curriculum and lesson design to align instruction with the standards, design formative assessments, examine student work, engage in lesson study and peer observations.

- Coaching by content area experts who are also expert in the pedagogy that has been identified as research-based best practice. Coaches would work with the Critical Friends Groups as well as individual teachers working with the targeted populations.

- On site PD on the best practice frameworks of instruction (Newmann, Warnock, Marzano, Daniels and Hyde) and effort-based education (Lauren Resnick-Institute for Learning, U.of Pittsburg) are provided at the school site.

Using Breaking Ranks II as a framework, provides a path for any high school to address disengaged students and the achievement gaps related to gender, income, special needs or race as well as increasing overall student performance and success.

Delivery systems include School Improvement Teams, Leadership Teams, Critical Friend Groups, Advisory Committees, Curriculum Committees, and various staff meetings to implement the Breaking Ranks recommendations within the school improvement plan.

Essential components/mechanisms of this intervention include:

- Broad-Based Support - Securing support from stakeholders including teachers,
students, staff, administrators, school board, community partners and parents.

- Common Goals - Acknowledging the need for comprehensive school improvement, high school redesign, student success and the significance of SLC’s in achieving those.
- A Focus on Student Learning - Establishing student learning as the end goal and providing effective teaching as the means with instruction aimed at high expectations.
- Professional Development - Investing in quality, on-going professional development that is aligned with the needs identified by the school improvement process.
- Shared Leadership and Decision-Making - Practicing decision-making and leadership that is shared among stakeholders; decisions are based upon school data and research.
- Data-driven Decisionmaking and Planning - Using the school improvement process to engage stakeholders in the planning and implementation process based upon assessment and evaluation of student progress by using the Cycle of Continuous Improvement.

Job embedded PD at leadership, teacher and support levels to increase internal capacity for improvement and sustainability of student achievement.

The MCES will provide teachers with the professional development, coaching, regular opportunities for collaboration with peers, and other supports needed to implement a rigorous curriculum and provide high-quality instruction. The NSDC PD Standards and Guidelines (also embedded in the School Improvement Framework) are adhered to in this model and described in more detail in section 3. of this application.

Comprehensive short cycle and summative assessment systems to measure performance and goal attainment linked to the building school improvement plan.

The intervention will be articulated and embedded in the MI School Improvement Framework and will address many of the standards, benchmarks and key characteristics from each of the 5 SIF strands. Mileposts coming from this intervention include the Cycle of Continuous Improvement process, creation of professional learning communities, alignment of instruction and assessment with state standards, and improvement of practices in key areas such as school organization, classroom practice, leadership, and community connections. Teaching and student learning will be at the center as school practices will include best practice instructional methods, data-driven decision-making, as well as collaborative and reflective design of curriculum, instruction, and assessment. At the foundation are Professional Learning Communities with teachers engaged in job-embedded PD.

In addition to NCLB/ED YES/AYP data collection tools, other tools include NEA Keys to Excellence for Your Schools (KEYS) a comprehensive, research-based, data-driven program for continuous school improvement (CSI).

Support systems to ensure student and teacher success and sustain improvement.

Fidelity for this intervention will be supported and monitored including:

1. Consistent, ongoing coaching by MCES to support the implementation of the SLC’s structures and strategies,
2. Connecting the school with a state and national network of secondary schools implementing similar projects to provide support and shared accountability,
3. Setting high expectations for implementation,
4. Requiring evidence of success by measuring results frequently and sharing those results with all stakeholders,
5. Inviting, expecting and building commitment from all stakeholders,
6. Acknowledging & linking results to rewards- consequences,
7. Continuous evaluation.
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)

In a 2008 USDOE study of the federal SLC program, an initiative that includes many of the Breaking Ranks strategies, the following results were reported:

As measured by Annual Performance Report data, early changes in school-wide reported outcomes indicated the following trends:

• Where there is evidence of change, however, trends appear to be moving in the right direction for school-related behaviors. Specifically, the APR data suggest an upward trend in student extracurricular participation and promotion rates from 9th to 10th grades. The trend for extracurricular involvement in SLC schools showed a substantial and statistically significant increase of five percentage points in participation after receipt of SLC funding.

• Although ninth-grade promotion rates appear stable, on average, across all years of data collection, there was a statistically significant positive trend in the percentage of 9th grade students being promoted to 10th-grade during the post-grant period. This trend also held for SLC schools implementing freshman academies, which have as an expressed focus reducing the 9th-grade dropout rate. In addition, mean estimates were similar to the national average for large high schools by the end of data collection (85 percent).

• There was also a downward trend in the incidence of violence in SLC schools over time. The three most recent years of data collection following the receipt of the SLC grant suggest that incidence of negative behaviors such as student violence may be on the decline. The data suggest that, on average, SLC schools experienced a statistically significant 1.4-point drop in the number of violent incidents (per 100 students) during the post-grant period.

• Where there is evidence of change, however, trends appear to be moving in the right direction for attainment of academic milestones. For example, the data suggest increases in the percentage of graduating students planning to attend either two- or four-year colleges. Between the pre- and post-grant periods, this percentage increased by about four percentage points, which is statistically significant. The absence of comparative national data, however, makes it difficult to infer whether this is due to receipt of the SLC grant rather than part of a more general national trend.

These strategies are currently being implemented in six Michigan high schools: Marquette, Muskegon, Traverse City Central and West, and Grand Rapids Creston and Union.

Michigan State University professors, Susan Printy and BetsAnn Smith, are the lead evaluators for the Michigan SLC Consortium. Their year 2 reports indicate increases in professional conversations and collaboration as well as an increase in focus on teaching and student learning. The KEYS teacher surveys and CES student surveys also indicate positive trends in relationships, relevance, and rigor.

Based on the schools APR reports to the USDOE, early evidence indicates positive trends in increased passing grades and credit recovery. Grand Rapids Creston made AYP status last year and expects to this year, as does Grand Rapids Union.
In addition to the researchers and authors listed earlier, the intervention has been informed by the work of Saphier, Haley-Specca, and Gower. Their book, The Skillful Teacher is a handbook used by MSU in the Michigan Principals Fellowship as is Lauren Resnick’s research on effort-based education and Elmore’s research on Instructional Rounds.

There were numerous studies referred to in the research of Elmore, Marzano, Newmann, and the others listed earlier that were based on evaluation standards and guidelines of the various professional evaluation associations. The elements of evidence that emerged from these various studies shaped the logic model and Theory of Change underlying the intervention. MCES evaluation tools were developed by a third party (FERA) to be used as a formative assessment and to capture all aspects of the MCES Comprehensive School Reform Model. That model included CFGs and Best Practice professional development and other interventions aligned with a Theory of Change or Action from Dick Elmore’s research on School Reform. The evaluation process included surveys, analysis of MEAP data, focus group interviews, quality review site visits, student work, and classroom observations. There were at least three cohort groups of schools participating in the evaluation. The evaluations showed consistent positive results when schools implemented with integrity and staff leadership remained stable. The researchers’ evaluation questions focused on the MCES interventions:

- Best practices in instruction & assessment
- Action research (cycle of inquiry and use of data)
- Essential questions
- Integrating initiatives to focus on student achievement
- Critical Friends Group (LASW)
- Leadership Teams
- Curriculum development
- Collaboration, reflection, inquiry
- Building a learning community
- Habits of Mind
- MCES Secondary Literacy program

The evaluators summarized the following CSR Intervention results:

- MEAP scores rose at a significantly greater rate than the state average; especially in reading
- Teachers use more cooperative learning activities, integrated units, and inquiry around essential questions to align with state standards
- Leadership is shared, collaborative and focused on student achievement data and changes in school & classroom practices to affect data
- Parents and community are more involved
- All groups reported significant increases between the first and third year of the grant in use of CES Principles, PLC, CIA Alignment, use of Best Practice, and levels of Student Achievement that they attributed to the MCES interventions.
The evaluators summarized the following for the Secondary Literacy PD/coaching results:

☐ All but one of the schools participating in Secondary Literacy professional development made increases in their MEAP scores over the course of three years.

☐ University Preparatory Academy made the largest gains with an increase of 25.4% of their students meeting proficiency. Hull Middle School made similar gains with an increase of 21.1% of their students meeting proficiency.

☐ Both Columbia and Union City Middle School were able to consistently stay above the state average.

☐ Over the course of three years, all but two of the schools increased their ELA scores.

☐ Benton Harbor Hull Middle School had the largest increase in its’ ELA MEAP score. In 2005, 25.9% of its students achieved proficiency, compared with only 3.8% in 2003.

☐ UPA surpassed the state average in 2005.
Exemplar 3: Job Embedded Professional Development
(15 points possible)

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

- The applicant should provide detailed data that supports successful performance in developing job-embedded professional development plans for:
  - principals
  - school leadership teams
  - teachers
  - support staff
The professional development plan provided through Michigan CES is designed to focus on specific areas of need and to build the capacity of staff to provide and lead ongoing professional development activities even after the end of the grant period. The characteristics of high quality professional development have been identified in research and in the National Staff Development Council’s guidelines, and are as follows: (1) Results-driven and job-embedded; (2) Focused on helping teachers become deeply immersed in subject matter and teaching methods; (3) Curriculum-centered and standards-based; (4) Sustained, rigorous, and cumulative; and (5) Directly linked to what teachers do in their classrooms.

MCES coordinates and facilitates this process by creating or strengthening a professional learning community within the school. Community-building skills are presented and practiced as educators have substantive conversations around teaching and learning. Workshops, collaborative teams, study groups, staff retreats, and technical assistance from highly skilled, school-reform coaches are some of the pathways to building the knowledge base and skill level of all stakeholders. This is accomplished in the following ways:

School Improvement Coach: A School Improvement Coach (SIC) is assigned to each partner school to coordinate all grant activities, facilitate leadership team activities, as well as provide staff development, reflective feedback, data collection and analysis, and general problem solving in guiding the school change process. The SIC will be at the school site up to 24 days plus engaged in related training days.

Focused Professional Development Activities include (1) A staff retreat develops a shared understanding of the school improvement plan and the purpose of the grant; (2) The Leadership Institute (three days of summer inservice and three additional days during the school year for the leadership team) provides knowledge and competencies for shared leadership; (3) Critical Friends Group (CFG) training (six days per year) provides facilitators selected from and by the staff with the skills to guide small professional learning communities to be more collaborative, reflective, and inquiring about teaching and learning with the ultimate goal of informing practice by looking at student work; and (4) Focused professional development for staff (based on a school-wide assessment) strengthens knowledge and implementation of best practices. MCES will provide staff development to occur during staff meetings after school, during staff development days or other released time.

The Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools (MCES) will provide teachers with the professional development, coaching, regular opportunities for collaboration with peers, and other supports needed to implement a rigorous curriculum and provide high-quality instruction as well as implement SLC structures and strategies. A Breaking Ranks II cornerstone strategy is to align the school-wide comprehensive professional development with the content knowledge and instructional strategies required to prepare students for postsecondary success. With a focus on the needs of students caught in the inequitable conditions of many traditional school settings, high-quality professional development will be provided throughout the project period to
advance the practice of teachers, administrators, and other school staff of effective, research-based instructional strategies for improving the academic achievement of students (particularly students with academic skills that are significantly below grade level) and provide the knowledge and skills staff need to participate effectively in the development and implementation of SLC.

Professional Development will occur through professional learning communities collaboratively investigating “best practice” instruction including literacy strategies across content areas, formative assessment, extended instructional time, skills for catching up, curriculum development for academic support, use of a Continuous Improvement Cycle for data-driven decision making (including student work and other authentic assessments), identification of students needing support, and differentiated instruction. The MCES PD approach aligns with the National Staff Development Council’s characteristics of high quality professional development adopted by the State Board of Education. It is job-embedded and ongoing delivered in a multiple of ways: primarily through on-site workshops that occur during professional development release time days, during staff meetings, and/or during common planning time or release time where small groups of staff members are rotated through workshops or provided collaborative work time facilitated by the school redesign coach. The Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools is currently providing technical assistance, professional development and coaching to high schools in Grand Rapids, Muskegon, Traverse City and Marquette as part of the Smaller Learning Communities Federal Grant Program.

Fidelity for this strategy or professional development model, comes from the structure of having multiple teams engaged in a cohort of schools that hold one another accountable. Consistent coaching by MCES supports the implementation of the professional development model- its structures and strategies. This approach starts with the Cycle of Continuous Improvement from the SIF so schools can describe the current reality for student achievement at their school. They then describe the gap between that reality and their vision (students achieving proficiency on state tests). Their data analysis becomes more focused on classroom instruction and the impact on students daily work and on how instructional strategies are aligned with content expectations. MCES has provided this model (including literacy coaches) to several cohorts of schools over the past decade and has the staff and team of consultants to provide the professional development and coaching at the school sites. Math content coaches were added for the Smaller Learning Communities grant. MCES has a cadre of consultant coaches available to do PD and coaching on a larger scale; for example; during the peak of Comprehensive School Reform (CSR), MCES provided technical assistance for up to 30 schools in overlapping cohorts as model providers for both the CES (Coalition of Essential Schools) and the Middle Start models.

The implementation of the School Improvement Planning process including the Cycle of Continuous Improvement becomes embedded in the school culture and the way teachers go about their collaborative work to improve student achievement. The CFG structure and strategies is so empowering to teachers that they will not give it up even when external resources are diminished. They find ways to reallocate time so that they continue to collaborate and have student-focused and reflective dialogue.
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 Five Strands of SIF reflect the importance of using an integrated approach and several of the performance indicators cutting across all strands are embedded in the professional development provided by this model. Several of the SIF Performance Indicators describe collaboration and data-driven decision making as necessary elements of school improvement. CFG’s are the professional learning community structures that provide specific protocols and procedures for engaging in collaborative work that is focused on student performance (including student work) to use as data to make decisions regarding classroom practice. This inquiry into practice leads teachers into examining “best practice” strategies and improving the critical thinking skills of their students.

Coaching is a relatively new intervention that has demonstrated effectiveness in research by NSDC, Coalition of Essential Schools, various literacy models and is now a major component of the Statewide System of Support.

The Michigan Comprehensive Needs Assessment approach was an integral part of the MCES Comprehensive School Reform model and is also used extensively in the SLC Consortium as required for preparing the USDOE report on annual progress. MCES has also made it a practice to work with schools on doing the crosswalk between various improvement plans so that they can then integrate the plans into “one plan”.

MCES schools are also very diligent in analyzing the content and skills that are assessed on the MEAP and MME and facilitate analysis of the results so that adjustments in classroom and school-wide practices will take place.

Providing PD and coaching to support the use of Understanding by Design strategies has resulted in MCES schools being knowledgeable and adept at addressing the state content expectations, identifying essential questions, and integrating cross curricular themes into their instruction. Several MCES schools have integrated Newmann’s standards of teaching and learning from the Michigan Curriculum Framework into their instructional framework.

Key MCES staff members have been central office administrators responsible for compliance with Special Education, Title 1, and Section 504 requirements.

Specific Breaking Ranks II recommendations and Smaller Learning Communities strategies aligned with the Michigan School Improvement Framework include but are not limited to the following:

Strand I. Teaching For Learning (1) Each high school will identify a set of essential learnings—in literature and language, writing, mathematics, social studies, science, and the arts—in which students must demonstrate achievement in order to graduate; (2) Each high school will present alternatives to tracking and to ability grouping; (3) The content of the curriculum, where practical, should connect to real-life applications of knowledge and skills to help students link their education to the future; (4) Teachers will design high-quality work, use a variety of strategies and teach in ways that accommodate individual learning styles that engage students and promote critical thinking (inquiry) skills and Habits of Mind and Work; (5) Teachers will be adept at acting as coaches and facilitators to promote more active involvement of students in their own learning; and (6) Teachers will integrate...
assessments into instruction so that assessment
Strand II. Leadership (1) The principal will provide leadership in the high school community by building and maintaining a vision, direction, and focus for student learning; (2) Each high school will establish a site council and accord other meaningful roles in decision making to students, parents, and members of the staff; (3) A high school will regard itself as a community in which members of the staff collaborate to develop and implement the school’s learning goals where teachers will provide the leadership essential to the success of reform, collaborating with others in the educational community to redefine the role of the teacher; (4) Every school will be a learning community for the entire community where all personnel address their own learning and professional development needs as they relate to improved student learning; (5) The school community will promote policies and practices that recognize and appreciate diversity in accord with the core values of a democratic and civil society; (6) High schools will build partnerships with institutions of higher education; (7) High schools will create small units in which anonymity is banished; (8) Each student will have a Personal Plan for Progress that will be reviewed often to ensure that the high school takes individual needs into consideration and to allow students, within reasonable parameters, to design their own methods for learning in an effort to meet high standards; (9) Every high school student will have a Personal Adult Advocate to help him or her personalize the educational experience and all teachers will convey a sense of caring to their students so that students feel that their teachers share a stake in their learning; (10) High schools will develop flexible scheduling and student grouping patterns that allow better use of time in order to meet the individual needs of students to ensure academic success.
Strand III. Personnel and Professional Learning (1) PD is ongoing, collaborative, job embedded and research based; (2) Professional Development is supported by site-based instructional coaches; (3) Critical Friends groups (collaborative teams) are created to examine student work on a regular basis for the purpose of informing classroom instructional practice; and (4) Professional development needs are based on the evidence and the analysis of data.
Strand IV. School and Community Relations (1) The academic program will extend beyond the high school campus to take advantage of learning opportunities outside the four walls of the building; and (2) The high school will engage students’ families as partners in the students’ education.
Strand V. Data and Information Management (1) Consistent use of the “Cycle of Continuous Improvement” where data is collected regularly from a variety of sources and all instructional personnel practices “data-driven decision making” with priority placed on student achievement data; and (2) Support is provided to assist staff with data analysis.

The SLC’s intervention can be incorporated into the statewide system of support program by collaborating and partnering with the intermediate school district. This collaboration would include aligning and coordinating all services to include, but is not limited to, research-based training, coaching, and mentoring.
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)

An analysis of school reform research and the School Improvement Frameworks Key Performance Indicators strongly supports that sustainability is dependent upon the development of professional learning communities (PLC). Research indicates that schools most effective in terms of student achievement operate as professional learning communities characterized by: 1. Shared norms and values; 2. Collective focus on student learning; 3. Collaboration; 4. De-privatization /making practice public; and 5. Reflective dialogue (Newmann, et al. 1996). Because PLC’s change how educator’s approach their work, the disciplined practice of PLC’s becomes embedded in the school culture. Furthermore, by creating an intentional alignment between the practice of PLC’s and the content of the Michigan School Improvement Frameworks as well as Breaking Ranks II, sustainability can be embedded into the culture of the school. The following Sustainability Time-table (organized by the Breaking Ranks II Cornerstone Strategies) reflects the “rollout” of the Breaking Ranks II recommendations, considered to be high leverage for school reform.

See Exemplar 5 Sustainability Table Attached
Exemplar 6: Staff Qualifications
(15 points possible)

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

- Staff qualifications and vitae should match with areas that the applicant wishes to serve. Staff should have extensive experience in implementation of all applicable areas.
**Exemplar 6 Narrative Limit:** 1 page plus vitae for personnel (insert narrative and vitae here)

James Bodrie currently serves as the Director of the Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools as well as the Project Director for the Michigan Smaller Learning Communities Consortium. Mr. Bodrie is an experienced, knowledgeable educator with 40 years of educational practice in positions as a classroom teacher, K-12 principal, high school principal, central office administrator and educational consultant/coach. He has participated in professional development directly aligned with high school reform and creating smaller learning communities. Those activities include (1) Breaking Ranks Training and Workshops; (2) NWREL Small School Design Studio; (3) NWREL/USDOE Technical Assistance Workshop; (3) CSSR/NASSP Smaller Learning Communities Workshops; and the (4) CES National Small Schools Project Workshop. In addition, Mr. Bodrie is very active in Michigan school improvement and high school redesign efforts. He served a Lead Coach in the state’s Principal Fellowship that is designed to “turn-around” schools that are in AYP phases 3 or more. Recently, he also served as a Leadership Coach as part of Detroit Public Schools efforts to “turn-around” high schools.

Shug Brandell, consultant to MCES, served as a consultant to the Kellogg Foundation and as the Director of the Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools for 10 years following her retirement as Deputy Superintendent for Lakeview Schools in Battle Creek. She served on the Board of Directors for the national Coalition of Essential Schools and the Michigan Staff Development Council. She has participated in professional development directly aligned with comprehensive school reform, evaluation, and best practice instruction. She also is very active in Michigan school improvement and high school redesign efforts and served as Lead Coach in the state’s 2007 Principal Fellowship that is designed to “turn-around” schools that are in AYP phases 3 or more. Ms. Brandell is an MCES Leadership Coach in the SLC Consortium and for The Institute for Student Achievement as part of Detroit Public Schools efforts to “turn-around” high schools.

Nancy Fenton has been a 4th.-6th grade teacher, a middle school principal, and is presently Assistant Director for the Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools. She has served in a coaching capacity for MCES schools, Michigan Middle Start schools, and Institute for Student Achievement schools, and is certified to train in NASSP’s Breaking Ranks in the Middle. Nancy also has done extensive professional development in leadership, professional learning community, Critical Friends Groups, Thinking and Reflection, Lesson Study, Student Community Exhibition, and learning/instructional strategies. Nancy was on the Board for The National Forum to Accelerate Middle Grades Reform, was a member of its Executive Board for two terms, and has served on the Michigan STW Committee since its inception.
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.

Licensure and Insurance Documents Are on File With MDE
### Exemplar 5 Sustainability Plan Attachment High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cornerstone Strategy</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Establish the essential learnings a student is required to learn in order to graduate, and adjust the curriculum and teaching strategies to realize that goal. MCES intervention: Leadership Teams, PD, Coaches, CFGs</td>
<td>• Align all curriculum with MCF&lt;br&gt;• Identify Power Standards&lt;br&gt;• Deliver PD on higher order thinking and essential learnings&lt;br&gt;• Use vertical planning in content to determine requisite learning for HS</td>
<td>• Teachers refine instructional and assessment strategies to meet all student needs&lt;br&gt;• PD continues in best instr. Practices &amp; staff account.&lt;br&gt;• Teachers use many types of data to ascertain needs and successes</td>
<td>• Curr. &amp; instruction reviewed continuously against high standards and adjust where necessary&lt;br&gt;• Integrated units designed when feasible to promote relevancy&lt;br&gt;• A variety of assessments are used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Increase the quantity and improve the quality of interactions between students, teachers, and other school personnel by reducing the number of students for which any adult or group of adults is responsible. MCES intervention: Leadership Teams, PD, Coaches, CFGs</td>
<td>• Plan developed for small teams of students &amp; teachers, 25/1&lt;br&gt;• Teams balanced equitably by SES, gender, race, sped, language &amp; achievement&lt;br&gt;• Team plan heterogeneous flexible grouping&lt;br&gt;• Plan in place for common planning (CPT) for teams&lt;br&gt;• Plan that prepares teachers to use cpt effectively focusing on curriculum, instruction, assessment, and student developmental needs&lt;br&gt;• A plan for transitions&lt;br&gt;• Training started for CFGs</td>
<td>• Teaming implemented &amp; notes kept of all meetings&lt;br&gt;• Admin. attends periodically&lt;br&gt;• Most time is spent on CIA and student development&lt;br&gt;• Teachers practice getting into each other’s classrooms&lt;br&gt;• CPT implemented &amp; resources in place for continuation&lt;br&gt;• Plan implemented for depts... to meet 1/mo.&lt;br&gt;• Transition plan implemented and reviewed regularly&lt;br&gt;• CFG training cont. and staff meets in CFGs</td>
<td>• Teachers serve as critical friends to each other, study stud. work&lt;br&gt;• Teams use C of CI in reviewing all of their work&lt;br&gt;• Cont. PD determined by teams based on needs, delivered by team members w/MCES coach&lt;br&gt;• LT aligns resources &amp; calendar to support CPT, Dept.Mtg., &amp; goals of SIP&lt;br&gt;• Staff meets w/HS 2x/yr to inform their practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Implement a comprehensive advisory program that ensures each student has frequent and meaningful opportunities to plan and assess his or her academic and social progress with a faculty member MCES intervention: Leadership Teams, PD, Coaches, CFGs</td>
<td>• Extensive professional develop. on advisories&lt;br&gt;• An advisory plan is developed with appropriate curriculum for each grade with small students to teacher ratio&lt;br&gt;• Some plan is in place &amp; being used for at-risk students</td>
<td>• Advisory plan is implemented and reviewed monthly&lt;br&gt;• A plan is developed with a variety of resources to meet needs of all students&lt;br&gt;• Individual Student Plans a part of student portfolios&lt;br&gt;• Plan dev. for parent engagement</td>
<td>• All advisories implementing plan to engage parents &amp; community&lt;br&gt;• Data, includ. parent &amp; student surveys reviewed regularly to determine prog. Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Ensure teachers use a variety of instructional strategies and assessments to accommodate individual learning styles MCES intervention: Leadership Teams, PD, Coaches, CFGs</td>
<td>• The Cycle of Continuous Improvement is understood and used by LT and entire staff&lt;br&gt;• Appropriate assessments &amp; standards are determined&lt;br&gt;• Teachers begin est.of CFGs and begin looking at student work</td>
<td>• C of CI is used routinely by all teams&lt;br&gt;• PD in best practice instr. &amp; CFGs cont, with expected implementation</td>
<td>• Progress Assessments given routinely to determine student mastery of standards &amp; instruct. adjusted accordingly&lt;br&gt;• CFGs routinely study student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Implement schedules flexible enough to accommodate teaching strategies consistent with the ways students learn most effectively and that allow for effective teacher teaming and lesson planning MCES intervention: Leadership Teams, PD, Coaches, CFGs</td>
<td>• A schedule has been dev. that allows for teaming, advisories, cpt &amp; team flexibility in scheduling &amp; decision making&lt;br&gt;• PD is delivered by MCES on using cpt effectively</td>
<td>• Schedule is implemented with teacher practice &amp; sharing of flexible scheduling experiences&lt;br&gt;• Cont. monitoring with notes, admin. visits, and MCES coaching&lt;br&gt;• Teams cont. review their work against the goals they have set</td>
<td>• Teams spend time in reflection on goal accomplishment&lt;br&gt;• Teams use C of CI routinely&lt;br&gt;• Teams study student work together</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#6 Institute structural leadership systems that allow for substantive involvement in decision making by students, teachers, family members, and the community, and that support effective communication among these groups

**MCES intervention:** Leadership Teams, PD, Coaches, CFGs

- A school leadership team has been identified and is fully functioning
- A system is developed and implemented for communication of the plan to all stakeholders
- An avenue is developed and implemented for soliciting input from all stakeholders
- PLC is understood and practiced
- Norms are established and modeled
- A common need and vision are built around Breaking Ranks II in the high school
- Roadblocks are identified and solutions determined
- Align SIP w/BRII
- Internal & external review of school development & administration in spring
- LT representative of all stakeholders is fully functioning
- A two-way communication plan has been implemented
- All effective PLC strategies are used in all mtg. scenarios
- C of CI is used routinely
- Stakeholder surveys are developed, given, and reviewed to improve process
- Review and modify SIP and school vision
- Cont. with internal and external reviews
- Place all programs & activities through equity sieve
- Cont. w/MCES leadership coaching and PD
- LT routinely reviews practices & systems for effectiveness and modifies if necessary
- Stakeholder surveys continue to be given and reviewed
- Cont. with prior LT practices & refine as needed
- Cont. with MCES leadership coaching where responsibility will gradually be turned over to the team
- Cont. internal and external review

---

#7 Align the school-wide comprehensive, ongoing professional development program and the Personal Learning Plans of staff with the requisite knowledge of content, instructional strategies, and student developmental factors

**MCES intervention:** Leadership Teams, PD, Coaches, CFGs

- PD started on numeracy, literacy, some CFG work, leadership, data collection, adolescent characteristics, HOTs and teaming w/ expected beg. implementation
- Some advisory, CFG, & best practice PD is off-site with MCES staff
- PD plan for year 2 determined
- PD with coaches and MCES will continue with expected implementation
- PLPs for staff will be implemented and routinely reviewed w/admin.
- PD plan will be reviewed and year 3 plan determined based on SIP and staff needs
- PD continues with coaches and MCES based on staff input and requirements of model
- Staff PLPs cont. with review
- PD plan reviewed & year 4 plan determined based on SIP and staff needs
- PD continues with coaches and MCES based on staff input and requirements of model
- Staff PLPs cont. with review
- PD plan reviewed & year 4 plan determined based on SIP and staff needs
RESUME
JAMES F. BODRIE
1900 Catalina Drive #426
Muskegon, Michigan  49444
231-730-7007
jbodrie@hotmail.com

EDUCATION AND CERTIFICATION

Certification
Michigan State University 2007
Michigan Principal's Fellowship
Principal Leadership Coach

Certification
Michigan State University 2005
Alliance for Building Capacity in Schools
School Improvement Consultant

Certification*
Michigan School Business Officials Association
Chief Financial Officer
(*Pending Completion of 4 Accounting Credits)

Masters
Central Michigan University 1990
Educational Administration and Leadership

Masters
Central Michigan University 1983
Secondary School Personnel

Bachelors
Michigan State University 1971
Industrial / Vocational Education and Mathematics

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Educational Consultant
Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools 2002 to present
Jackson, Michigan

Director of Business and Personnel Services
Orchard View Schools 2000 to 2002
Muskegon, Michigan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>School/Location</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Principal</td>
<td>Orchard View Schools, Muskegon, MI</td>
<td>1997 to 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Principal and Athletic Director</td>
<td>Northport Public Schools, Northport, MI</td>
<td>1990 to 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Athletic Director</td>
<td>Northport Public Schools, Northport, MI</td>
<td>1986 to 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Coach</td>
<td>Clare Public Schools, Clare, MI</td>
<td>1977 to 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and Coach</td>
<td>Alma Public Schools, Alma, MI</td>
<td>1971 to 1977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRESENTATIONS**

- Michigan Educational Leadership Collaborative
  - "Innovative Scheduling"
  - Spring Conference – 1996

- Michigan Association for Supervision and Curriculum
  - "Structural Options for Increased Learning"
  - Fall Conference – 1995

- Michigan Institute for Educational Management
  - "Exhibitions of Mastery"
  - "High School Class Projects"
  - Classroom Assessment Conference
  - Spring – 1995

- Coalition of Essential Schools
  - "Alternative Assessments"
  - National Conference
  - Fall – 1994

- Middle Cities Education Association
  - "Emerging Assessments to Address Broad Based Student Exit Outcomes"
  - Classroom Assessment Professional Development Program
  - April – 1993
SPECIAL RECOGNITION

State Board of Directors Officer
Secretary
Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools
1999 - 2002

State Board of Directors Trustee
Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools
1995 - 1999

National Congress Delegate
Coalition of Essential Schools
1996 – 1997

Outstanding Person in Education Award
Traverse Bay Area Intermediate School District
1988

President
Northport Education Association
1988 – 1990

Vice-President
Northport Education Association
1987 – 1988

Commission on Excellence in Education Delegate
Mid-Michigan Education Focus Group
1980

Building Representative
Clare Education Association
1981 – 1986

Regional Coach of the Year
Michigan Baseball Coaches Association
1976 and 1977
REFERENCES

Sharilyn (Shug) Brandell  
Co-Director  
Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools  
269-968-4427 (H)  
269-317-9664 (M)

Nancy Fenton  
Co-Director  
Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools  
269-317-9911

Mitch Zaleski  
Curriculum Director (Retired)  
Orchard View Schools  
Muskegon, Michigan  
231-780-3185
**Sharalyn (Shug) Brandell**  
125 Wa Wee Nork Dr. Unit 1 B  
Battle Creek, MI 49015  
269-968-4427, cell 269-317-9664  
email smbrandell@comcast.net

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Education</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987-1995</td>
<td>60 credit hours, Education Leadership, Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Master of Arts, Elementary Education, Western Michigan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts, Elementary Education, University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Work Experience</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Student Achievement –Leadership Coach at Detroit Institute of Technology@Cody High School in Detroit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant//TA provider Willow Run Middle and High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator and Lead Coach serving six large high schools as part of the Michigan Smaller Learning Communities Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDE AYP Audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director and School Reform Coach of the Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS School Violence Project Director, Battle Creek Schools and Police Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Evaluator, Academy for Educational Development, New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellogg Youth Initiative Project Consultant, W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer, John Carver Policy Governance Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator, Lakeview School District, Battle Creek, MI, Interim Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent, Director of Personnel and Special Education, Director of Adult and Community Education, Elementary School Principal, Department Head, Teacher K-7, High School Coach,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher, Van Buren Consolidated Schools, Belleville, MI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Professional Development/Organizational Change (between 1992-2010)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant writer and steering committee member for EMU SE Michigan Stewardship Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Coaches Institute and Principals Fellowship Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES National Fall Forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSDC Board of Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Schools Project Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDE School Improvement Conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASA Conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASSP Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB, ED YES! Workshop, Washtenaw ISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Impact: Evaluating Staff Development, JoEllen Killion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Staff Development Council Standards, Stephanie Hirsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Council of Foundations and Michigan Evaluators Association conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor’s Education Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Staff Development Council Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDE CSR workshop with NCREL: Applying Research and Technology to Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Council for the Teachers of English conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practices, Walloon Institute, Harvey Daniels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice Theory/ Reality Therapy, Glasser Institute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facilitation of Teams, Assoc. of Quality Participation
1998
Healing Racism, Institute for Healing Racism in America
1997
Policy Governance, John and Miriam Carver
1995
School Reform, Pat Dolan, ASCD
Leadership Seminar, Block, Senge, Wheatley
Michigan Leadership Academy, Education Alliance
1994
Education Change Agents, Bob Garmston
Cognitive Coaching, Art Costa
1993
Quality Seminar, W. Edwards Deming
Outcomes Based Education, Bill Spady
Transformational Leaders, John Champlain
1992
Coalition of Essential Schools, Ted Sizer

Presentations, Publications, Awards
2009 Presenter at MEA, MASA, MASSP, on High School Redesign
2007 Presenter, MDE School Improvement Conference, School Improvement Framework
2006 Presenter, Looking at Student Work, High School Best Practice Conference
2003 Presenter, Adolescent Literacy program, MEA and MRA conferences,
2001 Presenter, on Professional Learning Communities, CES Fall Forum
1997 Presenter, National Governors’ Conf., “Citizen Participation in Restructuring Schools”
Awarded Calhoun County Educator of the Year
1995 Presenter, National Governors’ Conf., “Design Customer/Learner-Centered Schools”
Presenter, National AASA Conference, “World Class Math Project”
Co-presenter, ASCD National Conference, “Quality Schools”
1979-1993 Presented at several state conferences on various curriculum and school reform topics.

Grant writer/Project Coordinator
2007 Smaller Learning Communities grant from national DOE, Michigan SLC Consortium serving 6 high schools across Michigan
2000-2005 Comprehensive School Reform grants for 35 schools
1999 Barriers to Employment Grant, City of Battle Creek
1997 Citizen Participation Grant for Lakeview Schools
1987-95 Bilingual Program for Japanese students
1991-95 Japanese Language for Lakeview Elementary Students
1988-94 Summer Science Institute, development of county-wide K-6 Science Curriculum

Professional Committees and Community Service
Since fall of 2000, my work has focused on comprehensive school reform and my role has ranged from holder of the vision articulated through grant writing to administrator of grant funded school reform programs to serving as a school reform coach in a variety of schools. Using the Breaking Ranks II Report as a framework for redesigning high schools, I coach and oversee other coaches in converting six large high schools into small learning communities that emphasize relationships, rigor, and relevance. I was selected to participate in the Michigan Dept. of Education Coaches Institute that provided high quality professional development for coaches to work with leaders in high priority schools in Michigan.
Over the course of my career, I served on or led numerous committees in the areas of curriculum and school reform. Through these efforts, I facilitated several innovative programs; developmental kindergarten, quality management, participatory decision-making, special education service, Japanese language and Bilingual education, human sexuality curriculum for grades 5-8, school-age child care, preschool education for four year olds, alternative education for grades 9-12.

My community service includes serving on several boards; Y-Center, Parks and Recreation for the City of Battle Creek, Southwest Michigan Urban League, U of Michigan local and national boards, Battle Creek Community Foundation and Kellogg Foundation advisory committees, and the United Arts Council. I have trained several boards for the Carver Policy Governance model.

References
Cindy Ruble, Superintendent, Lakeview School District, Battle Creek, MI, 269-565-2400
MaryAlice Galloway, Michigan Department of Education, 517-373-4990
Joyce Brown, former Project Director, W. K. Kellogg Foundation, consultant, 269-962-8236
## Nancy M. Fenton

### Education
**Western Michigan University:**
- Master in Educational Leadership – August, 1988

**Albion College:**
- Bachelor of Arts Degree – June, 1970

### Professional experience

**Assistant Director** - Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools, 12236 61/2 Mile Rd., Battle Creek, MI 49014, January 2008-present

**Co-Director** - Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools, 400 S. Jackson Street, #2, Jackson, MI, 49201, March 2001-January 2008

**Associate Director** – Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools, 209 East Washington, Suite 224, Jackson, MI, 49201, August 1999-March, 2001

**Principal** – Springfield Middle School, Battle Creek Public Schools, 3 West VanBuren, Battle Creek, MI, 49016, October 1992-1999

**Principal/Teacher** – Territorial Sixth Grade School, Lakeview School District, 15 Arbor Street, Battle Creek, MI, 49015, July, 1992-October, 1992

**Teacher** – Grade 6, Territorial Sixth Grade School, Lakeview School District, 15 Arbor Street, Battle Creek, MI 49015, 1991-1992

**Teacher** – Grades 4-6, Minges Brook Elementary School, Lakeview School District, Lincoln Hill Drive, Battle Creek, MI 49015, 1970-1991

**Trainer** – Effective Instruction, Lakeview School District, 1985-1990

**Teacher** – Preschool Play School, Lakeview School District, 15 Arbor, Battle Creek, MI, 49015, Summers 1971 and 1972

### Administrative experience

**Co-Direct** a small non-profit organization with five full-time employees

**Coordinate Programs and Coach** in instruction, literacy, and leadership in the Inkster Public Schools
Coordinate curriculum design and instruction and Train leadership at Willow Run Secondary Complex

**Conduct Comprehensive School Audits** in two Detroit Public Schools and two Detroit Charter Schools

**Coach for the Institute of Student Achievement in a Small Schools initiative** for Osborn University of Mathematics, Science, and Technology in the Detroit Public Schools

**Coach** leadership in advisories, Critical Friends Groups, and leadership facilitation at Inkster High School through a Small Learning Communities Grant

**Coordinate** the Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools (MCES) and the Michigan Middle Start (MMS) Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) program in Benton Harbor

**Design and Implement** training for site visit participants for Schools to Watch (STW) and Collaborative Peer Review (CPR modeled after School Self Assessment for Michigan Middle Start)

**Lead** STW, CPR, and MCES Affirmation site visits

**Coordinate** the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) program for the Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools (MCES)

**Coach** directly for MCES, Michigan Middle Start, and Institute for Student Achievement

**Plan and Conduct** training for coaches and leadership seminars for school leadership teams for MCES and MMS CSR schools

**Plan and Conduct** workshops on instruction, data collection, reading comprehension strategies, learner outcomes, teaming, middle school philosophy and structure, integrated units, looking at student work, professional learning community, curriculum mapping, cycle of continuous improvement, lesson study, inquiry, and student exhibition.

**Plan and Facilitate** Critical Friends Groups (CFG)

**Manage, supervise, and lead** a 50 member staff and 400 students in a city middle school, grades 4-8

**Plan and implement** transition from junior high school to middle school

**Prepare and manage** a Middle Start Grant

**Design** the plan and **organize** the implementation of a district-wide grade level re-alignment, 9th Grade center, and middle school

**Supervise and evaluate** instructional staff

**Develop** Individual Development Plans (IDP) for instructional staff

**Promote** equity within the school culture
Supervise five special education programs and their transition to inclusion

Recruit, interview, and recommend staff for hire

Develop and manage building budgets

**Awards received**

W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Excellence in Education, $1,000 Incentive Award, 1995, Attended ASCD Workshop, “Increasing Academic Achievement”, Ann Arbor, MI


Superintendents’ Task Force Thinking Skills Committee, Grant to attend the “Tenth Annual Intermediate Conference on Critical Thinking and Educational Reform”, Sonoma State University, CA

W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Excellence in Education $1,000 Incentive Award, 1986, Attended “Essential Elements of Effective Instruction Workshop”, Buena Park, CA

**Professional memberships and National Affiliations**

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

National Middle School Association

Michigan Middle Start

National Forum to Accelerate Middle Grades Reform, Board Member, Executive Board

National Adolescent Literacy Coalition

CES National Regional Directors

National Staff Development Council

National School Reform Faculty

ABCS Coach for state of Michigan

National Reading Association

International Reading Association

Michigan Schools to Watch, State Committee and Coordinator for Application Process
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