

SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

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



Electronic Application Process

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

MDE-SSOS@michigan.gov

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

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

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

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

Contact Information

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

Mark Coscarella
Interim Supervisor
Office of Education Improvement & Innovation

OR

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

Telephone: (517) 373-8480 or (517) 335-4733

Email: MDE-SSOS@michigan.gov

EXTERNAL PROVIDERS: BACKGROUND & APPROVAL PROCESS

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

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

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

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

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

Applications will only be **reviewed** if:

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

Applications will only be **approved** if:

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION OVERVIEW

The Application is divided into four sections.

Section A contains basic provider information.

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

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

Section D Attachments

SECTION A: BASIC PROVIDER INFORMATION

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

Instructions: Complete each section in full.

1. Federal EIN, Tax ID or Social Security Number		2. Legal Name of Entity									
[REDACTED]		Pearson Learning Teams (a unit of Pearson Education, Inc.)									
3. Name of Entity as you would like it to appear on the Approved List											
Pearson Learning Teams											
4. Entity Type:		5. Check the category that best describes your entity:									
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For-profit <input type="checkbox"/> Non-profit		<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Business</td> <td style="width: 33%;"><input type="checkbox"/> Institution of Higher Education</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Community-Based Organization</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> School District</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Educational Service Agency (e.g., RESA or ISD)</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____</td> </tr> </table>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Business	<input type="checkbox"/> Institution of Higher Education	<input type="checkbox"/> Community-Based Organization	<input type="checkbox"/> School District	<input type="checkbox"/> Educational Service Agency (e.g., RESA or ISD)	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Business	<input type="checkbox"/> Institution of Higher Education										
<input type="checkbox"/> Community-Based Organization	<input type="checkbox"/> School District										
<input type="checkbox"/> Educational Service Agency (e.g., RESA or ISD)	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____										
6. Applicant Contact Information											
Name of Contact Beth Wray		Phone 310-664-2339		Fax 310-581-2002							
Street Address 2701 Ocean Park Blvd., Suite 220		City Santa Monica		State CA	Zip 90405						
E-Mail beth.wray@pearson.com		Website www.pearsonlt.com									
7. Local Contact Information (if different than information listed above)											
Name of Contact		Phone		Fax							
Street Address		City		State	Zip						
E-Mail		Website									
8. Service Area											
List the intermediate school district and each individual district in which you agree to provide services. Enter "Statewide" ONLY if you agree to provide services to any district in the State of Michigan.											
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Statewide											
Intermediate School District(s):			Name(s) of District(s):								

9. Conflict of Interest Disclosure

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

Yes

No

What school district are you employed by or serve: _____

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

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

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

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

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

SECTION B: PROGRAM DELIVERY AND STAFF QUALIFICATION NARRATIVES

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

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

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

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

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

Derived from two decades of research and development, Pearson Learning Teams (LT) is a well-defined and fully articulated school improvement model with an explicit framework or support system to guide teacher collaboration efforts and build leadership capacity of administrators and teacher leaders. Through the creation of job-alike collaborative teacher workgroups, LT facilitates the systematic and continuous study of instruction by helping teachers develop specific instructional solutions based on evidence from the classroom. LT research has been published in several peer-reviewed journals as one of the few programs to scientifically isolate the positive effects of teacher collaboration on student achievement (Saunders et al., 2009).

1. Support Systems to Ensure Student and Teacher Success and Sustain Improvement

THE LT MODEL. The LT program support system includes four distinguishing features that together provide a framework for improving instruction throughout the school:

1) Stable settings. Stable settings bring teachers and administrators together to study, refine, and implement instructional strategies targeted at specific student needs. These include (1) teacher workgroups (4-8 teachers from the same grade or content area who meet twice a month); and (2) an Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) (teacher leaders and administrators who meet monthly to coordinate workgroup progress). Together with collaborative settings for principals and district administrators, these meetings bring educators together to work toward common instructional goals.

2) Protocols for team collaboration that help teachers use data and inquiry to drive instructional improvements. The primary LT protocol, "Addressing Common Student Needs," helps teachers identify common student needs; find or develop appropriate means to assess student progress toward targeted learning objectives; jointly plan, prepare, and deliver lessons; use evidence from the classroom to evaluate the commonly planned and delivered lessons; and, finally, reflect on the process to determine effectiveness and next steps.

3) Leadership Training. The LT Leadership Training & Assistance program is designed to develop strong instructional leaders throughout the school. The program is comprised of two leadership institutes for teacher leaders each year; monthly support delivered directly to the principal and teacher leaders; monthly regional meetings for principals; and 20 days of district support services.

4) Site-level Assistance & Training to sustain implementation, maintain focus, and build local capacity. A dedicated LT Advisor provides on-site assistance and training to each school throughout the year, with face-to-face support at the monthly ILT, assistance to select teacher learning teams, and monthly planning meetings with the administrator. Once the implementation is stable, the model offers training of district or school staff to deliver LT school services independently.

ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES. Well-implementing LT schools should yield the following outcomes within 1-3 years:

* Gains in student achievement that significantly surpass the average rate of gain among schools in the same district and throughout the state

- * Highly effective teacher workgroup meetings in which teachers spend the majority of time planning, evaluating, and refining their teaching
- * Greater capacity among teachers to provide effective instructional leadership to workgroups and the staff as a whole
- * Sharper and more enduring focus on academic goals and outcomes
- * Stronger collective commitment among staff towards improving teaching, learning, and student achievement

2. Content and delivery systems and mechanisms proven to result in dramatic and sustained improvement linked to student achievement

Improving the quality of instruction and leadership through a job-embedded, collaborative PD framework such as Learning Teams can lead to sustained improvements in student achievement. Stable settings and tested protocols provide are key elements in this process.

SETTINGS FOR CHANGE: The critical and unique element in the LT model and approach is settings. Faculty meetings and professional development workshops are generally familiar school site settings. The major focus of the LT model is making these familiar settings highly effective by encouraging consistent and meaningful contributions to improved teaching and learning. Aside from faculty meetings and workshops, teachers in LT schools meet in job-alike workgroups for 45-60 minutes two to three times per month. Stable teacher workgroups are the foundational settings in the LT model. In order to effectively support teacher workgroups, principals meet with workgroup facilitators each month in the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT). Collectively, the ILT helps set direction for and leads the staff in the school's improvement efforts. The ILT meets monthly for approximately 90-120 minutes. Finally, administrators plan and strategize with Pearson LT staff in monthly planning and regional meetings. These dedicated settings are the backbone for effective LT implementation.

PROTOCOLS: The LT staff has developed tested protocols to guide the work of workgroups. The primary LT protocol helps teachers identify common student needs; find or develop appropriate means to assess student progress toward targeted learning objectives; jointly plan, prepare, and deliver lessons; use evidence from the classroom to evaluate the commonly planned and delivered lessons; and reflect on the process to determine effectiveness and next steps (Saunders & Ermeling, 2007). By giving teachers a stable, focused protocol within which to study and apply instructional innovations, LT becomes the vehicle through which teachers take what they're learning from curricular or pedagogical reforms—from mathematics or ELA programs, to ELL instructional reforms, to new textbook adoptions—and apply it directly to their instruction in the classroom.

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

Establishing interrelated settings at each level of school leadership and instruction allows schools to integrate professional development directly into the work of educators. Principals, administrators, teachers and support staff work together to address common student needs and apply targeted instructional strategies in response. As such, this model is almost entirely teacher-driven, with instructional improvements coming from the collaborative process. Over time, school-site support services shift from Pearson advisors to trained, district-based advisors, further building school and district capacity to sustain the LT model over the long term. (For more information on building capacity and sustainability, see Exemplar 5.)

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

The LT model is designed to promote the integration of short cycle and summative assessment systems directly into the inquiry cycle in order to drive instructional improvement. Focused, authentic use of assessment data in the collaborative development and delivery of lessons helps teachers (1) target their instruction to common student needs, and (2) differentiate instruction in a systematic, comprehensive manner that yields measurable results for all students.

Comprehensive program evaluation is also built into every LT implementation in order to help schools monitor implementation progress over time. Developed to assess demographic, implementation, and achievement data, the standard evaluation program is designed to meet three objectives: (1) document program outcomes, both formative and summative; (2) document implementation strength and fidelity; and (3) provide feedback for implementing schools for the purpose of celebrating successes as well as improving program implementation. Every LT school is evaluated annually on 7 metrics which have been developed and tested in the field for reliability and validity. Each instrument assesses key aspects of program implementation, system outcomes, and academic achievement outcomes.

(1) READINESS ASSESSMENT: Assesses the level of readiness for a given school on seven dimensions related to successful LT implementation.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT: Assesses fidelity and strength of LT implementation at each school.

(2) GLOBAL RATINGS OF TEACHER WORKGROUP PROGRESS: Assesses LT Teacher Workgroup progress throughout the year.

(3) GLOBAL RATINGS OF ILT PROGRESS: Assesses LT Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) meeting progress throughout the year.

(4) TEACHER WORKGROUP SURVEY: Assesses teacher perceptions regarding LT implementation including perceived benefits of LT, support for the program, and perceived success at implementing the 7-step protocol.

(5) LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE EVALUATIONS: Assesses the extent to which the Summer and Follow-up Leadership Institutes meet the stated objectives.

(6) REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR MEETING EVALUATIONS: Assesses the extent to which the monthly RAMs meet the stated yearly objectives.

(7) STANDARDIZED STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA: Student achievement data are obtained for all LT schools each year. Mean scale scores are assessed over time to establish pre- and post-data. Average gains by LT schools are compared to the average district and/or state level gains. In high-implementing LT schools, we

expect to see gains in student achievement by Year 3.

The standard evaluation is intended to provide a clear picture of the quality of LT implementation. LT staff then meets regularly with all participants and stakeholders through a variety of established settings and special meetings to share and learn from the data. Advisors and senior staff also use district planning meetings to assist LEAs in reporting school-level achievement data from state and local assessments to all participating Tier 1 and Tier 2 schools on a yearly basis and to the Office of Federal Programs on a quarterly basis. By coordinating the planning and use of data across all levels of implementation, the LT model facilitates effective and frequent communication of school progress to district staff, the MDE, and the Office of Federal Programs.

EXAMPLE: LAUSD SECONDARY SCHOOLS. In 2006, LAUSD implemented LT in 15 middle and high schools with the aim of establishing and sustaining effective teacher teams at all 184 secondary schools over a 5-year period. In a successful expansion from the initial 15 schools in the first year, the 2007–2008 school year added 33 new middle and high schools; prepared 36 additional middle and high schools to implement the LT program in 2008–2009; trained district staff in the LT program; collaboration with district staff to integrate LT with existing programs; and prepared to expand to additional schools in upcoming years. At the end of Year 1, over 80% of teacher workgroups were on track or making significant progress with establishing regular LT meetings and systematically studying their teaching. An analysis of teacher dialogue during workgroups indicated that those with solid LT implementations spent more time in meetings focused on instruction, were more likely to attribute student learning to their own instruction versus external factors, displayed more depth and rigor in instructional discussions, and expressed greater intellectual curiosity about teaching (McKnight & Bancroft, 2008). An external analysis of student achievement data after Year 1 also indicated that schools with at least 1 high-implementing workgroup showed slightly higher growth than matched comparison schools in most subjects, and impressively higher growth in a few subjects (Daley, 2008). By Year 2, LAUSD-employed advisors were trained to provide school-site services at two-thirds of all participating schools. According to systematic teacher surveys, 74% of teachers felt that participation in LT contributed to their efforts to improve achievement, and 82% reported seeing positive results in student performance. As of 2009-2010, LT is training and supporting more than 680 teacher teams in the areas of mathematics, science, English language arts, history, ESL, PE, special education, and various elective courses. Evaluation of interim and long-term outcomes by external and internal researchers is ongoing.

Daley, G. (2008). Implementation and Value Added Analysis of Learning Teams. Inter-Office Report to Director of Research and Planning: Department of Research and Planning: Los Angeles Unified School District.

McKnight, K., & Carlson-Bancroft, A. "Analysis of Instructional Talk in Teacher Workgroup Meetings." Evaluation Report to Los Angeles Unified School District, September 30, 2008.

Saunders, W.M., Goldenberg, C.N., & Gallimore, R. (2009) Increasing achievement by focusing grade level teams on improving classroom learning: A Prospective, Quasi-experimental Study of Title 1 Schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46, 4, 1006-1033.

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)

With research findings published in several peer-reviewed journals, Learning Teams is one of the few programs that has been able to scientifically isolate the positive effects of teacher collaboration on student achievement.

The LT model comes from over two decades of research and replication studies conducted in the classrooms and schools of low-income urban communities (Goldenberg, 2004; Goldenberg & Gallimore, 1991a; Saunders, O'Brien, Marcelletti, Hasenstab, Saldivar, & Goldenberg, 2001; Saunders & Goldenberg, 2005; Tharp & Gallimore, 1989).

One of these investigations culminated in a 6-year, prospective case study of a single elementary school. From 1990 to 1995, the school shifted from lowest achieving to surpassing district averages on both standardized tests and performance-based assessments (Goldenberg, 2004). Researchers started by identifying four dimensions associated with increases in student achievement: goals, indicators, assistance and leadership (Goldenberg & Sullivan, 1994). Over the course of the case study, a fifth dimension was added—settings. These five dimensions now comprise the LT model.

When implemented well, LT leads to improvements in overall school culture, including wider distribution of leadership, more effective team meetings, higher expectations and positive instructional attributions.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

* In a 5-year comparison study, student achievement in Title 1 LT schools rose by 41% overall and 54% for Hispanic students, gains that were significantly greater than those made by demographically-matched comparison schools (Saunders et al., 2009).

* An independent value-added analysis of LT secondary schools demonstrated that after just 1 year, schools with at least 1 well-functioning workgroup showed higher growth overall on state achievement tests than demographically matched comparison schools in most subjects, and impressively higher growth in three high school subject areas (Daley 2008).

DISTRIBUTED LEADERSHIP

* An external evaluation of LT schools indicate that teachers assume more academic leadership roles in their groups, enjoy more distributed leadership, and experience a heightened sense of professional responsibility (McDougall et al., 2007).

TEACHER MEETINGS FOCUSED ON INSTRUCTION

* Research and replication studies indicate that when teachers engage in collaborative inquiry in job-alike teams, teacher meetings become more focused on instruction. This effect emerges from deliberate planning around instructional goals and student outcomes, resulting in “meaningful instructional changes” in teacher practice in both primary and secondary schools (Ermeling, 2010; McDougall et al., 2007; Gallimore et al., 2009).

HIGHER EXPECTATIONS & INSTRUCTIONAL ATTRIBUTIONS

* Teachers in LT schools express higher expectations for student learning and are more likely to shift attributions of improved student performance toward “specific, teacher-implemented, instructional actions” and away from external factors such as student traits or other non-instructional explanations (McDougall et al., 2007; Gallimore, et al. 2009).

Subsequent replication and evaluation studies have reproduced several of these findings related to student achievement and leadership development in secondary schools.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT. After implementing Learning Teams for two consecutive years, secondary schools in LAUSD experienced achievement gains in several key content areas:

In 78% of high schools and 98% of middle schools, the majority of teacher workgroups in tested areas showed gains in CST scores from the previous year

Teacher workgroups in LT high schools produced CST gains greater than those of the state in key content areas including Algebra II, Geometry, World History (Grades 9 & 10), as well as gains greater than those of the district in Biology and Chemistry (9th & 10th grades).

In LT middle schools, 7th Grade Math and ELA produced CST gains greater than those of the district, and 8th Grade Algebra I and Geometry gains surpassed those of the district and state.

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT. In 2010, researchers explored the impact of LT on leadership roles of principals and teachers in secondary schools and found that collaborative learning teams positively influenced school leadership in two ways: (1) by strengthening principals’ instructional leadership, and (2) distributing leadership and instructional decision-making throughout the school. These changes in instructional and distributed leadership supported implementation of the LT model and promoted three key outcomes: (1) more accurate identification of student needs and instructional strategies, (2) greater communication across grade levels, and (3) improved job satisfaction and teacher retention (Abbott & McKnight, in press).

CITATIONS

Abbott, C. & McKnight, K. (in press). Developing School Leadership Through Collaborative Learning. *Journal of Scholarship & Practice*. American Association of School Administrators.

Daley, G. (2008). Implementation & Value Added Analysis of Learning Teams. Inter-Office Report to Director of Research and Planning: Department of Research and Planning: Los Angeles Unified School District.

Ermeling, B. (2010). Tracing the effects of teacher inquiry on classroom practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26 (3), 377-388.

Gallimore, R., Ermeling, B., Saunders, W., & Goldenberg, C. (May, 2009). Moving the learning of teaching closer to practice: Teacher Education Implications of School-based Inquiry Teams. *Elementary School Journal*, 109, 5, 537-553.

Goldenberg, C. (2004). *Successful school change: Creating settings to improve teaching and learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.

McDougall, D. Saunders, W. & Goldenberg, C. (2007). Inside the black box of school reform: Explaining the how and why of change at Getting Results schools. *Journal of Disability, Development, and Education*, 54, 54-89.

Saunders, B., O'Brien, G., Hasenstab, K., Marcelletti, D., Saldivar, T., & Goldenberg, C. (2001). Getting the most out of site-based professional development. In P. Schmidt & P. Mosenthal (Eds.). *Reconceptualizing literacy in the new age of pluralism and multiculturalism* (pp. 289-320). Greenwich, CT: IAP.

Saunders, W. & Goldenberg, C. (2005). The contribution of settings to school improvement and school change: A case study. In C. O'Donnell & L. Yamauchi (Eds.). *Culture and context in human behavior change: Theory, research, and applications* (pps. 127-150). NY: Peter Lang.

Saunders, W., Goldenberg, C. , & Gallimore, R. (2009) Increasing achievement by focusing grade level teams on improving classroom learning: A Prospective, Quasi-experimental Study of Title 1 Schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46, 4, 1006-1033.

Tharp, R. & Gallimore, R. (1989) *Rousing Minds to Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

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).

Learning Teams introduces schools to its job-embedded collaborative model through a systematic process of training, support, and ongoing school-site assistance provided to all participants. The following implementation plan represents the standard LT model over the course of one year, with support and assistance provided to principals, school leadership teams, teacher workgroups, and support staff.

Sample LT Implementation Plan:

SUMMER & WINTER: LEARNING TEAMS INSTITUTES

Summer Institute: 2 day training for district and site administrators as well as teacher workgroup facilitators

Mid-Year Institute: 1 day session all workgroup facilitators to share findings and results across schools

AUGUST -- JUNE: ONGOING SITE-LEVEL SERVICES SUPPORTED BY DEDICATED LT ADVISOR

Administrator Planning Meetings: Monthly site-level meeting at each school

Instructional Leadership Team Meeting: Monthly facilitator and administrator meeting at each school

Teacher Workgroup Meetings: Strategically supported monthly teacher workgroup meetings for teachers and instructional support staff

Regional Administrator Meetings: Monthly district-level meetings for participating administrators (for multi-school cohorts)

Strategic Additional Support: LT Advisor provides 1 additional day of strategic service every month to each school (e.g., a second workgroup visit, additional planning meeting, presentation to staff, 2nd ILT, or individual meeting with facilitators)

Strategic Planning: LT Advisors assists with development of LT strategic plan for subsequent school year

Project Management: LT Advisors take responsibility for all agendas, notes, and reminders related to facilitator meetings and admin planning meetings

LT Knowledge Base: Provide access to larger LT network of research, examples, and materials

ONGOING: Ongoing District Level Services Provided by LT Sr. Staff

District-Level Strategic Planning: Review and plan for alignment of LT with district vision, priorities, initiatives

Institute Preparation: Secure input and feedback on planning for LT institutes

RAM Preparation: Debrief and plan for monthly LT regional administrators' meetings (for multi-school cohorts)

School-Specific Strategic Planning: Think through ongoing support of each school and principal, including opportunities for observation and assistance

Implementation Planning: Plan for subsequent year of implementation, launch

sequence for continuation, multi-year timelines

Scale-Up Planning: Plan for expansion: selection of schools, intro of LT to new schools, preparation for new schools, etc. (when relevant to project circumstances)

In-House Advisor Preparation: Identify potential in-house advisor candidates and plan for certification of district staff to sustain the site level support of LT over time and reduce contract costs (when relevant to project circumstances)

Evaluation & Assessments: Provide update on latest results from LT evaluation instruments (institute evaluations, implementation checklist, ILT ratings, workgroup ratings, teacher surveys, review of work products from teams, analysis of state and district achievement results)

IMPROVEMENTS IN SCHOOL CULTURE AND FUNCTIONING

Once teams are established and working well, LT leads to improvements in general school culture and functioning. An external evaluation indicated those schools implementing Learning Teams exhibited distinct improvements in administrative leadership, the efficiency and focus of teacher meetings, use of data by all educators, and overall instructional effectiveness. Outcomes include:

1. Tighter linkages between teachers and administrators in their efforts to focus on academic goals and improve student achievement
2. Increased administrator participation in meetings focused on improving instruction
3. More use of published agendas and prior awareness of meeting topics
4. More tightly coupled meetings that are less frequently cancelled or re-purposed to a non-instructional focus
5. Greater teacher understanding of and more positive expectations for assessment data
6. An 'improvement over time' versus a 'one-shot' orientation for collecting, analyzing and using data
7. Attributions for student achievement more focused on teachers' planning and instruction, rather than teacher and student traits, and other non-instructional explanations

(McDougall, Saunders, & Goldenberg, 2007; Gallimore, et al., 2009)

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)

STATE STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS. Pearson LT has extensive experience in multiple states across the country assisting SEAs and LEAs meet state and federal requirements for school improvement. In Michigan, the LT model aligns with several key elements associated with the Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and the AdvancED/NCA Accreditation standards for school improvement, including the following:

- * providing teachers and principals with a structured process for incorporating student data into instructional learning and development
- * improving governance and strengthening distributed leadership throughout the school
- * emphasizing the fact that schools must be places of learning for teachers as well as students
- * providing administrators and teachers with an embedded support system dedicated to continuous improvement

Regardless of a school or district's placement in the accreditation cycle, the LT model will provide schools with systems and processes to better analyze data, assess protocols of practice related to instruction and learning, and evaluate student achievement in relation to state assessments. As an infrastructure designed to support high-quality instruction, the LT model is also uniquely positioned to help teachers address all grade level and content expectations—from state assessments like the MEAP and MME, to GLCEs and HSCEs—through collaborative grade-level or content-specific teams.

FEDERAL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT REQUIREMENTS. LT also meets the required elements of the US Department of Education's School Improvement Grant (SIG) Transformational Model for Tier 1 and Tier II schools in the following ways:

1. Develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness.

The leadership model embedded within the LT framework is one of “distributed leadership” based on the hypothesis that improving instruction requires shared leadership responsibilities by a team of individuals. An external evaluation of LT schools showed that LT implementation required teachers to assume academic leadership roles which promoted more distributed leadership and fostered a heightened sense of professional responsibility (McDougall et al., 2007). These findings were replicated in qualitative evaluations of principals and teachers in secondary schools (Abbott & McKnight, in press). The LT model promotes distributed leadership by requiring teachers to assume academic leadership roles in collaborative teacher workgroups, and to help chart the academic course and outcomes of their school through participation in an Instructional Leadership Team.

2. Implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies.

The LT model provides teachers with an inquiry-driven process for studying and improving their instruction within a variety of comprehensive reform strategies. Working in grade-level or subject-specific teams, teachers can apply PD learned in content-specific workshops to instructional problems across all core content areas (mathematics, reading, language arts, science, and history), as well as specialty and

extracurricular instructional areas. By giving teachers a stable, focused protocol within which to study and apply instructional innovations, LT becomes the vehicle through which teachers take what they're learning from curricular or pedagogical reforms—from mathematics or ELA programs, to ELL instructional reforms, to new textbook adoptions—and apply it directly to their instruction in the classroom.

3. Increase learning time.

The school calendar and time play an important role in student learning outcomes. Education time is not limited to students, however. The LT model is based on the premise that in order for schools to be places of learning for students, they must be places of learning for adults as well. LT provides all educators—from administrators to teachers to instructional coaches and specialists—with stable, focused time to come together and examine their own instruction. Teachers meet 2 to 3 times a month to study their practice, collaborate around effective instructional strategies, and learn from their own experiences. When teachers return to the classroom with comprehensive instructional strategies targeted to specific student needs, the students are more responsive and engaged in the learning process. To the extent that students spend more time actively engaged in learning activities, particularly when at an appropriate level of difficulty, achievement will increase.

4. Provide operational flexibility and sustained support.

The LT model is designed to build capacity and distributed leadership within the school. Beginning in Year 1, a dedicated LT Advisor provides on-site support to each school, with face-to-face assistance during monthly principal planning meetings, the monthly ILT meeting, and targeted teacher workgroup meetings. Step-down strategies are then built into the model for a smooth transition to sustain the model over the long-term. By Year 2, we typically recommend that districts begin to dedicate full-time district personnel as in-house advisors to replace Pearson staff for site-level support services at each school. At least one in-house advisor would be identified and certified during LT implementation and would begin to take over some site level services near the end of Year 2. By Year 3, all school-site services would be provided by the district's in-house advisor.

TITLE 1 SCHOOLS. LT has extensive experience working in Title 1 schools. Unlike other teacher collaboration programs which were modeled after staff development practices in high-achieving schools, the LT model was developed and refined in low-income, high-ELL Title 1 schools for the primary purpose of raising achievement. The majority of LT partners around the country are low-performing, Title 1 schools and districts. When implemented well, LT can lead to statistically significant gains in student achievement, over and above the normative rate of growth. In a 5-year study, achievement in LT Title 1 schools rose by 41% overall and 54% for Hispanic students, relative to a comparable group of Title 1 schools that did not deploy teacher teams (Saunders et al., 2009). In subsequent engagements with over 200 schools across 20+ districts, LT partners have consistently demonstrated gains on standardized tests that match or exceed gains of the state.

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)

Building Internal Capacity with District "In-House" Advisors

Pearson LT understands the importance of building a school's capacity to sustain effective school improvements over the long-term. At the same time, it is critical that schools and districts attract and maintain the highest quality teachers and educators on their staff. With these two principles in mind, the LT model includes a step-down approach to implementation that (a) allows the school to gradually transition the responsibility of school-site services from a Pearson Advisor to a district "in-house" advisor, and in doing so (b) utilizes existing local knowledge to provide and sustain the model.

Typically in Year 1 or 2 of LT implementation, we recommend that districts begin to dedicate full-time district personnel as "in-house" advisors to replace Pearson staff for site-level support services. This brings about a significant reduction in price per school from the standard full implementation price (approximately \$30,000 per school) and prepares the district to transfer capacity for sustaining LT services over the long term. At least one "in-house" district-level advisor would be identified and certified during Year 1 or 2 of implementation and would begin to take over site level services for some number of schools the following year. Pearson senior staff will continue to deliver to personnel from all participating schools the 2-day Leadership Institutes each summer, all Monthly Regional Meetings, and all Materials associated with the trainings and work. Pearson senior staff would also provide ongoing support and guidance to in-house advisors as well as access to the Pearson Advisors Desktop (an electronic platform and knowledge base for accessing our latest advisor resources and teaching materials). By Year 3, schools should be implementing the LT model almost entirely on their own, with increasingly limited oversight, support and training provided by LT senior staff.

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)

The LT design and implementation staff is comprised of 30 individuals representing more than 300 years of classroom teaching experience. Seven members are trained researchers with Ph.D. or Ed.D. degrees; 8 are literacy and 5 are math specialists with school and district-based experience serving in a coaching or content expert capacity; 5 have served as building principals; and 14 have administrative credentials. Key personnel involved in developing and/or implementing the LT model are as follows:

DAVE MARCELLETTI, M.A: Director, Pearson LT, Training & Innovation. Dave leads the implementation of the LT model. He earned his B.A., teaching credential and M.A. at Loyola Marymount University, after which he spent 16 years teaching in the Lennox School District. While teaching in Lennox, he had the opportunity to work closely with Bill Saunders and Claude Goldenberg to develop what has grown into the Pearson LT model. (see resume)

BRAD DARLING, Ed.D: Secondary Schools Director. Brad is the director of implementation for secondary LT projects. He completed his MEd in Educational Administration & Management from Sydney University and earned his Ed.D at UCLA. (see resume)

PAM TAMUSAITIS, M.A.: Director. Pam is currently the director of implementation for LT projects in California and Ohio. Pam earned two MA degrees, one in instruction and curriculum and the other in education leadership. (see resume)

TIM TATSUI, Ed.D: Associate Director. Tim completed his Doctor of Education at UCLA, where he researched teacher clinical practicum models and conducted action research around college-going culture development. He currently directs LT projects in Pomona, CA, Omaha, NE, and Cincinnati, OH. (see resume)

RICH CINQUEPALMI, M.A: Associate Director. Rich currently directs all LT schools in Ohio and West Virginia. He earned his BA in Music Education from the Ohio State University, MA in Music Education from Kent State University, MA in School Administration from Ashland University, and Superintendent credential from Ashland University. Rich has served as a Principal mentor for the Ohio Principal's entry year program, and was a site Principal in Massillon, Ohio before joining Pearson LT.

Proposed services at each school would be directed by an LT point person responsible for overseeing project implementation and conducting district-level services.

Selection of this individual from the LT staff will be determined by the nature of the project (elementary, secondary, or K-12). In addition, each participating school will receive 20-24 days of school-site assistance from a certified LT Advisor. If sufficient schools participate, the Advisor will be fully dedicated to the district and live in the local community. The same rigorous recruitment standards applied to our LT staff would be applied to the selection of this individual. We look for advanced-degreed professionals who pay attention to details, communicate well, and demonstrate the drive to complete tasks required for successful reform. Candidates who pass the screening are interviewed in a multi-step process that results in a profile of both skills and dispositions that can be used to assess fit with particular projects. Wherever possible, we will recruit locally to access local knowledge that is important to success.

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

Pearson LT Resumes for Key Personnel

David Marcelletti, M.A., *Director, Pearson Learning Teams*. Dave leads the implementation of the LT model. He earned his B.A., teaching credential and M.A. at Loyola Marymount University, after which he spent 16 years teaching in the Lennox School District. While teaching in Lennox, he had the opportunity to work closely with Bill Saunders and Claude Goldenberg to develop what has grown into the Pearson LT model.

Education

Masters of Arts, Counseling, Loyola Marymount University, 1991

Bachelor of Arts, Political Science, Loyola Marymount University, 1984

Professional Experience

2006 to present Elementary Director, Pearson Learning Teams

2002 to 2005 Getting Results Senior Consultant, CSULB

1997-2001 Getting Results Consultant, CSULB

1986 to 2001 Teacher, Grades 4 - 8, Lennox School District

1995 Assistant Principal (on special assignment), Jefferson School

1989 to 1990 Counseling Intern, Felton School and Lennox Middle School (worked with students in grades K through eight)

1992 to 2001 Master Teacher, Loyola Marymount University, Cal State University at Dominguez Hills, University of Southern California, Pepperdine University.

1992 to 1994 Grade five History/Social Studies State-Wide Test Development and Leadership Team, California Learning Assessment System

1991 to 1992 Instructor - LDS Preparation Course - Second Language Acquisition, DeNeve & Associates

California Credentials

Multi-Subjects Elementary Credential, Loyola Marymount University, 1987

Pupil Personnel Services Credential, Loyola Marymount University, 1991

Language Development Specialist Certificate, Certified 1990

Publications

Saunders, W., O'Brien, G., Marcelletti, D., Hasenstab, K., Saldivar, T., & Goldenberg, C. (2001)

"Getting the most out of school-based professional development in culturally diverse schools." In P. Schmidt & P. Mosenthal, (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing literacy in the new age of pluralism and multiculturalism*. Greenwich, CN: Information Age Publishing.

Brad Darling, Ed.D., Secondary Director, Pearson Learning Teams. Los Angeles. Brad has worked in education for the past 12 years in public, correctional, and private schools. During this time he has also served as an adjunct professor, keynote speaker, and consultant for several local universities and colleges within the Departments of Education. Dr. Darling earned his Ed.D from UCLA, focusing his research on school effectiveness, from the student perspective. His findings have been used to improve schools within the Orange County Department of Education, as well as schools throughout the nation. He is now the Secondary Director, Pearson Learning Teams and is part of the leadership team that is researching and designing instructional improvement programs for large inner city high schools in Los Angeles and New York.

Education

Concordia University, Irvine: B.A. English - 1995

Sydney University, Sydney: MEd. Education: Administration & Management - 1997

University of California, Los Angeles: Ed.D. Educational Leadership - 2002

Positions

1996-1997: Teacher: Sydney, Australia

1997-2000: Teacher: Zion Lutheran School, Anaheim, CA

1998-2000: Vice Principal: Zion Lutheran School, Anaheim, CA

2000-2003: Instructor: Orange County Sheriff's Department, Santa Ana, CA

2001-2003: Site Liaison/Teacher: Alternative, Charter and Correctional Education Schools and Services (ACCESS), Orange County Department of Education, Costa Mesa, CA

2000-2005: Adjunct Professor: Concordia University, Irvine, CA

2003-2005: Principal: ACCESS, Orange County Department of Education, Santa Ana, CA

2005-2006: Adjunct Professor: Saddleback College, Mission Viejo, CA

2005-Current: Secondary Director for Learning Teams, Pearson in Santa Monica, CA

Certification

Professional Clear Single Subject Teaching Credential (Expires 2010)

Administrative Services Credential (Expires 2010)

Selected Committees

2003- present: Education Administration Advisory Committee: Concordia University, CA

2003- present: Institutional Review Board: Orange County Department of Education, CA

2004-present: Teaching Performance Assessment Assessor: Vanguard University, CA

Recent Keynote Presentations

2006: California State University, Fullerton, Leadership Conference: Becoming a Leader of Character

2005: Journal of Juvenile Court, Community, and Alternative School Administrators of California 36th Annual Conference: Where Are They Now: Tracking Graduates of Alternative Education

2003-2005: Consortium District Intern Program (OCDE): Classroom Management Techniques for High Risk Teens. & Violence Prevention and Working with At-Risk Youth

2003: Educating Adjudicated, Incarcerated, and At-Risk Youth: Bridging Professional Perspectives, 13th Annual Conference: Full ACCESS: Using Students' Perspectives to Improve Educational Service

2001-2004: Anti-Defamation League, Community Outreach: Positive Choices, Stereotyping America's Youth and Stop the Hate

Awards

2009: Concordia University Alumnus of the Year

2005: Culminating Project Award: UCLA Educational Leadership Program

2003: Crystal Bell: Orange County Department of Education

1996: Rotary Academic/Ambassadorial Scholarship

Publications

Michigan Department of Education

2010-11 Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

Preferred External Education Services Provider Application: **Pearson Learning Teams**

Darling, Brad. (2005). Ensuring that No Child is Left Behind: How Orange County is Reducing Dropout Rates. *Journal of Juvenile Court, Community, and Alternative School Administrators of California*, Spring, 2005.

Darling Brad & Price, Ted. (2004). Students' Perspective on Alternative, Community, and Correctional Education Schools and Services (ACCESS). *Journal of Correctional Education*, March, 2004.

Pam Tamusaitis, M.A., Elementary Director, Pearson Learning Teams. Has worked in education for the past 20 years in public schools. Ms. Tamusaitis was a teacher, grade level facilitator, literacy coach, and a member of her school's leadership team at one of the LAUSD elementary schools involved in the Learning Teams scale up study. Ms. Tamusaitis earned two M.A. degrees, one in instruction and curriculum and the other in education leadership. Currently Ms. Tamusaitis is the Elementary Director for the Pearson Learning Teams program and is part of the leadership team that is researching and designing instructional improvement programs for schools across the nation. She has helped deliver summer Leadership Institutes in Ohio each of past two years as part of Pearson's collaboration with John Carroll University and Ohio Reading First schools.

Education

M.A. Educational Leadership
California State University Northridge, 2003
M.A. Elementary Education: Instruction and Curriculum
California State University Northridge, 1990
B.A. Diversified Liberal Arts
University of San Diego, 1986

Professional Experience

2005-Current Learning Teams, Director, Pearson
1999-2005 Literacy Coach, Los Angeles Unified School District
1986-1999 Elementary School Teacher, Grades K-6, Los Angeles Unified School District

California Credentials

Preliminary Administration Service Credential
California State University Northridge, 2003
Clear Multiple-Subject Teaching Credential
California State University Northridge, 1989

Additional Experiences

Presenter: California State University Conference: Preparing Teachers to Teach Reading, 2003
Presenter: California Association of Bilingual Educators Conference, 1996 & 1997
Presenter: International Reading Association Conference, 1998
Presenter: Los Angeles Unified School District Open Court Training and Passport Events, 1999-2005
Grade Level Chairperson/AALT Representative, 1994-1999
Mentor Teacher, 1995-1999
United Teachers of Los Angeles Chapter Chair, 1988-1993
Participant in Title 7 Research and Development Grant: Primary Language Arts and English Language Development, 1994-1999

Awards

California State Assembly: Certificate of Recognition for Educating the Children of California, 2003
Los Angeles Unified School District: Certificate of Recognition for serving as a Literacy Coach for five years, 2005
Los Angeles Unified School District; Certificate of Appreciation for Volunteer Tutorial Program, 2006. (10/13/07)

Timothy T. Tatsui

Home 310.649.4408
Work 310.402.1685
Mobile 310.266.2902

6112 South Garth Av
Los Angeles, CA 900
kibokoyaottt@yahoo.c

Summary of Qualifications

- Skilled in consensus and relationship building, negotiation, and interpersonal written and oral communication
- Ability to think strategically, lead and translate ideas and insights effectively in complex, multi-partner projects
- Experienced with business development processes, strategic analyses, planning and design, and general management
- Proficient in conducting and applying qualitative and quantitative research and continuous improvement design

Experience

2007-Present

Director, LT

Pearson Education

- Designed and led multiple, multi-year consulting projects in school districts across the nation, directing hiring, training and evaluation of senior and junior consultants and managing implementation of initiatives focused on improving teacher quality and school improvement
- Selected as senior management consultant, over successive years, by project partners and executive teams from large, urban districts and/or private foundations in Cincinnati, OH, Omaha, NE, Pomona, CA and Los Angeles, CA to support the design and management of complex, multi-party strategy for continuous improvement
- Served as a member of PearsonLT's management team to design, model, execute and monitor short- and long-term strategic business plans, including business model design, pricing strategies, talent recruitment and management, intellectual property development, business development and market analysis

2006-2007

Program and Policy Development Specialist

Office of the Executive Officer, Los Angeles Unified School District

Office of the Chief Instructional Officer, Los Angeles Unified School District

- Represented Senior District Management in discussions with administrators, labor unions, and policy makers in a proactive, accurate and media-sensitive manner
- Prepared written reports and communicated analyses and recommendations for confidential and public policy initiatives, formulating positions and providing direction for Senior Management
- Executed preparation, analysis, interpretation and application of proposed city, state, and federal legislation
- Coordinated cross-functional teams in the nation's second largest school district, working with Senior Managers from Health & Human Services, Charter Schools, Special Education, Early Childhood Education, Specially Funded Programs, Parent Community Services, Adult & Career Education and After-School Programs
- Conducted evaluation and validation audits as a Cabinet-appointed member of State Review Team
- Developed, coordinated and monitored studies related to the District's instructional programs and strategic plan

2005-2006

Curriculum Specialist, Instructional Coach

Compton Unified School District

- Coached and evaluated instruction and implementation of curriculum adoptions, and trained management and staff in quantitative and qualitative data analysis to target building-level trends and inform instruction
- Observed classroom instruction, identifying instructional strengths and targeting areas for improvement
- Drafted policy and strategic plans as a member of the site leadership team

1999 to 2005

District Trainer, Mentor Teacher

Compton Unified School District

- Designed and evaluated the curriculum and training for the school district's Teacher Training Institute
- Trained new teachers and district interns regarding instructional methods, classroom management strategies, and assessment-driven decision making to meet the needs of diverse learners and ensure access for all students
- Conducted District-wide instructional audits, guiding school teams to more effectively analyze data and design strategic plans to address persistent instructional concerns

1997 to 2005 **Educator, Department Chair, Site Management Team**
C.A. Dickison Elementary, Compton Unified School District

- Elected by staff to design, implement, and evaluate policies and programs to address school-site challenges
- Mobilized community resources and fostered strong parent involvement through parent workshops and partnerships with community based organizations and local colleges
- Disney Teacher of the Year Nominee, 2003; Site Teacher of the Year 2004, Compton Unified School District

2001-2005 **Advisor, Master Teacher, Graduate Schools of Education**
California State University, Dominguez Hills

Loyola Marymount University
Pepperdine University

- Coached and supervised intern-credential teachers in classroom management and the integration and alignment of subject-specific pedagogical theory and practice
- Collaborated with student teachers to draft and execute targeted plans for improvement
- Advised student teacher candidates to master competencies for teacher certification through lesson observation, demonstration, and feedback

1997-1999 **Corps Member**
Teach for America, Los Angeles Corps

- Taught as a member of a selective national corps of teachers, committing to teach at least two years in an urban, high-poverty public school district

Education

Master of Business Administration **2010**
University of California, Los Angeles, Anderson School of Management Los Angeles, California
Business Strategy, Marketing Management, Global Financial Markets, Managerial Accounting, Corporate Finance, Operations and Technology Management, Negotiations Behavior, Managerial Economics, Global Macroeconomics

Doctor of Education **2006**
University of California, Los Angeles, Graduate School of Education Los Angeles, California
Qualitative and Quantitative Research, Education Policy, Action Research Design & Statistics, Published
Dissertation: *Transforming Aspirations to Actions in Early Readiness Programs: Action Research in Early College Outreach*, Recipient of 2006 UCLA Culminating Project Dissertation of the Year, Selected 2006 Graduate Speaker

Professional Credential, Multiple Subjects **2001**
California State University, Los Angeles Los Angeles, California
Golden Apple Award: 2001 CSULA Teacher of the Year

Bachelor of Arts, Sociology & Religion **1997**
Baylor University Waco, Texas
Dean's List Honors, AKD Honor's Society, Juvenile Justice Mentor, Summer Teacher in United Republic of Tanzania

Swahili and East African Culture, Study Abroad **1996**
University of Nairobi, Baylor University Program in International Studies Nairobi, Kenya
Intensive Swahili Instruction, Ethnographic Tribal Home Stays, East African Religion & Culture

Dutch Art and European Culture, Study Abroad **1995**
University of Limburg, Maastricht Maastricht, The Netherlands
Dutch Art, Western European Literature, Study of 442nd World War II Regimental Combat Team

Experience

Associate Director

July 08 - Present, Pearson Learning Teams - Akron, Ohio

- Supervise and Support Learning Teams Implementation in 40 schools in Ohio and West Virginia
- Collaboration with the Ohio Office of Literacy and Reading First
- Presenter at the Indiana and Michigan State-Wide Principal Conferences

Principal

August 06 – June 08 Franklin Elementary School, Massillon City Schools

- Served as Principal in a pre-K through 4 building overseeing 50 staff members.
- Worked with staff to move the building from SI status to Safe Harbor.
- Implemented Franklin University, a college awareness program for elementary students.
- Presenter at the Ohio Literacy Conference

5th and 6th Grade Principal

August 05 – June 06 Massillon Middle School, Massillon City Schools

- Served on the team that opened a new OSFC building, combining two local Middle Schools into one city-wide facility.
- Served on the District Technology Committee
- Served on the LPDC Committee

Principal

August 00 – June 05 Gorrell Elementary School, Massillon City Schools

- Worked with staff to improve our report card rating from Academic Watch to Effective.
- Awarded the School of Promise Award
- Served on the District Curriculum Committee
- Served on the LPDC Committee

Elementary Music Teacher

August 98 – June 00 Portage Elementary School, Barberton City Schools

- Taught Vocal, Instrumental and General Music K-5
- Served on the Superintendents Advisory Council
- Served on the District Curriculum and Technology Committees.

Director of Choral Music / Elementary Music Teacher

August 93 – June 98 Nordonia High School / Ledgeview Elementary School, Nordonia Hills City Schools

- Instructed Vocal and General Music K-12
- Supervised the Theater Department 9-12
- Awarded Sallie Mae 1st Year Teacher Award
- Awarded PTSA Educator of the Year

Education

Ashland University, Ashland, Ohio

2005-06

- Superintendents Licensure Program

Ashland University, Ashland, Ohio

1998 - 00

- Masters in School Administration
Elementary/Middle School Principal Licensure Program

Kent State University, Kent, Ohio

1993-95

- Masters in Music Education
Phi Kappa Alpha

Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

1988-93

- Bachelors in Music Education
Richard DeSelm Fellowship

References

References are available on request.