

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

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

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

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

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

Contact Information

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

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

Michigan Department of Education
2010-11 Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants
Preferred External Educational Services Provider Application

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			
		RMC Research Corporation			
3. Name of Entity as you would like it to appear on the Approved List					
RMC Research Corporation					
4. Entity Type:		5. Check the category that best describes your entity:			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For-profit <input type="checkbox"/> Non-profit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Business <input type="checkbox"/> Community-Based Organization <input type="checkbox"/> Educational Service Agency (e.g., RESA or ISD)				
<input type="checkbox"/> Institution of Higher Education <input type="checkbox"/> School District <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____					
6. Applicant Contact Information					
Name of Contact Dr. Carolyn Vincent		Phone 888-762-4200		Fax 703-558-4823	
Street Address 1501 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 1250		City Arlington		State VA	Zip 22209
E-Mail vincentc@rmcarl.com		Website http://www.rmcarlington.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)

RMC Research Corporation is pleased to submit this application as an **external provider of comprehensive support to ensure student and teacher success and to sustain improvement in the area of reading**. RMC Research has provided support to schools, school districts, state education agencies, and the US Department of Education in the effective use of evidence-based reading instruction to improve student achievement and teacher effectiveness. This proposal describes support services, content and delivery systems, job-embedded professional development, and formative assessment systems that RMC can provide alone or in partnership with another external provider, depending on the specific needs of the eligible school and the capabilities and strengths of other qualified providers. The services described are focused on meeting the needs of secondary students and their teachers though RMC's approach has been just as successful in elementary schools.

The services described in this proposal are designed to ***improve secondary students' content area knowledge through professional development in disciplinary literacy instruction for secondary content area teachers***. "Disciplinary literacy instruction" is defined in this proposal as advanced vocabulary and comprehension instruction embedded within content area subject matter in English/language arts, science and social studies. Research and practice have shown that the achievement of students in chronically underperforming secondary schools can be turned around when secondary teachers acquire the necessary competencies to teach both rigorous subject matter and the advanced reading skills needed for students to obtain deep content area knowledge. Therefore, RMC's proposed services focus on increasing teachers' knowledge of the advanced reading skills (i.e., disciplinary literacy) necessary for students' development of rich content area knowledge.

RMC's proposed services are grounded in adolescent literacy research. Adolescent reading entails reading to learn in subjects that present their ideas and content in different ways. Adolescent readers are expected to read and write across a wide variety of disciplines, genres, and materials with increasing skill, flexibility, and insight. However, millions of adolescents experience difficulty acquiring the advanced reading skills needed to read in the content areas. Test score data and research confirm that many adolescents first need to improve their general vocabulary and reading comprehension skills before they can take full advantage of content area instruction. Only then can students undertake some of the specialized challenges that disciplinary texts pose. This is because content area reading difficulties are reciprocal; a lack of content knowledge means problems understanding texts, and a lack of understanding texts means students are unlikely to learn content.

RMC will provide high quality, job-embedded professional development to content area teachers in the disciplinary literacy instruction needed for improving students' content area learning and reaching proficiency or above on the MEAP, the Michigan Merit Exam, and the ELPA. RMC's professional development will focus on instructional techniques content area teachers can use to meet the literacy needs of all their students, including those who struggle. Research suggests that the teaching of generic reading comprehension strategies has some merit, and that students can learn routines that help them comprehend various types of texts. However, deep content area knowledge requires more than applying generic comprehension strategies to new texts; it also requires skills, knowledge, and reasoning processes specific to particular disciplines (Heller & Greenleaf, 2007). Disciplinary literacy requires students to have specific kinds of background

knowledge and approaches to reading for each subject or discipline. To ensure that the optimal environment for success exists, content area teachers should provide explicit vocabulary instruction, direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction, and opportunities for discussion of text. These strategies help content area teachers adapt their instruction so that all students, even those who struggle with reading, have easier access to the special language and text structure of content area materials. Therefore, RMC's approach to professional development will include: (1) enhancing content area teachers' knowledge of high-quality adolescent literacy instructional practices; (2) developing content area teachers' knowledge of high-quality disciplinary literacy instruction; and (3) applying disciplinary literacy instruction in content area classrooms to meet the needs of all learners.

RMC's high quality job-embedded professional development services consist of an explicit and targeted professional development approach designed to increase content area teachers' knowledge of evidence-based, high-quality disciplinary literacy instruction. Teachers will receive professional development that is customized to meet their needs. RMC has knowledge and experience in providing high-quality, evidence-based vocabulary and comprehension instruction to instructional staff. This experience ensures consistency and alignment of information across grade levels and content areas and results in services that form a coherent professional development picture in support of an increase in student achievement for grades 6-12. RMC has listed possible professional development topics for disciplinary literacy related to each of the aforementioned exemplars. These discipline-specific reading strategies are derived from recent research.

Professional Development for Teachers

- **Professional Development in Managing Ongoing Assessments of Student Reading Performance and Creation of Data Driven Instructional Program**
 - Organizing, analyzing and using data to make effective instructional decisions to increase students' content area achievement
 - Planning high-quality, evidence-based disciplinary literacy instruction based on student learning needs
 - Differentiating disciplinary literacy instruction within the classroom (tier 2) to meet the vocabulary and comprehension learning needs of all students

- **Professional Development in Targeted Academic Supports and Interventions For Students Performing Below Grade Level:** Building a knowledge base of effective instructional practice in the following areas:
 - Explicit vocabulary instruction and building specialized vocabulary;
 - Direct and explicit generic reading comprehension strategies, such as monitoring comprehension, pre-reading, goal setting, asking questions, making and confirming predictions, re-reading, and summarizing; and
 - Strategies for effective implementation of tier 1 disciplinary literacy instruction, such as using the gradual release of responsibility model, establishing instructional routines, building prior knowledge without texts, expanding prior knowledge with reading, and incorporating accountable student talk through discussions of text meaning and interpretation.

- **Technical assistance to guide the formation and execution of professional study groups:** Technical assistance is intended to build staff knowledge and skills needed to implement disciplinary literacy instruction by helping schools to form subject-specific

professional study groups. Because disciplinary literacy requires knowledge of topics in a particular field, the subject-specific professional study groups provide a format for content area teachers to become partners in teaching and learning to identify the kinds of advanced reading skills that are essential to their content areas, the specific reading demands that are distinct to their content areas, the norms for reasoning within the discipline, and the challenges that students face when learning to read in these ways. The goal of the study groups is to provide a forum in which teachers can share knowledge and participate in collaborative inquiry and reflection. Specifically, professional study groups provide teachers with the opportunity to discuss high-quality instruction in specific content areas and evidence-based instructional recommendations that support teachers in selecting, adapting, and teaching different strategies specifically and appropriately for each learning context, especially if the goal is to support students in internalizing and adapting cognitive tools of their own.

The professional study groups are meant to be a partnership between content area teachers and RMC staff. The content area teachers contribute the subject matter expertise, while RMC provides specific disciplinary literacy strategies to assist in meeting teachers' goals. RMC staff can participate as facilitators, observers, or both, with the goal of creating groups that will eventually function independently.

- **Technical Assistance in Literacy Curriculum Alignment to Michigan State Standards for Reading, Writing, Listening, and Speaking:** Technical assistance is intended to build staff knowledge and skills needed to implement instruction that is aligned with and helps students to meet the Michigan state standards for Reading, Writing, Listening, and Speaking K-6. This is especially crucial with the recent adoption of the new Common Core Standards..

Professional Development For the Instructional Coach(es). If the school's turnaround plan includes the use of coaches, RMC will provide professional development for the instructional coach that will focus on building expertise in coaching strategies. Professional development may include building a knowledge base of effective coaching practices in the following areas:

- Literacy coaching strategies for the new coach
- Advanced coaching strategies
- Analyzing and using data to improve instructional decisions
- Working together to increase literacy achievement: The Principal and the Coach
- Facilitating grade level team meetings

Professional Development for the Principal and Assistant Principal. School leaders are the key to school improvement. For a school to achieve excellence in literacy teaching and learning, leaders must be knowledgeable about the components of reading and evidence-based instructional routines and must provide ongoing support for and supervision of teaching and classroom practice. To ensure consistency in core literacy knowledge, the principal and assistant principal will participate in selected professional development with teachers and/or the coach. Additional professional development for the principal and assistant principal will focus on building expertise in supervision through on-going walk-throughs and/or instructional rounds, which is a process to help educators develop a shared practice of observing, discussing, and analyzing learning and teaching. Professional development may include building a knowledge base of effective instructional leadership practices in the following areas:

- Instructional Leadership for Literacy 101 (designed for a new principal or assistant principal)
- Advanced Leadership for Literacy (designed for an experienced instructional leader)
- Working Together to Increase Literacy Achievement: The Principal and the Coach
- The Literacy Walk-Through: Support and Accountability (this includes follow-up site visits and dual walk-throughs with leadership coaching)

Technical Assistance for Meeting Facilitation. RMC staff will be available to facilitate meetings that are an important part of a school’s implementation plan, such as grade level team meetings, study groups, and literacy leadership meetings. RMC is prepared to collaborate with another external provider to provide any or all of the services and training it has proposed and can deliver these services in a variety of formats (see *Delivery Methods*, below). The RMC staff who are included in the *Staff Qualifications* section, can work in concert with another external provider or as independent sources of professional development and technical assistance.

Delivery Method of Services

RMC will use a variety of delivery methods and training formats, as befits the topics and participating school staff’s needs: whole group, small group, or individualized; both on-site and off-site (using webinars). Professional development for staff will be highly interactive, content area specific, and based on a “gradual release of responsibility” model [i.e., support that moves from explicit instruction (modeling) to guided practice to independent practice as the staff’s skills reach proficiency]. Once professional development topics have been presented, RMC staff will monitor implementation and supervision of literacy instruction by observing, modeling, and providing feedback. The on-site observation, monitoring and feedback functions are extremely important for making adjustments in “real world” contexts so that services can be tailored to meet individual staff and school needs. RMC can offer a very flexible schedule which includes having staff on-site at a school as often as needed. When off-site, RMC staff will provide technical assistance and on-going support via webinar, phone and email.

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)

RMC has been a leader in translating the research on evidence-based reading practices into resources, professional development, and technical assistance for the U.S. Department of Education, state education agencies (SEA), and school districts (LEA) in all states. One of RMC's strongest areas of expertise and experience is in using the research on evidence-based reading instruction to build needed literacy knowledge and skills of district and school staff for raising the reading achievement of students. RMC will draw on that expertise and experience to support Michigan SIG grant recipients as they raise the reading achievement of their students.

Under a U.S. Department of Education contract, RMC established the National Reading Technical Assistance Center (NRTAC, formerly the National Center for Reading First Technical Assistance or NCRFTA) to provide assistance to states and districts implementing Reading First grants. NRTAC was designed to be the pre-eminent source of technical assistance and information on scientifically-based reading research (SBRR) and scientifically-based instruction. NRTAC tasks include: serving as a high quality resource for scientifically-based reading research; planning and providing technical assistance and professional development to build SEA/LEA capacity; providing customized, contextual, consultative assistance to individual states and districts; creating products, tools and resource materials to Reading First clients to help them understand and implement Reading First, and collecting information on implementation.

Through RMC's work under NRTAC, RMC has produced the following: several research syntheses on new studies and meta-analyses of SBRR in the areas of comprehension, vocabulary, and coaching that have emerged since the report of the National Reading Panel a compilation of case studies of Reading First implementation at the state, district, and school levels, and national, regional and state conferences, seminars, academies and workshops highlighting best practices in reading instruction. Additionally, RMC conducted a survey and a focus group to evaluate the quality and relevance of the NRTAC's services, materials and resources, as well as the frequency of communications and timeliness of services. Forty-one Reading First State Directors completed the survey, and nearly all respondents (95% and higher) *agreed* or *strongly agreed* that NRTAC staff provided them with new ideas to improve an ongoing program, policy or practice, and that they provided effective assistance for SEAs and LEAs regarding scientifically based reading instruction. In addition, more than 90% of respondents *agreed* or *strongly agreed* that NRTAC staff helped to improve their states' understanding of SBRR and helped them refine SBRR-related practices in schools and districts.

RMC's approach and practices to assist teachers and school and district administrators successfully increase student achievement in reading are based on a few key research studies and meta-analyses of existing research: (1) the National Reading Panel Report, (2) two USED Institute for Education Sciences Practice Guides that reinforce the importance of using data to make decisions about instruction and intervention in an evidence-based reading program, (3) one USED Institute for Education Sciences Practice Guide that provides evidence-based recommendations that educators can use to improve literacy levels among adolescents in upper elementary, middle, and high schools, and (4) the research on implementation science. Together, these bodies of evidence form an argument that support services which focus on increasing teachers' knowledge of the advanced reading skills (i.e., disciplinary literacy) necessary for students' development of rich content area knowledge.is strongly supported by research.

The foundation of RMC's understanding of scientifically-based reading research is the 2000 report of the National Reading Panel—*Teaching Children to Read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. In 1997, the National Reading Panel (NRP), convened by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), was asked by Congress to assess the status of research-based knowledge about reading for children in grades K-5, including the effectiveness of various approaches to teaching children to read. The Panel developed and adopted a set of rigorous research methodological standards to guide the screening of the research literature relevant to each topic area addressed by the panel. The Reading Panel's research suggests that reading instruction is complex and that learning to read requires a combination of skills, including phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, and text reading comprehension skills (NICHD, 2002).

- With regard to **phonemic awareness skills**, the panel concluded that phonemic awareness skills can be taught, and is effective in improving reading with all types of children under a variety of teaching conditions.
- With regard to **phonics skills**, the panel concluded that systematic phonics instruction makes a bigger contribution to children's growth in reading than nonsystematic alternative programs or no phonics.
- With regard to **fluency**, the panel concluded that guided oral reading with feedback has a significant positive impact on word recognition, reading fluency, and comprehension.
- With regard to **vocabulary**, the panel concluded that vocabulary instruction leads to gains in comprehension. Preteaching of vocabulary words and repeated exposure in different contexts were found to improve vocabulary and comprehension.
- With regard to **comprehension**, the panel concluded that when students are given cognitive strategies instruction, they make significant gains on measures of reading comprehension over students trained with conventional instruction.

Another piece of research that RMC relies on to guide the support it provides to teachers and administrators as they use student achievement data to make instructional decisions is the *Institution for Educational Science's Practice Guide #4067: Using student achievement data to support instructional decision making* (Hamilton, Halverson, Jackson, Mandinach, Supovitz, & Wayman, 2009). The guide was developed by a panel, convened to examine studies that evaluate academically oriented data-based decision-making interventions and practices. This guide focuses on how schools can make use of common assessment data to improve teaching and learning. The panel made five recommendations based on findings from studies that use causal designs to examine effectiveness of data use interventions, case studies of schools and districts that have made data use a priority, observations from the field, and expert opinion. The recommendations are: (1) make data part of an ongoing cycle of instructional improvement; (2) teach students to examine their own data and set learning goals; (3) establish a clear vision for schoolwide data use; (4) provide supports that foster a data-driven culture within a school; and (5) develop and maintain a districtwide data system (Hamilton et al., 2009).

Another meta-analysis of the research that guides RMC's approach to supporting reading instruction is the *Institute for Educational Science's Practice Guide #4045: Assisting students struggling with reading: Response to Intervention (RTI) and multi-tier intervention in the primary grades*. This guide offers specific recommendations to help educators identify students in need of intervention and implement evidence-based interventions to promote their reading achievement. It also describes how to carry out each recommendation, including how to address potential roadblocks in implementation (Gersten et al, 2008). The panel that conducted this research

analysis made five recommendations based on findings of rigorous studies of interventions to promote reading achievement in addition to expert opinion. The recommendations are: (1) screen all students for potential reading problems at the beginning of the year and again in the middle of the year; (2) provide differentiated reading instruction for all students based on assessments of students' current reading levels; (3) provide intensive, systematic instruction on up to three foundational skills in small groups to students who score below the benchmark on universal screening. Typically these groups meet between three and five times a week for 20-40 minutes; (4) monitor the progress of tier 2 students at least once a month. Use these data to determine whether students still require intervention. For those still making insufficient progress, school-wide teams should design a tier 2 intervention plan; and (5) provide intensive instruction daily that promotes various components of reading proficiency to students who show minimal progress after reasonable time in tier 2 small group instruction (Gersten et al., 2008).

A third meta-analysis of the research that guides RMC's approach to supporting adolescent reading is the *Institute for Education Science's Practice Guide #4027: Improving adolescent literacy: Effective classroom and intervention practices*. The goal of this practice guide is to present specific and coherent evidence-based recommendations that educators can use to improve literacy levels among adolescents in grades 4-12. The practice guide includes five specific recommendations for educators along with a discussion of the quality of evidence that supports these recommendations. The first two recommendations focus on strategies for vocabulary and comprehension instruction. The third recommendation concerns discussion of and about texts. The fourth recommendation concerns student motivation and engagement. The final recommendation concerns struggling readers, those students who probably score well below their peers on state reading tests and whose reading deficits hinder successful performance in their coursework. It encourages educators to make available intensive and individualized interventions for struggling readers provided by trained specialists (Kamil et al, 2008).

RMC's approach to supporting the improvement of reading achievement and instruction has also been influenced by the research of Dean Fixsen and his colleagues at the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN). They have researched evidence-based practices in various fields such as medical, human services, and recently, education. They conducted a review and synthesis of the implementation literature and have developed a framework for the implementation of evidence-based programs. This framework consists of various stages of implementation, beginning with exploration and ending with sustainability (Fixsen, Naoom, Blase, Friedman, & Wallace, 2005). Conclusions from the synthesis indicate that adaptations made after an initiative has been implemented with fidelity were more successful than modifications made before full implementation. Implementations administered with high fidelity were those that had context components, or implementation drivers, that were present to successfully use evidence-based practices or programs. These implementation drivers include staff selection and training; ongoing consultation and coaching; staff and program supervision; preservice and inservice training; facilitative administrative support; and systems interventions.

RMC believes that local reading stakeholders make up an implementation team that help to put effective practices in place and use data to monitor the progress of implementation over time. The implementation team can assist the school in recognizing and anticipating shifting priorities and influences and make appropriate adjustments without losing the key components that define the evidence-based program. In summary, the authors conclude that when strong core implementation components are well-supported by strong organizational structures, the desired outcomes of sustaining high fidelity practices can be achieved.

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 service that RMC is proposing to provide to eligible SIG schools and their district leaders is an approach in improving secondary student reading achievement built around high-quality job-embedded professional development. Based on experience supporting schools using this approach, RMC anticipates that its support service of targeted professional development and technical assistance will build the capacity (individually and collectively) of teachers, coaches, and school leaders to create a strong literacy culture. The foundation for a cohesive team of educators who work together to increase student learning is based on the following:

- A shared schoolwide vision for literacy instruction that is based on a deep understanding of effective instructional practices and supportive leadership.
- Communication that clearly defines learning goals, high-quality instruction, and the roles and responsibilities of all members of the learning culture.
- Implementation of evidence-based, high-quality instruction that is differentiated to the learning needs of students.
- An increase in staff understanding of the Michigan State Standards for Reading, Writing, Listening, and Speaking K-6 and how to use the Standards Aligned System to prioritize teaching and learning targets.

RMC's proposed service consists of an explicit and targeted three-pronged job-embedded professional development approach to increase each school staff's knowledge of literacy skills and high-quality instruction. The three prongs [teachers, coaches, and administrators-including the principal, assistant principal, and key district administrators] will receive parallel but interconnected and ongoing professional development and technical assistance that is customized to meet the needs of the participants in each prong and school. RMC has knowledge and experience at all school staff levels – teacher, coach, and leadership. This experience ensures consistency and alignment of information across levels and results in services that form a coherent professional development picture in support of an increase in student literacy achievement K-6. Based on its extensive experience using this approach in districts and schools around the country, RMC has identified the critical professional development topics and technical assistance related to needs of teachers and administrators in low-performing schools.

RMC has found its training-based support model to be most effective when implementing the following steps:

1. Review existing data and school reports to determine professional development and technical assistance foci. The following documents will be collected and analyzed to help understand and describe the school's context regarding the state of reading instruction and achievement:
 - Data Driven Needs Assessment training results and action plan
 - school improvement plan
 - student reading achievement data-benchmark and outcome assessments for each class
 - reading curricula and other key instructional materials used at each grade level
 - list of supplemental and/or intervention reading materials and/or programs
 - classroom schedules

- master school schedule, including any existing reading intervention schedules
2. Design and implement a professional development plan targeted to and aligned with each of the three prongs of RMC's support: (a) teachers' and coaches' implementation of literacy as well as disciplinary literacy instruction; (b) principal's and assistant principal's supervision of teaching and learning; (c) central administrators' support of the implementation.
 3. Monitor each prong's efforts and build a culture of literacy to increase student achievement.
 4. Make appropriate adjustments in technical assistance and professional development plans based on monitoring results and staff feedback.

RMC believes that its service can add value to a school district by helping to intensify and deepen professional development services. Through RMC's work under the NCRFTA and NRTAC, as well as with the New England Comprehensive Center, the New York Comprehensive Center, and the Great Lakes East, the Northwest and the Southwest Comprehensive Centers, RMC staff have demonstrated that they have a depth of knowledge and experience in helping low performing, high poverty schools increase student literacy achievement. The accomplishments of Michigan SIG schools will be measured by their ability to meet stated performance expectations and RMC's proposed service can the school in meeting these standards and learning goals.

**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)

RMC has extensive experience working with state and federal education requirements. RMC provides technical assistance to state education agencies (SEA) as a major partner in a number of the US Department of Education (USDE) funded regional Comprehensive and Content Centers, which help SEAs develop the capacity to carry out current USDE reform initiatives. Of the 16 existing Regional Comprehensive Centers nationwide, RMC currently holds prime contracts for the New York Comprehensive Center and the New England Comprehensive Center and holds subcontracts in the Great Lakes East, Southwest, and Northwest regions.

The Comprehensive Centers are currently charged with providing frontline assistance to states in implementing the programs and requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), with a focus on assisting SEAs in developing and implementing the Statewide System of Support required in ESEA Title I, Section 1117, wherein the state creates structures that support improvement in an aligned state-district-school system aimed at raising student achievement.

Working under a contract from the U.S. Department of Education in 2004-05, RMC conducted a thorough analysis of the state reading standards and related state assessments of a sample of 20 states, including Michigan, to determine their alignment with the essential components of reading as described in the report of the National Reading Panel and as included in the No Child Left Behind Act. RMC worked with each selected state, including MDE, to determine the complete set of standards and assessments to be included in the review. RMC also trained a panel of national reading experts to conduct the review, analyzed the reviewers' ratings of each state's standards, and produced the final report of the analysis. The final report prepared by RMC can be read at <http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/other/reading/state-k3-reading.html>.

Through its technical assistance to SEAs and LEAs, RMC has worked closely with specific state standards, grade level expectations (GLEs), and state assessments. In its role as a partner in the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center (GLECC) providing support to specific MDE initiatives, RMC has developed a working knowledge of Michigan's state academic standards, including Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCEs), as well as Michigan High School Content Expectations (HSCEs), and Michigan's state assessments, including MEAP.

Through its work with MDE's High School Redesign initiative, RMC has participated in a formal crosswalk of the Michigan School Improvement Framework with the proposed high school redesign framework. Through this project RMC has also become familiar with the Michigan Merit Curriculum and the Michigan Merit Exam.

Although RMC has not yet worked under contract with specific Michigan schools or districts, it is very experienced with providing in-depth support and professional development based on a thorough understanding of state academic standards, grade level expectations, and related formative and summative assessments. RMC has helped schools and districts develop and implement improvement plans based on a fine alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessments in tune with state standards and all of the related specific state and federal requirements.

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)

Once a district has invested in an evidence-based program or successfully implemented a significant change initiative, the question of how to sustain practices that are working arises. Consequently, state and district leaders are looking for guidance in determining which aspects of programs and improvement initiatives are important to sustain, and how to successfully create and implement a sustainability plan. RMC recently led a national project funded by the U.S. Department of Education to examine the research and educational literature on sustaining implemented programs and interventions and developed an extensive set of tools, resources, trainings, and documents to help state and local leaders sustain their successful evidence-based reading programs. RMC will include the training and specific support on developing and implementing a sustainability plan for all schools and districts that they serve through the SIG grant opportunity.

RMC work has been guided by the following definition of sustainability: Sustainability is the ability of a staff to maintain the core beliefs and values it holds for its reading program (its reading culture) and use them to guide program adaptations over time while maintaining improved or enhanced outcomes (Century & Levy, 2002).

The concern that a majority of programs and interventions are not sustained after initial implementation is well-founded, considering that studies of educational programs show that sustaining results past the initial funding period cannot be taken for granted. For example, one longitudinal case study of sustainability in the Comprehensive School Reform Program showed that after three years, only five of the thirteen schools studied continued to implement their comprehensive school reform models with moderate to high levels of intensity (Datnow, 2005). Among the findings was the indication that many schools could not sustain their reform programs because they had done little practical planning for monitoring the progress of the program over time, nor had they planned for sustainability. In addition to the Datnow study, many findings have shown that it is primarily the strategies for dealing with change, coupled with an organization's capacity to implement the strategies effectively, that make the difference in sustaining a reform. (Fullan et al., 2001; Adelman & Taylor, 2003; Earl et al., 2003; Noell & Gansle, 2009).

RMC Research operated the Reading First Sustainability Project (2006-09) for three years to develop resources on sustaining evidence based reading programs and provide training and technical assistance. Resources from a comprehensive set of materials that take state and district leaders from basic concepts in sustainability and assessing readiness to planning to sustain to working outside program boundaries to create systems that institutionalize evidence based reading programs. Specifically, the project developed: (1) a series of Sustainability Briefs with eight editions; (2) sustainability self-assessment instruments at the state, district, school, and classroom levels; (3) a series of documents with 15 titles that illustrate key sustainability strategies in the self-assessments with examples from state and district work; (4) a workshop on local sustainability planning, with full materials and training, including an archived webinar of workshop use; and (5) facilitator guides that can be used to conduct an "advanced seminar" on sustainability at the state, district or school levels.

The resources developed by the Reading First Sustainability Project have been disseminated nationwide. Fifty school districts across the country participated in regional training sessions

conducted by RMC and developed local sustainability plans to continue the success of their local reading program. RMC has provided direct, onsite assistance to 22 SEAs to help them build capacity to support school districts in sustainability planning and to work with colleagues in other programs within the SEA to sustain evidence-based reading programs. Resources created through the project are on the U.S. Department of Education's website:

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/readingfirst/support/sustaining.html>.

When the evidence-based reading model supported by this RMC service is fully implemented, teachers will be using data to inform and provide high quality reading instruction tailored to individual student needs. They will be collaborating and consulting with each other regularly to plan and determine appropriate evidence-based reading practices. By focusing on the refinement of the coach's role to accomplish this task, the proposed service will support the skills of coaches as they increase teachers' ability to consistently make data-driven instructional decisions once coaching support is removed, thereby making it more likely that the new practices will remain.

Through the delivery of the support, teachers will expand their repertoire of instructional methodologies and learn ways to deliver the methods more effectively, while simultaneously building self-efficacy in these skills through participation in teacher learning communities. As their instructional effectiveness grows, capacity to sustain the activities occurs because there will be a like-minded and similarly trained group of teachers to support one another. In addition, the established procedures for on-going communication, collaboration, and peer coaching in support of increasing student reading achievement will be ingrained as the way reading is taught in that school. It is expected that schools implementing the practices taught in the model will be well equipped and on their way to sustaining the activities at the conclusion of RMC's support.

Nevertheless, adjusting to the inevitable turnover on a school staff is one of the on-going challenges in sustaining the new reading model, since a highly skilled group of teachers of reading will exist. The positions to which these highly skilled teachers are assigned do make a difference to a school's ability to sustain the new practices. Therefore, RMC staff will meet with district leaders to discuss district staffing policies, procedures and actions to ensure that trained staff remains in their positions. RMC staff will provide district leaders with tools to use as a guide when hiring and assigning building principals, coaches and teachers. The tools will help leaders identify individuals with belief systems similar to that of the school and/or district. District communication will take place both in person and via telephone, email, and/or webinar.

The proposed process for sustaining activities after the school is successfully implementing the new reading model includes:

- communicating with district leaders every other month to discuss the district's role in supporting the sustainability of the implementation of new practices;
- strengthening the district and school policies, procedures, and supports related to the personnel system that will support the model; and
- debriefing after the intervention to discuss next steps in sustaining the model.

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)

RMC is proposing the following three members of its Literacy Team as staff for the proposed literacy support service. If additional staff would be required, RMC would propose additional equally qualified members of that team.

Dr. Corinne Eisenhart, Research Associate - Dr. Eisenhart is a member of the National Reading Technical Assistance Center team. In this capacity she works for RMC Research Corporation, providing consultation and professional development in scientifically-based reading research, literacy instruction, and educational leadership to SEAs and Reading First school districts throughout the United States. Presently a member of the faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership at Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania, Dr. Eisenhart teaches graduate courses in curriculum, diversity, and school leadership, as well as supervising principal interns. Her present research focuses on leadership coaching and the impact of principal leadership on student reading achievement. Dr. Eisenhart was formerly an Early Childhood Advisor for the Pennsylvania Department of Education and State Director of Reading First.

Kristina Najera, Research Associate - Kristina Najera is a Research Associate at RMC Research Corporation in Arlington, VA. She brings expertise in literacy, preservice and inservice teacher training and professional development, and curriculum development. She is currently serving as a Technical Assistance Provider with the National Reading Technical Assistance Center (NRTAC), and in that role she provides professional development and technical assistance to principals, teachers, and district leaders. Additionally, she helps develop resources to support effective scientifically-based reading practices.

Ms. Najera served as an elementary school teacher and teacher leader for nine years. She worked as an educational consultant and literacy coach for an educational publisher in California where she provided professional development in reading, data-driven decision-making, and differentiated instruction. She is completing her doctorate at the University of Delaware and expects to graduate in 2010.

Sarah Sayko, Research Associate - Sarah Sayko is a Research Associate at RMC Research Corporation in Arlington, VA. Ms. Sayko brings expertise in early literacy, curriculum development, and teaching and teacher training. Ms. Sayko is currently serving as a Technical Assistance Provider with the National Reading Technical Assistance Center (NRTAC) assisting states with the implementation of their Reading First grants. Ms. Sayko was also a project member on the Reading First Sustainability Project. In this capacity, she assisted in the development of state and local resources to support sustaining evidence-based reading practices and facilitated local districts on the development of sustainability plans.

Prior to joining RMC, Ms. Sayko was a Reading First Coordinator in a Massachusetts school district, where she was responsible for program implementation and was a Reading First Coach, working directly with teachers to support implementation of evidence-based reading practices. She is a certified K-12 reading specialist and holds a M.Ed. in Reading from Lesley University.

Corinne E. Eisenhart, Ph.D.

Education Ph.D., Education-Curriculum and Instruction, (Focus: Early Childhood/Special Education),
University of Virginia May 1991
M.Ed., Early Childhood Education, Shippensburg University, Shippensburg, PA
Graduated with High Honors 1985
B.S., Elementary Education, Shippensburg State College, Shippensburg, PA
Graduated with Honors
Additional Courses (Administrative Certification) at Western Maryland College

Certifications

Professional Certificate: Instructional Level II, Pennsylvania
Areas of Certification: Elementary and Early Childhood Education
Pennsylvania Reading Specialist
Pennsylvania Elementary Principal Certification
Pennsylvania Supervisor of Elementary Education Certification
Pennsylvania Supervisor of Curriculum & Instruction Certification
Pennsylvania Superintendent's Letter of Eligibility
Maryland Advanced Professional Certification: Elementary-Middle School Principal/Supervisor
Maryland Superintendent Certification

Professional History:

2008 – Present *Research Associate, RMC Research Corporation, Arlington, VA*

Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania

Tenure-Track faculty appointment: Department of Educational Leadership, Special Education and Policy,
August 2008-present
Teach graduate-level courses in curriculum and leadership; Supervise principal interns; Serve on
university committees

Professional Development and Technical Assistance

Florida Center for Reading Research (FCRR); Eastern Regional Reading First Technical Assistance Center
(ERRFTAC); Florida State University, January 2006-September 2008
Provide consultation and technical assistance to State Departments of Education and Reading First
School Districts on early literacy, Scientifically-Based Reading Research, implementation of
Reading First
Professional Development (e.g., oral language development, differentiated instruction, data-based
decision making, leadership)
Develop early literacy training materials
Principal Module-Member of the Development and Writing Team

Educational Consultant: Scientifically-Based Learning Associates (Private Consulting)

Dover Area School District, Dover, Pennsylvania, 2008-present
Provide on-going professional development across the district to K-6 teachers, reading specialists, IST
teachers (literacy) and administrative team (instructional leadership)
Tuscarora Area School District, Mercersburg, PA, 2008-present
Provide on-going professional development to teachers, specialists, and principals (early literacy)
Eisenhower Elementary School, Gettysburg Area School District, 2006-present
Provide on-going professional development in early literacy for K-3 teachers, Reading Specialists,
Special Education teachers, and principals
Early Reading First Conference (Lancaster, PA), June 13, 2007
Provide professional development for Pre-K teachers and directors on scientifically-based reading
research and oral language development
Mt. Holly Elementary School, Carlisle Area School District, 2005-2006
Provide ongoing professional development in early literacy for K-2 teachers (Scientifically-based

Michigan Department of Education
2010-11 Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants
Preferred External Educational Services Provider Application

reading instruction, side-by-side coaching, analysis of data and instructional decision-making, book study

Success by Six, United Way of Cumberland County, January-April 2006

Provide consultation and facilitation for the Transition to Kindergarten Project

Steel Valley School District, Munhall, PA, January-April 2006

Evaluation of full-day Kindergarten Program

On-site Observations, Use of Time Analysis, Teacher Perception Survey, Interviews (Administration, Teachers, Instructional Aides, Parents), Review curriculum and assessment data

Provide a written report with specific recommendations to improve student achievement outcomes

Pennsylvania Department of Education, April-September 2005

Provide leadership for Pennsylvania's Reading First Program, including: implementation, technical assistance, professional development, and monitoring

Positions at the Pennsylvania Department of Education

Early Childhood Education Advisor, June 2000-December 2003

Lead position in Early Childhood Education for the Commonwealth of PA. Provided leadership for state Early Childhood Education initiatives, including: *Governor's Institutes for Early Childhood Educators, Read to Succeed, Empowerment Schools Improvement Plan Review Team, 3rd Grade Assessment Task Force, Online Course for Early Childhood Educators, Program Review Team for Elementary Education and Early Childhood Education at PA Colleges and Universities, PDE Early Childhood Model Sites, and "I Am Your Child" Program Design Team, Leadership Team: Mid-Atlantic Early Childhood Education Network, Early Learning Work, Reading First Grant Writing Team*

State Coordinator: Pennsylvania Reading First

Provided leadership for implementation, professional development, and technical assistance. Worked closely with Dr. Rita Bean and Dr. Naomi Zigmond (University of Pittsburgh) on the evaluation of Pennsylvania Reading First

Positions in Public Education

Elementary Principal: Carlisle Area School District, Mooreland Elementary School, June 1993-June 2000

Served approximately 320 students (including emotional support, neurological support, and kindergarten special needs classrooms)

Supervised 40 teachers and staff members

Mooreland Elementary School 5th Grade students received the highest PSSA scores in Pennsylvania in Reading (1999) and Mathematics (1998-1999)

Building Administrator/Head Teacher: Carlisle Area School District, North Dickinson Elementary School, June 1991-June 1993

Served approximately 200 students (including multi-age classrooms)

Developmental First Grade Teacher: Carlisle Area School District, Crestview and Hamilton Elementary Schools, 1984-1987

First Grade Teacher: Carlisle Area School District, Crestview Elementary School, 1976-1984

Kindergarten Teacher: Susquenita Area School District, Duncannon, PA, Susquenita Elementary School ("open classroom" learning environment), 1974-1976

Other Public Education

Curriculum Specialist: Capital Area Intermediate Unit, December 2003-May 2004

Provided professional development for area school districts in literacy, math, and science

Wrote online course on oral language development

Facilitated meetings for Reading Specialists

Positions in Higher Education

Adjunct Professor: Pennsylvania State University-Harrisburg, August – December 2005

Teach undergraduate course in early literacy

Assistant Professor (part time): Shippensburg University, August – December 2005

Supervise student teachers (Early Childhood)

Michigan Department of Education

2010-11 Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

Preferred External Educational Services Provider Application

Doctoral Student Positions: University of Virginia, 1987-1990

Student Researcher (Dissertation) “Mothers and their Young Children with Cerebral Palsy during Interactive Play: A Substantive Theory,” funded by: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (\$12,970)

Graduate Research Assistant Project Manager for Elizabeth Hrnrcir, Ph.D., Play and Child Development Project, funded by The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (\$350,000)

Assistant Researcher for Robert Pianta, Ph.D., Appalachia Educational Laboratory Project: “Preparing Pre-Service Teachers to Teach Students At-Risk”

Student Researcher for Mary Catherine Ellwein, Ph.D. (Collected qualitative data on middle school boys and girls attending a camp for gifted students)

Co-Instructor with Elizabeth Hrnrcir, Ph.D., Graduate level course: “Development during Infancy”

Field Researcher - Play and Child Development Project, (Assessed young children throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia using the *Bayley Scales of Infant Development* and the *WISC-R*)

Education – Private Enterprise

Learning Sciences International, September 2004-May 2005

Early Childhood Advisor - Lead Content Expert

Responsible for development of the content outlines for the Early Literacy Online courses (funded by the PA Department of Education-Reading First)

Hired, trained, and supervised the content writing team

Wrote text documents to support the content of the online courses

A member of the “Think Tank” to grow new ideas

Publications

Eisenhart, C. & Eschenmann, D. (2004). *Help Your Child Get Ready for Mathematics: A Handbook for Parents of Children 3 to 6 Years-Old*. Elizabethtown, PA: Continental Press.

Eisenhart, C. & Wisner, K. (2003). Help Your Child Learn to Read: A Handbook for Parents of 5-7 Year-Olds. Elizabethtown, PA: Continental Press. (2005 Teachers’ Choice Award – Learning Magazine)

Eisenhart, C. (2002) *Read to Succeed: Strengthening Early Literacy in Pennsylvania*. PTA in Pennsylvania, 77(5), 25.

Hrnrcir, E.J. & Eisenhart, C. (1991). *Use with caution: The “at-risk” label*. Young Children, 46(2), 23-27.

Cooper, J. & Eisenhart, C. (1990). *The influence of the reform movement on early childhood teacher education programs*. In O.N. Saracho & B. Spodek (Eds.), Yearbook in Early Childhood Education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Selected Presentations and Trainings

03/2008 “The Wonder of Words” - vocabulary instruction (Long Island, NY)

03/2008 “Oral Language: Thinking Guided by Words” – 2 day event (Oregon Statewide Literacy Outreach)

01/2008 “Increasing the Intensity of Instruction Within the Reading Block” (Florida Focus Schools, numerous sites throughout Florida)

01/2008 “Independent Practice: Going from Accuracy to Fluency” (On-Going Professional Development, Catskill, New York)

01/2008 “Oral Language” (Pre-K to Grade 3 Literacy Leaders, Long Island, NY)

12/2007 “Oral Language” (presentation, classroom demonstrations, grade level meetings, Catskill, New York)

11/2007 “Oral Language Development: The Foundation for Literacy – A Leadership Perspective” (Delaware statewide training for principals)

11/2007 “The Process of Differentiating Instruction: Through the Lens of a Reading Coach” (Rhode Island statewide training)

10/2007 “Comprehension: Thinking Guided by Print” (Indiana State Reading Conference)

09/2007 “Oral Language: The Foundation for Literacy” (PreService Teachers – statewide training, Athens, GA)

09/2007 “Active Engagement” (Miami/Dade County, Florida)

08/2007 “Teaching ALL Children to Read: Seven Essential Instructional Practices” (Inservice Training,

Michigan Department of Education

2010-11 Section 1003(g) School Improvement Grants

Preferred External Educational Services Provider Application

- Gettysburg, PA)
- 08/2007 “The Reading Block: Making Sense of Centers” (Connecticut State Literacy Conference, Cromwell, CT)
- 07/2007 “Enhancing the Development of Oral Language in Kindergarten and First Grade through Systematic and Explicit Instruction” (National Reading First Conference, St. Louis, Missouri)
- 06/2007 “Building a Foundation for Learning: Kindergarten Literacy” (Regional Training, Syracuse, New York)
- 06/2007 “Comprehension: Knowledge to Practice” (Virginia Reading First Institute, Staunton, Virginia)
- 06/2007 “Connections-Paving the Way for Children” (Keynote Speaker – Early Reading First Conference, Lancaster, Pennsylvania)
- 05/2007 “Fluency: Knowledge to Practice” (State Literacy Leaders, Trenton, New Jersey)
- 05/2007 “Differentiated Professional Development: Supporting Professional Growth for ALL Teachers” (National Reading First State Directors Meeting, Chicago, IL)
- 04/2007 “The Process of Differentiating Instruction: I Do-We Do-You-Do” (statewide literacy conference, Providence, Rhode Island)
- 04/2007 “Teaching ALL Children to Read: Leadership in Mississippi Reading First Schools” (Principals and District Administrators, Jackson, Mississippi)
- 04/2007 “Working Together to Meet the Learning Needs of ALL Children” (Maine Reading First training)
- 02/2007 “Intervention: Using Data to Plan Instruction for Struggling Readers” (Gettysburg PA Area School District, K-3 teachers and administrators)
- 02/2007 “Using DIBELS Data to Differentiate Instruction” (Carlisle PA Area School District K-3 teachers)
- 02/2007 “Instruction to Meet the Learning Needs of Each Child: A Leadership Perspective” (Mississippi Reading First principals)
- 12/2006 “Components of Systematic and Explicit Oral Language Instruction in Kindergarten and First Grade” (Arizona Reading First State Conference)
- 11/2006 “Working Together to Meet the Needs of All Students” (North Carolina Reading First Coaches)
- 09/2006 “Differentiating Teacher Instruction” (Reading Teachers, Reading Coaches, and Principals – St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands)
- 08/2006 “The Continuum of Instruction in Kindergarten and First Grade: Differentiated Instruction and Reading Centers” (New York State Reading First Conference)
- 07/2006 “Components of Systematic and Explicit Oral Language Instruction in Kindergarten and First Grade” (Reading First National Conference, Reno, NV)
- 06/2006 Program Specific Professional Development: Effective Use of the Houghton-Mifflin Core Reading Program Training (Kindergarten Teachers of the Miami-Dade School District)
- 06/2005 “Reading First Early Literacy Online Courses: A New Perspective on Professional Development” (KSRA Leadership Meeting, State College, PA)
- 11/2004 “Raising Student Achievement through Literacy Coaching” (Full day Pre-Conference Institute - PA Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Conference)
- 10/2004 “It’s NOT Either/Or – It’s BOTH: Scientifically-Based Reading Research as the Foundation of a Comprehensive Literacy Framework” (Keystone State Reading Conference, Seven Springs, PA)
- 10/2004 “School Improvement Through Literacy Coaching” (Keystone State Reading Conference)
- 10/2004 “Reading, “Riting and “Rithmetic: What’s Happened to the Third “R” in Early Childhood Classrooms” (Keynote Speaker at Early Childhood Conference, Jersey Shore, PA)
- 08/2004 “Teaching ALL Children to Read” (Workshop-Cumberland Valley School District)
- 06/2004 “Building a Literacy Toolkit” (Workshop-Intermediate Unit 15)
- 05/2004 “It’s NOT Either/Or – It’s BOTH: Scientifically-Based Reading Research as the Foundation of a Comprehensive Literacy Framework (International Reading Association Convention, Reno, NV)

Kristina M. Najera

Areas of expertise

- Developmental Literacy Pre-K-12
- Teacher Training
- Curriculum and Instruction

Education

PhD, Education, Literacy Specialization, University of Delaware, Newark, DE
(expected graduation May 2010)

M.A., Education, Literacy Specialization, University of Delaware, Newark,
DE

M.Ed., Early Childhood Education, Towson University, Towson, MD

B.S., Elementary Education, University of Delaware, Newark, DE

Certification

Elementary Teacher, Pre-K-6, Maryland and Connecticut

Professional history

2009-Present	Research Associate, RMC Research Corporation, Arlington, VA
2007-2008	Instructor, University of Delaware, Newark, DE
2005-2007	Teaching Assistant, University of Delaware, Newark, DE
2001-2005	Educational Consultant and Literacy Coach, Houghton Mifflin Publishing Co., San Diego, CA
1998-2000	Research Assistant, University of Delaware, Newark, DE
1989-1998	Elementary Teacher, Cecil County Public Schools, Maryland; New Canaan Public Schools, Connecticut

Professional experience

Technical Assistance and Teacher Training

Currently working as a Technical Assistance Provider with the National Reading Technical Assistance Center assisting states in the implementation of Reading First grants. Duties include providing consultation and professional development in scientifically-based reading research and instruction, assessment and data utilization, intervention for struggling readers, coaching training, and sustainability.

Provided professional development training and literacy coaching to staff in Indiana and California schools in need of improvement in literacy based on identified need.

Provided resources and training to schools on scientifically-based reading research and evidence-based practices as literacy coach and educational consultant. Coached classroom teachers on the implementation of core and supplemental approaches for K-3 reading and the use of data from valid and reliable assessments as the basis for instructional decision making. Assisted in the analysis of school-wide literacy strengths and weaknesses and formulated plans to improve student achievement in reading and teaching effectiveness. Provided professional development to staff on the five components of reading.

Conducted presentations: “Graduate students as researchers” – Study group at National Reading Conference 2006-2008; “The effects of an electronic concept mapping tool on fifth grade students’ writing” – International Reading Association 2008; Graduate Student Research Forum 2007; “The writing process and the six traits of writing” – California Reading Association, 2004; “Phonemic Awareness and Phonics” – California Principal’s Meeting, 2001.

Instructional Experience

University Instructor—“Beginning Literacy Instruction” 2008; 2006-2007; “Teaching Reading and Writing in the Elementary School” 2007-2008; Children’s Literature (graduate course) Summer 2008

Elementary Teacher—1989-1998. Taught whole and small group lessons in all content areas in grades K, 2, and 6. Member of Kindergarten curriculum committee and math curriculum committee. Member of School Improvement Team. Field tested assessment system currently in use in Maryland—Work Sampling System. Wrote kindergarten writing/spelling guide for parents.

Research and Evaluation

Conducted a research study with two professors—“The effects of an electronic concept mapping tool on fifth grade students’ writing 2007. Wrote the literature review. Created lesson plans and delivered instruction. Collected and analyzed the data. Wrote executive summary.

Conducted a survey on elementary and middle school teachers' knowledge, beliefs and practices 2007. Wrote the literature review. Collected and analyzed data. Provided recommendations for differentiated professional development to the school district.

Conducted a survey and an analysis of International Reading Association's *ReadWriteThink* website. Provided recommendations for redesign of website based on survey results and analysis 2007.

Evaluated proposals submitted to National Reading Conference for paper sessions, poster sessions, and round table discussions 2007.

Conducted a study to complete dissertation requirements—"An Exploration of Students' Cognitive Processes: Strategies Sixth Grade Students Use to Write Essays Using an Electronic Concept Mapping Tool" 2008-2009. Wrote and defended proposal. Conducted interviews, observations, and think-aloud protocols. Collected data. Currently transcribing and analyzing data.

Training

Delaware Writing Project 1999
Houghton Mifflin Reading, Math, Science, Social Studies, Technology-2001-2005
Adult Literacy Project—transcribing data 2007

Professional Affiliations

International Reading Association
National Reading Conference
American Education Research Association
National Association for the Education of Young Children

Sarah G. Sayko

Areas of expertise

- Developmental Literacy K-12
- Teacher Training
- Curriculum and Instruction

Education

M.Ed., Reading, Lesley University, Cambridge, MA
B.A., English Literature and Elementary Education, Wheaton College,
Norton, MA

Certification

Reading Specialist K-12, State of Massachusetts

Professional history

2006-Present	Research Associate, RMC Research Corporation, Arlington, VA.
2005-2006	Reading First Coordinator, Gill-Montague Regional School District, Turners Falls, MA.
1999-2005	Literacy Specialist, Needham Public Schools, Needham, MA.
2005-2006	Supervising Practitioner, Hampshire Educational Collaborative Initial Licensure Program: Reading Specialist. Turners Falls, MA.
2002-2003	Consultant, Brown Publishing Network, Inc., Wellesley, MA.
1997-1999	Project Assistant, The Center for Reading Recovery, Lesley University, Cambridge, MA.

Professional experience

Technical Assistance and Teacher Training

Currently working as a Technical Assistance Provider with the National Reading Technical Assistance Center assisting states in the implementation of Reading First grants. Duties include providing consultation and professional development in scientifically-based reading research and instruction, assessment and data utilization, intervention for struggling readers, and sustainability.

Conducted state technical assistance visits to assist states in determining capacity to sustain Reading First. Served as a facilitator for local districts as they developed sustainability plans.

Served as the ELA specialist for a school under improvement review in Indiana. Identified responsive strategies and resources for literacy. Provided follow up professional development training to staff in literacy based on identified need.

Provided resources and training to school staff on scientifically-based reading research and evidence-based practices as the Reading First Coordinator and Reading First Reading Coach. Coached classroom teachers on the implementation of core, supplemental and intensive intervention approaches for K-3 reading and the use of data from valid and reliable assessments as the basis for instructional decision making. Assisted in the analysis of school-wide literacy strengths and weaknesses and formulated plans to improve student achievement in reading and teaching effectiveness. Provided professional development to staff on the five components of reading.

Instructional Experience

Administered literacy assessments, developed remediation plans, and implemented instruction as a Literacy Specialist. Conducted one-to-one, small group and whole-class literacy lessons with students. Developed and modeled literacy lessons for classroom teachers and collaborated and consulted with classroom teachers, special educators, and teaching assistants. Researched and gathered literacy materials and resources for teachers, and provided literacy professional development training for elementary staff.

Research and Evaluation

Served as Principal Investigator for a research synthesis on *Successful High Implementing Reading First Schools*.

Synthesized research on school reform sustainability and was principle author of a literature review and annotated bibliography for the Reading First sustainability project. Assisted in designing a sustainability framework, evaluation tools, and resources for state and local education agencies.

Researched and recommended appropriate literature for a core reading program grades K-3 and evaluated literature for key teaching components as a Consultant for a publishing company.

Assisted in the preparation of the professional books *Matching Books to Readers*, *Guiding Readers and Writers in the Intermediate Grades*, and *Word Matters* by Irene Fountas & Gay Sue Pinnell. Aided in leveling books according to Fountas and Pinnell guidelines, coordinated logistics and worked at the 1997 and 1998 Northeast Reading Recovery Conferences.

Training

Project Read – Phonology
Project Read – Written Expression
Foundations – Wilson Language Basics for K-3

Professional Affiliations

International Reading Association
National Reading Conference

References

- Adelman, H. S. & Taylor, L. (2003). On sustainability of project innovations as systemic change. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 14, (1), 1-25.
- Century, J. R. & Levy, A. J. (2002). Sustaining your reform: Five lessons from research. *Benchmarks: The Quarterly Newsletter of the National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform*, 3(3), 1-7.
- Datnow, A. (2005). The sustainability of comprehensive school reform models in changing district and state contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41, (1), 121-153. Retrieved from <http://eag.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/41/1/121>.
- Earl, L., Watson, N., & Katz, S. (2003). Large-scale education reform: Life cycles and implications for sustainability. Reading: The Centre for British Teachers (CfBT).
- Fixsen, D.L., Naoom, S.F., Blase, K.A., Friedman, R.M. & Wallace, F. (2005). Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, The National Implementation Research Network (FMHI Publication #231).
http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~nirn/resources/publications/Monograph/pdf/Monograph_full.pdf
- Fullan, M., Rolheiser, C., Mascal, B., & Edge, K. (2001). Accomplishing large scale reform: A tri-level proposition. *Journal of Educational Change*.
- Gersten, R., Compton, D., Connor, C.M., Dimino, J., Santora, L., Linan-Thompson, S., and Tilly, W.D. (2008). *Assisting students struggling with reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and multi-tier intervention in the primary grades: A practice guide*. (NCEE 2009-4045). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides/>.
- Hamilon, L., Halversion, R., Jackson, S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J., & Wayman, J. (2009). *Using student achievement data to support instructional decision making* (NCEE 2009-4067). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides/>.
- Heller, R., and Greenleaf, C. (2007). *Literacy instruction in the content areas: Getting to the core of middle and high school improvement*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Lee, C.D., Spratley, A. (2010). *Reading in the disciplines: The challenges of adolescent literacy*. New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation of New York.
- National Institutes of Health. (2000). Report of the National Reading Panel. *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and*

its implications for reading instruction. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/nrp/smallbook.htm>.

Noell, G. & Gansle, K. (2009). Moving from good ideas in educational systems change to sustainable program implementation: Coming to terms with some of the realities. *Psychology in Schools*, 46, (1), 78-88.

Shanahan, T., and Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content-area literacy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78, 1, 40-59.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Services. (2005). *Analysis of state k-3 reading standards and assessments*. Washington, DC: Author.

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.

Business License

STATE OF MARYLAND
Department of Assessments and Taxation

I, PAUL B. ANDERSON OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF ASSESSMENTS AND TAXATION OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE DEPARTMENT, BY LAWS OF THE STATE, IS THE CUSTODIAN OF THE RECORDS OF THIS STATE RELATING TO THE FORFEITURE OR SUSPENSION OF CORPORATIONS, OR OF CORPORATIONS TO TRANSACT BUSINESS IN THIS STATE AND THAT I AM THE PROPER OFFICER TO EXECUTE THIS CERTIFICATE.

I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT RMC RESEARCH CORPORATION IS A CORPORATION DULY INCORPORATED AND EXISTING UNDER AND BY VIRTUE OF THE LAWS OF MARYLAND AND THE CORPORATION HAS FILED ALL ANNUAL REPORTS REQUIRED, HAS NO OUTSTANDING LATE FILING PENALTIES ON THOSE REPORTS, AND HAS A RESIDENT AGENT. THEREFORE, THE CORPORATION IS AT THE TIME OF THIS CERTIFICATE IN GOOD STANDING WITH THIS DEPARTMENT AND DULY AUTHORIZED TO EXERCISE ALL THE POWERS RECITED IN ITS CHARTER OR CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION, AND TO TRANSACT BUSINESS IN MARYLAND.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I HAVE HEREUNTO SUBSCRIBED MY SIGNATURE AND AFFIXED THE SEAL OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF ASSESSMENTS AND TAXATION OF MARYLAND AT BALTIMORE ON THIS NOVEMBER 15, 2006.

RECEIVED
SECRETARY OF STATE
2006 NOV 30 AM 11:41

Paul B. Anderson
Paul B. Anderson
Charter Division



301 West Preston Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201
Telephone Balt. Metro (410) 767-1344 / Outside Balt. Metro (888) 246-5941
MRS (Maryland Relay Service) (800) 725-2258 TTY/Voice
Fax (410) 333-7097

Certificate of Insurance

Client#: 35303

RMCRE1

ACORD™ CERTIFICATE OF LIABILITY INSURANCE		DATE (MM/DD/YYYY) 9/25/09
PRODUCER Chittenden Insurance Group 501 Islington Street 3rd Floor Portsmouth, NH 03801 603 436-1555	THIS CERTIFICATE IS ISSUED AS A MATTER OF INFORMATION ONLY AND CONFERS NO RIGHTS UPON THE CERTIFICATE HOLDER. THIS CERTIFICATE DOES NOT AMEND, EXTEND OR ALTER THE COVERAGE AFFORDED BY THE POLICIES BELOW.	
INSURED RMC Research Corp 1501 Wilson Blvd Suite 1250 Arlington, VA 22209	INSURERS AFFORDING COVERAGE INSURER A: Hartford Casualty Insurance Com INSURER B: Twin City Fire Insurance INSURER C: INSURER D: INSURER E:	NAIC #

COVERAGES
 THE POLICIES OF INSURANCE LISTED BELOW HAVE BEEN ISSUED TO THE INSURED NAMED ABOVE FOR THE POLICY PERIOD INDICATED, NOTWITHSTANDING ANY REQUIREMENT, TERM OR CONDITION OF ANY CONTRACT OR OTHER DOCUMENT WITH RESPECT TO WHICH THIS CERTIFICATE MAY BE ISSUED OR MAY PERTAIN. THE INSURANCE AFFORDED BY THE POLICIES DESCRIBED HEREIN IS SUBJECT TO ALL THE TERMS, EXCLUSIONS AND CONDITIONS OF SUCH POLICIES. AGGREGATE LIMITS SHOWN MAY HAVE BEEN REDUCED BY PAID CLAIMS.

INSR LTR	ADD'L INSR	TYPE OF INSURANCE	POLICY NUMBER	POLICY EFFECTIVE DATE (MM/DD/YY)	POLICY EXPIRATION DATE (MM/DD/YY)	LIMITS
A		GENERAL LIABILITY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> COMMERCIAL GENERAL LIABILITY <input type="checkbox"/> CLAIMS MADE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OCCUR GEN'L AGGREGATE LIMIT APPLIES PER: <input type="checkbox"/> POLICY <input type="checkbox"/> PRO-JECT <input type="checkbox"/> LOC	04UUNLZ6020	07/01/09	07/01/10	EACH OCCURRENCE \$1,000,000 DAMAGE TO RENTED PREMISES (Ea occurrence) \$300,000 MED EXP (Any one person) \$10,000 PERSONAL & ADV INJURY \$1,000,000 GENERAL AGGREGATE \$2,000,000 PRODUCTS - COM/PROP AGG \$2,000,000
B		AUTOMOBILE LIABILITY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ANY AUTO <input type="checkbox"/> ALL OWNED AUTOS <input type="checkbox"/> SCHEDULED AUTOS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HIRED AUTOS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NON-OWNED AUTOS	04UECUY2799	01/03/09	01/03/10	COMBINED SINGLE LIMIT (Ea accident) \$1,000,000 BODILY INJURY (Per person) \$ BODILY INJURY (Per accident) \$ PROPERTY DAMAGE (Per accident) \$ AUTO ONLY - EA ACCIDENT \$ OTHER THAN EA ACC \$ AUTO ONLY: AGG \$
		GARAGE LIABILITY <input type="checkbox"/> ANY AUTO				AUTO ONLY - EA ACCIDENT \$ OTHER THAN EA ACC \$ AUTO ONLY: AGG \$
A		EXCESS/UMBRELLA LIABILITY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OCCUR <input type="checkbox"/> CLAIMS MADE <input type="checkbox"/> DEDUCTIBLE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RETENTION \$ 10000	04RHURQ3705	07/01/09	07/01/10	EACH OCCURRENCE \$5,000,000 AGGREGATE \$5,000,000 \$ \$ \$
B		WORKERS COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ANY PROPRIETOR/PARTNER/EXECUTIVE OFFICER/MEMBER EXCLUDED? If yes, describe under SPECIAL PROVISIONS below OTHER	04WBJR8225 NO	07/01/09	07/01/10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WC STATU-TORY LIMITS <input type="checkbox"/> OTH-ER E L EACH ACCIDENT \$500,000 E L DISEASE - EA EMPLOYEE \$500,000 E L DISEASE - POLICY LIMIT \$500,000

DESCRIPTION OF OPERATIONS / LOCATIONS / VEHICLES / EXCLUSIONS ADDED BY ENDORSEMENT / SPECIAL PROVISIONS

CERTIFICATE HOLDER Ohio Department of Education 4200 Surface Road Columbus, OH 43228	CANCELLATION 10 Days for Non-Payment SHOULD ANY OF THE ABOVE DESCRIBED POLICIES BE CANCELLED BEFORE THE EXPIRATION DATE THEREOF, THE ISSUING INSURER WILL ENDEAVOR TO MAIL <u>30</u> DAYS WRITTEN NOTICE TO THE CERTIFICATE HOLDER NAMED TO THE LEFT, BUT FAILURE TO DO SO SHALL IMPOSE NO OBLIGATION OR LIABILITY OF ANY KIND UPON THE INSURER, ITS AGENTS OR REPRESENTATIVES. AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE <i>Donna L. Walsh</i>
--	---

IMPORTANT

If the certificate holder is an ADDITIONAL INSURED, the policy(ies) must be endorsed. A statement on this certificate does not confer rights to the certificate holder in lieu of such endorsement(s).

If SUBROGATION IS WAIVED, subject to the terms and conditions of the policy, certain policies may require an endorsement. A statement on this certificate does not confer rights to the certificate holder in lieu of such endorsement(s).

DISCLAIMER

The Certificate of Insurance on the reverse side of this form does not constitute a contract between the issuing insurer(s), authorized representative or producer, and the certificate holder, nor does it affirmatively or negatively amend, extend or alter the coverage afforded by the policies listed thereon.