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.
The Application is divided into four sections.

Section A contains basic provider information.

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Federal EIN, Tax ID or Social Security Number</th>
<th>2. Legal Name of Entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Control for Southern Regional Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Southern Regional Education Board High Schools That Work/Making Middle Grades Work

4. **Entity Type:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□</th>
<th>For-profit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Check the category that best describes your entity:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□</th>
<th>Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Community-Based Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Educational Service Agency (e.g., RESA or ISD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Institution of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Other (specify): Non-profit compact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Applicant Contact Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Contact</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gene Bottoms</td>
<td>404-875-9211</td>
<td>404-872-1477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>592 Tenth Street NW</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>30318-5790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Contact</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary Bredahl</td>
<td>517-381-9576</td>
<td>517-381-9576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>585 Aquila Drive</td>
<td>East Lansing</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>48823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

8. **Service Area**

List the intermediate school district and each individual district in which you agree to provide services. Enter “Statewide” ONLY if you agree to provide services to any district in the State of Michigan.

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

Explain 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.
DESCRIPTION OF COMPREHENSIVE IMPROVEMENT SERVICES
SUPPORT SYSTEMS TO ENSURE AND SUSTAIN STUDENT AND TEACHER SUCCESS.
SREB’s High Schools That Work (HSTW) and Making Middle Grades Work (MMGW) is the
nation’s first large-scale effort to engage state, district and school leaders in
partnerships with teachers, students, parents and the community to raise student
achievement at middle grades schools and high schools. It is based on the simple
belief that most students become “smarter” through effort and hard work and
implementation of 10 Key Practices: implementation of ten Key Practices: HIGH EXPECTATIONS for student learning and EXTRA HELP for students,
rigorous and relevant ACADEMIC STUDIES, quality CAREER TECHNICAL Studies, career
focused PROGRAM OF STUDIES, purposeful WORK BASED LEARNING, GUIDANCE AND ADVISEMENT
for all students, TEACHERS WORKING TOGETHER to improve teaching and learning, STUDENT
ENGAGEMENT in challenging assignments, and USING DATA FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT.
School leaders and teachers motivate students to achieve at high levels when they:
· Expand student opportunities to learn a rigorous academic core that is taught in
ways that enable students to see the usefulness of what they are asked to learn.
· Create supportive relationships between students and adults including providing
students with the extra help needed to meet challenging course standards and with the
support to make successful transitions from the middle grades to high school and from
high school to postsecondary studies and careers.
· Work as teacher advisers with parents and students to set goals and to help students
select the right courses that prepare them for postsecondary studies and careers.
· Focus school leadership on supporting what and how teachers teach by providing
common planning time and professional development aligned with school improvement
plans.

CONTENT AND DELIVERY SYSTEMS AND MECHANISMS
High Schools That Work (HSTW) has spent 25 years developing and refining a
comprehensive school improvement model that, when implemented with fidelity, is
associated with increased achievement for all groups of students, decreased
achievement gaps between student groups, increased graduation rates, and improved
college- and career-readiness. HSTW has engaged in continuous research and data
analysis to identify and gauge the efficacy of school and classroom practices that
advance student achievement. This research shows that when high schools join rigorous
academic and quality career/technical programs into a focused program of study in a
school context of high expectations and student support with engaging instruction, it
results in closing achievement gaps to college readiness standards for all groups of
students and increases graduation rates.
The HSTW/MMGW school reform components:
1) On-site support from an experienced, professional School Improvement Specialist to
assist the school implement all elements of the 10 Key Practices:
2) Technical Assistance through a comprehensive audit of school classroom practices
that includes classroom observations, stakeholder interviews, document reviews and data analysis;

3) A professional development plan designed to build leadership and high expectations culture-building capacity of school leaders, engage faculty in school improvement planning and implementation, and improve the depth of content knowledge and instructional delivery of teachers;

4) High quality publications, resources and training materials;

5) Access to a national network of schools that use the HSTW/MMGW design through the HSTW Annual Staff Development Conference, HSTW National Workshops and site visits to network schools. The SREB HSTW/MMGW support plan is founded on the principle that student achievement improves when the adults change school and classroom practices in a manner that causes students to put forth greater effort to learn. A team of HSTW consultants and national experts will provide intensive support to assist schools in a comprehensive redesign of school and classroom practices. HSTW will support schools in developing school and teacher leaders; aligning curriculum, instruction and assessments to increase rigor; and involving the entire school community in developing a high-performance learning culture.

6) A biennial NAEP-linked Assessment and Student and Teacher Survey that ties achievement to experiences. Student achievement data is correlated to the extent students report experiencing effective practices; thus providing school improvement data directly linked to student experiences. (Assessed in January-February in even calendar years only) A comprehensive report

Schools use the 10 Key Practices as a framework to:

• Provide a strong academic core of studies aligned at the high school to college- and career-readiness and at the middle school to high school readiness levels.

• All adults reflect high expectations for all students to achieve at the proficient or advanced level in a standards-based, grade-level curriculum.

• Provide students who need it extra help and support to meet high expectations and to close achievement and opportunity gaps.

• Implement research-based and engaging instruction throughout the school that connects what is being learned to students’ personal and future career interests while motivating them to continue their education beyond high school.

• Implement practices that support teachers working together to develop their capacity to plan and deliver a high-quality instructional program that meets grade- and course-level expectations and prepares students for the next level.

• Ensure student access to quality Career/Technical opportunities that meet community and employer needs and build technical skill and academic attainment.

• Connect work-based learning to a student’s program of study to connect the relevance of academic content to workplace expectations, skills and behaviors.

• Provide all students guidance services that support their efforts to be successful, demonstrate the support of a caring adult who advises them on the courses and experiences they need in high school to be ready for college or a career.

• The leadership of the school create and share a vision of a school that prepares students for life after high school and build a school culture of continuous
improvement that is supported by teachers and stakeholders.

- Work as advisers with parents and students to set goals and to help students take the right courses that prepare them for postsecondary studies and careers.
- Strengthen transitions between school levels.

Focus school leadership on supporting what and how teachers teach by providing common planning time and professional development aligned with school improvement plans.

In this environment, more students will recognize that school matters to their future and more students able to set future educational and career goals and choose which courses to take to achieve those goals.

**JOB EMBEDDED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

SREB uses both formative and summative measures to evaluate what is working in schools and what needs to work better, and uses data to identify research-based actions and action steps to address those needs. Having worked in so many schools, we find similarities among low-performing schools and are prepared to make recommendations for action after initial data is collected and studied.

SREB follows these practices as part of our quality assurance process:

- Provide experienced trainers who use adult learning strategies to prepare school teams — school and teacher leaders — and the whole school to implement major agreed upon interventions.
- Assign an experienced coach to work with school leaders and the district and state to (1) support the school in implementing content and practices received from the training, (2) develop master teachers at the school to train other teachers, and (3) recognize when major interventions are being effectively implemented.
- Support school leaders and the school leadership team in identifying and implementing major interventions.
- Arrange a time to conference with the district facilitator on each school visit. Determine support the principal needs to enable the school to succeed in implementing the major interventions and communicate that to the district.
- Provide assistance to help school leaders and the district facilitator anticipate changes in school and classroom practices as new strategies are put in place and teacher capacity is increased.
- Assist each school in developing, planning and implementing professional learning targeted to specific interventions each year to meet emerging school needs.
- Provide feedback to the school and district on specific actions and support that are needed to stay on schedule in implementing the major interventions with fidelity.
- Work with school leaders to select the right staff to participate in training around major interventions and to implement the interventions with fidelity.
- Assist schools in connecting student achievement data to school and classroom practices and in using the data to engage teams of faculty in creating school and classroom experiences that are predictive of higher student achievement.

**COMPREHENSIVE SHORT CYCLE AND SUMMATIVE SYSTEMS**
HSTW Effectiveness on Student achievement in reading and/or mathematics: Schools that become part of the High Schools That Work network are expected to show progress in changing school and classroom practices in ways that raise student achievement. In doing so, these schools focus on practices that have proven effective in advancing student achievement. Schools that implement the HSTW design improve academic achievement of all groups of students and improve other non-academic indicators as well.

The biennial HSTW Assessment has been the tool used to assess changes in school achievement levels since its first administration in 1988. This assessment was developed in partnership with ETS and a panel of researchers and educators; it provides comprehensive school-level data that correlates students’ achievement in three NAEP-referenced subject tests (reading, mathematics and science) with their perceptions of school and classroom experiences through the associated student survey. A related survey collects teacher perceptions of school and classroom practices. Because these assessments include both subject tests and surveys, SREB is able to tie student achievement data to the degree to which schools are make changes in school and classroom practices. These data have revealed that student perceptions of their experiences are predictive of student achievement. Similarly, faculty perceptions of school leadership and understanding of improvement efforts are predictive of the effectiveness of improvement efforts. By linking students’ perceptions to achievement, HSTW/MMGW provides schools with data to drive decision-making and improvement plans to implement these practices more deeply.

Schools with “High Implementation” designations hold high expectations for all students, utilize relevant and engaging instructional techniques, emphasize literacy across the curriculum, enroll students in rigorous academic and career/technical (CT) courses, and provide quality extra help and guidance services. High implementation schools had greater percentages of all and minority students, male and female, meeting college and career readiness goals on the 2004, 2006 and 2008 HSTW Assessments. For example, in 2008, 22 more of every 100 students at high-implementation sites met the reading readiness goal, 22 more of every 100 minority students met the reading goal, 23 more male students and 20 more female students met the goals compared with students at low-implementation sites across the network.

Schools see strong gains in achievement when they implement the HSTW/MMGW design with fidelity. Three comprehensive high schools in an urban Missouri district joined the HSTW network initially in the 2006-2007 school year and started receiving direct services from HSTW. With support from a HSTW Coach and an intense focus on improving literacy, each school experienced tremendous gains in the percentage of students who achieved at the proficient or above level on the 2009 Missouri End-of-Course Exam in English II. All three schools were much closer to the state average for All Missouri students in 2009 and Black students at all three schools surpassed the state average of the group in 2009. Students who receive Special Education services (IEP students) experienced dramatic improvements from 2008 to 2009.
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)

Schools see strong gains in achievement when they implement the HSTW/MMGW design with fidelity.

(See Table 1.)

Table 1: Increase in Percentage of Students Meeting HSTW Readiness Goals at High Implementation Sites Compared with Low Implementation Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>2004: 63,180 Students</th>
<th>2006: 61,815 Students</th>
<th>2008: 61,044 Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>+18</td>
<td>+16</td>
<td>+15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Students</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>+13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Students</td>
<td>+19</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>+16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Students</td>
<td>+18</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>+16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Special analysis of the 2004, 2006 and 2008 HSTW Assessments

Notes: 1. Implementation measurements changed somewhat over the three assessments.

2. New subject tests were administered in 2008, as a result, 2008 data are not directly comparable to previous years.

State assessment data also provides evidence of success with the design in longitudinal studies. Ohio approved HSTW as a framework for improvement for 69 high schools in 2001. In the first year of the initiative, 21 schools were in Academic Emergency and in danger of being taken over by the state. After using the HSTW framework for four years, none of the schools was in the lowest state report card level; the number of schools in the highest level, Excellent, tripled in the four-year period. These measures indicate improvement in academic achievement, student attendance and high school completion rates for all NCLB subgroups, indicating that the HSTW framework improves non-academic achievement as well as academic achievement. (See Table 2.)

Table 2. Ohio HSTW Schools and State Report Card Standing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Academic Emergency</th>
<th>Academic Warning</th>
<th>Continuous Improvement</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ohio Department of Education

Research base for the framework: Leaders from the Southeast approached SREB in late 1985 to develop a high school program that would help far more students meet college and career readiness standards. Initial and continuing research used to develop the framework includes:

As the framework has grown across the country, external research on the HSTW/MMGW framework has supported the positive impact the design has on student achievement. External Research includes:


HSTW uses data collected on its schools to produce research briefs, case studies, newsletters, site development guides, outstanding practices reports and readiness guides. The following publications represent some of the published research on the effectiveness of HSTW and are accessible on SREB’s Website: www.sreb.org

- Comprehensive School Reform: Making a Difference in Improving High Schools
- Doing What Works: Moving Together on High Standards for All Students
- Effects of High Schools That Work Practices on Student Achievement
- High School Experiences That Influence Reading Proficiency
- High School Reform Works – When Implemented: A Comparative Study of High- and Low-implementation Schools
- High Schools That Work Follow-up Study of 2002 High School Graduates: Implications for Improving Transitions from High School to College and Careers
- Leading School Improvement: What Research Says
- Preparing Middle Grades Students for High School Success: A Comparative Study of Most- and Least-Improved Middle Grades Schools
- Raising Achievement and Improving Graduation Rates: How Nine High Schools That Work Sites Are Doing It
- Ready for Tomorrow: Six Proven Ideas to Graduate and Prepare More Students for College and 21st-Century Careers
- Rigor, Relevance and Relationships Improve Achievement in Rural Schools: High School
Reform Works When Schools Do the Right Things

In October 2006, the Comprehensive School Reform Quality (CSRQ) Center of the American Institutes of Research (AIR) concluded that HSTW was built on a solid foundation that linked the model’s design to a research base for all of the model’s core components. The report found moderately strong evidence of services and support that enable schools to successfully implement the model. The report also recognized HSTW for its formal processes for establishing an initial understanding of the model at its sites, using informal strategies to develop faculty buy-in and using benchmarks for implementation. The CSRQ Center said that HSTW had very strong evidence of professional development and technical assistance for successful implementation.

(Comprehensive School Reform Quality Center of the American Institutes of Research. CSRQ Center Report on Middle and High School Comprehensive Reform Models. 2006.)

The American Youth Policy Forum and Pathways to College Network recognizes HSTW as a school improvement model designed to encourage students to complete a rigorous curriculum and high expectations. This report focusing on improving college preparation, access and success for underserved populations stated that the “goals and restructuring components of HSTW are well aligned to increase college access and address the college-going predictors regarding academic rigor and access to social networks and information.” Authors pointed out that HSTW serves students who previously were tracked in vocational and general education programs and for this reason, “its success is magnified for students of color and those from low-income families who are disproportionately enrolled in lower, non-college preparatory tracks.” (Martinez, M. and Klopott, K. “The Link between High School Reform and College Access and Success for Low-Income and Minority Youth.”)
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).

Implementation of the HSTW design is predicated on involvement of the entire staff in professional learning communities. The initial training by HSTW is a two-day Site Development Workshop (SDW) for the entire faculty led by the HSTW coach. The entire school staff is assigned in interdisciplinary groups of teachers with administrators, counselors and other staff spread out one per group. Each Key Practice (KP) of the design is discussed by the HSTW Coach along with network data that shows that the KP improves student achievement for all groups of students when implemented and discusses several actions schools can take to implement the Key Practices. Table groups then discuss how the KP can be implemented at their school; each group shares their ideas with the whole group. All ideas are collected. By the end of day two, teachers are assigned to PLCs that HSTW refers to as Focus Groups, to begin planning school improvement activities around improvement priorities that emerged during the SDW. The Focus Groups take all of the recommended ideas from the groups that address their priority and begin to form recommended actions for the school to take. Focus Groups reassemble to present major ideas to each other.

Focus Groups continue to meet throughout the year on a regular schedule, the school develops a communication plan to share the work with the entire school. An overall School Leadership Team takes the recommendations from the Focus Groups to design the School Improvement Plan. Many SREB publications are used as book studies and guides by Focus Groups. The HSTW coach will meet regularly with Focus Groups to support and extend their efforts.

SREB offers on-line subject area courses, site-based professional development and a range of National Workshops, Summer Institutes and an Annual Staff Development Conference that are all designed for teams. The HSTW coach will work with the schools to identify team members and to follow up to ensure implementation. See www.sreb.org for detailed descriptions.

In addition, HSTW provides a range of professional development activities for teachers and leaders, including site-specific professional development to help implement the HSTW/MMGW instructional design: developing a strong and rigorous academic curriculum, developing in-depth study in all content areas, embedding literacy and numeracy strategies across the curriculum, integrating academic course content and skills with career/technical education, redesigning the transition between middle grades and high school, aligning academic skills at grade level, and building school capacity to sustain the design and continuously improve the school. Instructional and pedagogical support for teachers in engaging students intellectually, socially, emotionally and behaviorally will be a primary objective for job-embedded professional development of all teachers. If the curriculum has not been aligned to state standards and readiness for the next level of education, training is provided to help district and school leaders create the alignment. Teachers are trained in developing units of instruction and daily lessons that are aligned to grade-level standards and incorporate literacy, numeracy and study skills. Professional development involves a multi-tiered approach with a focus determined by specific school needs. SREB has learned that Literacy is a key to student success.
and begins all transformation work with support to develop a literacy across the curriculum focus in all schools.

- Training for leaders (e.g., Leading a Literacy Across the Curriculum Focus)
- Training for teachers across the curriculum or in a specific content area (e.g., literacy focus team to develop a literacy plan for the school and teachers across the curriculum to integrate literacy strategies into lesson plans and assignments) - HSTW/MMGW emphasizes a job-embedded approach to training that occurs over time and incorporates small- and large-group training, modeling in classrooms, observing/critiquing teachers using new strategies and facilitation of professional learning community meetings focused on specific areas of growth.
- Coaching follow-up for focus teams (distributed leadership structure) to support schoolwide implementation of the content (e.g., implementation of literacy plan activities)
- Coaching support for the principal to model how to monitor implementation of new practices in classrooms (e.g., inclusion of literacy strategies in classroom instruction as observed in walkthroughs or described in lesson plans)
- Coaching support on the collection and analysis of relevant school data (e.g., number of writing assignments each student is asked to do and the frequency of writing in all classrooms)
- Coaching support to update the school improvement plan related to the activity (e.g., expand literacy training in year 2 to include career/technical and arts teachers)

Using workshops, coaching and job-embedded professional development, HSTW ensures that what is taught to college- and career-readiness standards by working with teachers to align the curriculum to standards. Specific focus is placed on ensuring alignment of the standard to the rigor of questioning in classrooms. HSTW provides training in rigor of questioning, instructional unit design, transition and catch-up courses, and the use of rubrics to strengthen the curriculum for every student. HSTW also uses effective guidance and advisement practices to create a college and career readiness culture. SREB offers training for district, school and teacher leaders who guide the professional development of teachers to improve school and classroom practices and advance student achievement. Based on SREB’s crosswalk of the SREB Leadership Curriculum Models, Critical Success Factors and Educational Leadership Policy Standards (ISLLC 2008), the training curriculum has been developed to build knowledge and skills in instructional leadership.
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)
HSTW follows a comprehensive and holistic process that provides effective planning at the district and school level to help collaboratively develop and fulfill schools’ and district missions and visions. SREB works with schools and districts throughout the country and, therefore, does not use specific templates for the school planning process. School improvement consultants work with schools to use required documents that states and districts have developed. However, the concept of using SMART (Strategic, Measurable, Attainable, Research-based and Time-bound) Goals focused on changing adult practices to increase student effort serve as the foundation for planning. As each school has a unique plan, specific dates and responsibilities cannot be listed. However, the plan proposed is based upon SREB experience that involves at least three years of support to make the changes required. The following occur as the initial activities in the first year of support.

1. Through an initial two-day Site Development Workshop for the entire faculty, a three day Technical Assistance Visit by an external team of educators and an in-depth review of the school’s data, HSTW assists teachers and leaders to take ownership of the school’s challenges – and to begin to take ownership of the solutions. The process includes a shift from just looking at achievement data to focusing on the adult practices and determining changes needed in those practices. As a result each school develops an intensive transformation plan including deliverables from HSTW, benchmarks for success and reviewables for ongoing monitoring of implementation.

2. District and school leaders work with HSTW to articulate state and district goals for the school. Discussions include what improvement efforts previously occurred, what is underway, what has failed to work, and what seems to be gaining results. Discussions cover curriculum, instruction, assessment, staffing, professional development and leadership. The needs of the school become clearer as problems and limitations are identified.

3. HSTW facilitates a shared understanding of the HSTW improvement design with district and school leaders, stating the non-negotiable strategies and actions needed to implement the design and the conditions a district should provide to support the principal and school staff through the improvement process. Needs of the school are put into the language of school improvement and components of the HSTW design.

Although each school will develop and implement a unique Transformation Plan focused on the gaps in the school, SREB has developed expertise in identifying the greatest challenges for low-performing students. In reviewing data over many years, we have learned that the following consistent problems are not sufficiently addressed in many schools. These lessons learned have led SREB to develop tools to address each and form the foundation for support for schools.

Many district and school leaders and teachers do not believe that many students can learn at college readiness levels. SREB surveys of teachers and leaders have found that little as 25 percent of the teachers in a school believe students can learn at college readiness levels.

Tools: SREB uses protocols and processes to assist districts and schools to set a clear mission to teach all students to college readiness standards; create an instructional system that will engage students to make the effort; create a culture where failure is not an option; and develop re-teaching opportunities aimed at
convincing students and parents that, with effort, students can learn at high levels. The transition between the middle grades and high school is weak. SREB has found that grade nine is a critical transition point. Low-performing students are at risk of dropping out of high school if they do not complete the middle grades with the literacy and mathematics skills they need to undertake college-preparatory classes. This concern is magnified by that lack of communication between the two levels of schooling.

Tools – SREB consultants will work with school and teacher leaders and district leadership to implement an acceleration program designed to identify students with the risk factors (poor attendance, poor behavior, failing English, failing mathematics) and implement tiered interventions to prepare them for college-preparatory courses in high school. PLC teams will be formed to design school wide, group and individual interventions for each at risk factor. HSTW coaches will work with school and district leaders to develop tools to improve the collaboration between the middle grades and high school.

Few schools have aligned their curriculum, teacher assignments and classroom assessment to high school college readiness standards. While teachers say their curriculum has been aligned to the state standards, SREB continues to find classroom learning activities, assessments, assignments and re-teaching are not aimed at getting students to college readiness standards.

Tools: Consultants assist teachers to develop catch-up programs and summer programs using SREB’s Getting Ready guides to help ensure student readiness for rigorous high school courses. Consultants assist teachers to move standards into the classroom using the SREB Unit Planning Template and work with teachers during common planning times to use protocols to develop challenging assignments. SREB also works schools to create a “failure is not an option” culture in which students are held to the readiness standards.

Many attempts to get students to apply what they are learning to the real world do not include proficient-level assignments and do not require students to attain greater depth of learning in the process. Teachers need help engaging low-performing students to learn academic content at levels that will allow them to meet college- and career-readiness standards.

Tools: Consultants and trainers provide all teachers with strategies to engage students intellectually, socially, emotionally and behaviorally in ways that get all students, especially low-performing ones, to put forth the effort to succeed. SREB also assists teachers to use protocols during common planning times to analyze the rigor of assignments and assessments and to review student work to determine if it meets standards.
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.
Many school leaders do not know how to lead a reform effort, and this leads to a failure to sustain many reforms. Leading change involves creating a culture in which teacher-leaders take ownership of the improvement effort and using professional learning communities to engage the entire faculty in making informed decisions. Tools: The SREB plan will engage teachers and leaders from the school and district in solving problems by using SREB’s leadership curriculum modules. These modules get teacher, school and district leaders to work together to learn effective leadership skills by solving problems at their school. Consultants work with school leadership to develop a continuous improvement framework of focus teams, including one for each of the priorities of the project along with one for literacy across the curriculum and one for standards-based grading practices.

Many teachers have classroom management concerns due to lack of adequate student engagement in the learning process and lack of strategic planning for instruction. Tools: SREB believes that teachers can best address classroom management by implementing proven instructional practices that engage students in learning. SREB works with districts and school and teacher leaders to engage students intellectually, behaviorally, emotionally and socially. Further, consultants work with leaders to use protocols to collect instructional data for decision-making and use the information to coach teachers to improve instruction.

Based upon the lessons learned in this work, HSTW works collaboratively with teacher, school and district leaders to develop plans to specifically meet the needs of the school. By recommending instructional strategies for specific content areas, interventions to close gaps and address transitions, support strategies across the curriculum (such as literacy), and school leader capacity-building training HSTW consultants will use these priority interventions to guide the work in each school:

1. Create a distributed leadership model of focus teams that engages all teachers and leaders in taking ownership of improvement efforts. Focus teams include teachers, school leaders, support staff, parents, community members and, in some cases, students, all focused on a specific area for growth in the school. In addition to developing plans for improvement, the teams also serve as a communication tool to engage everyone in the improvement effort.

2. Operate with an action plan, developed by the focus teams, that incorporates the school improvement strategies required by the state and district with the priority actions of HSTW/MMGW.

3. Align teacher assignments, student work and classroom assessment to grade-level and college- and career-readiness standards that emphasize depth of understanding.

4. Embed reading and writing strategies for learning in all courses to advance literacy and content achievement.

5. Use project-based learning to engage students in rigorous work in all content areas.

6. Create a “Failure Is Not an Option” focus in grades seven through ten by implementing effective grading practices that require students to redo work not meeting standards.
7. Support professional learning communities with common planning time to help teachers prepare to make greater use of authentic problems, project-based learning and other research-based strategies.

8. Provide leadership training for principals on classroom observation to monitor quality instruction, looking for intellectual, social, emotional and behavioral indicators of student success.

9. Provide leadership training for school leadership teams on the following topics: Creating a High-Performance Learning Culture, Assessing Academic Rigor to Ensure Grade-Level Proficiency and Using Root Cause Analysis to Reduce Student Failure.

10. Make a purposeful effort to improve transition into and out of the middle grades and high school by developing a data-based collaborative plan among sending and receiving schools, which addresses the academic, social, organizational and motivational needs of students during the transition.

11. Connect each student to an adult mentor/adviser for support.

12. Redesign the ninth grade using SREB’s redesign model that has been used to reduce failure rates.

13. Organize a large high school into career-themed small learning communities or academies.

14. Create programs of study and expect each student to select one, based on his or her interests, which increases both the rigor and relevance of the high school curriculum and boosts academic achievement and student motivation.

15. Provide an accelerated curriculum in the middle grades that includes the teaching of reading and the development of reading skills in all subjects; prepares students for college-preparatory English in high school; prepares all students to complete algebra no later than the ninth grade; and provides inquiry-based science that develops research and reasoning skills.

16. Redesign the sixth grade to monitor indicators of future dropouts and implement intervention strategies for students who have one or more recognized at-risk indicators.

17. Design Transitional Senior English and Mathematics courses for all students not demonstrating college and career readiness by the end of grade 11.
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)

SREB has 112 full-time staff members. Fifty-nine staff members work exclusively in school improvement. SREB uses a cadre of over 100 professional development providers located across the United States to facilitate workshops customized for the specific needs of each school. All members of the professional development cadre all have backgrounds checked as part of the selection process of SREB.

HSTW school improvement consultants are highly qualified and successful school, district and state leaders, most recruited from high implementation HSTW/MMGW sites. SREB maintains a Human Resources office which conducts searches for qualified applicants, conducts criminal background checks and publishes notifications of vacancies in trade journals. Due to the vast size of the HSTW/MMGW network, SREB receives over 100 resumes annually from current school leaders seeking employment.

SREB’s experienced coaches are experts in helping address critical challenges in student achievement and completion rates, providing professional development and implementing training with fidelity. SREB also has the unique ability to tap the nation’s largest network of schools engaged in continuous improvement using our proven framework of Key Practices, Goals and Conditions. We can help school leaders and teachers understand how schools with the same demographics have addressed their challenges and created a high-performance learning culture in which all students are expected to achieve grade-level standards.

Selection of school improvement staff includes the aforementioned background check, revue of the school’s (or district’s/state’s) progress under the leadership of the applicant, interview with an SREB Director, interviews with the applicants superiors and a final interview with the Senior Vice President. After successful completion of the process, the new hire is provided with a training plan that includes shadowing of veteran staff, participation in workshops and participation in a year-long series of webinars on topics key to the design.

The cadre of school improvement coaches is led by the Senior Vice President of SREB, James E. Bottoms. He is the founder of High Schools That Work (HSTW) and Making Middle Grades Work (MMGW). Bottoms also founded the Learning-Centered Leadership Program to improve the capacity of principals to lead improvement, which will be an integral part of the overall project support. Under his leadership, HSTW has grown to include 1,300 participating high schools in 30 states and the District of Columbia. Bottoms earned his bachelor’s, master’s and doctoral degrees from the University of Georgia. Bottoms has been a local teacher, principal and guidance counselor.

In addition, three directors at SREB will help oversee the efforts. Rhenida Rennie, Director of Contracted Services, Scott Warren, Director of State Initiatives, and Steve Broome, Director of State Services will collaborate to lead Transformation efforts across the country. Each is a former high school administrator and have combined for over twenty years of school improvement leadership experience. SREB will provide resumes on all leadership and each school improvement consultant for schools involved in Transformation.
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.

---

**LICENSEURE AND INSURANCE DOCUMENTS ARE ON FILE WITH MDE**