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

Electronic Application Process

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

davidsonk1@michigan.gov

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

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

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

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

Contact Information

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

Kristine Davidson  
Consultant  
Office of Education Improvement & Innovation  

OR  

Gloria Chapman  
Consultant  
Office of Education Improvement & Innovation

Telephone: (517) 335-4226  
Email: davidsonk1@michigan.gov
EXTERNAL PROVIDERS: BACKGROUND & APPROVAL PROCESS

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

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

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

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

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

Applications will only be reviewed if:

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

Applications will only be approved if:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplar</th>
<th>Total Points Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Description of comprehensive improvement services</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use of scientific educational research</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job embedded professional development</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Experience with state and federal requirements</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sustainability Plan</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Staff Qualifications</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points Possible</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

---
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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>203289870</td>
<td>The Achievement Network, LTD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The Achievement Network (ANet)

### 4. Entity Type: 5. Check the category that best describes your entity:

- [ ] For-profit
- [x] Non-profit
- [ ] Business
- [ ] Community-Based Organization
- [ ] Educational Service Agency (e.g., RESA or ISD)
- [ ] Institution of Higher Education
- [ ] School District
- [x] Other
  
  (specify): Education nonprofit

### 6. Applicant Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Contact</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Kelly</td>
<td>617-777-1797</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 Broad Street, Suite 1020</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>10005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:skelly@achievementnetwork.org">skelly@achievementnetwork.org</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.achievementnetwork.org">www.achievementnetwork.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>Amrutha Nagarajan</td>
<td>202-570-3898</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7375 Woodward, Suite 1520</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>48202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### 8. Service Area

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

- [x] Statewide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate School District(s):</th>
<th>Name(s) of District(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
9. Conflict of Interest Disclosure

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

☐ Yes  ☒ No

What school district are you employed by or serve: ____

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Support systems to ensure student and teacher success and sustain improvement
- Content and delivery systems and mechanisms proven to result in dramatic and sustained improvement linked to student achievement
- Job embedded professional development at leadership, teacher and support levels to increase internal capacity for improvement and sustainability linked to student achievement
- Comprehensive short cycle and summative assessment systems to measure performance and goal attainment linked to the building school improvement plan.
The Achievement Network (ANet) works alongside school leadership teams to strengthen their school-wide practice and culture of using learning standards and achievement data to get breakthrough results for students in low-income communities. We do so by providing schools with Common Core-aligned resources for literacy/English language arts and math for grades 2-8, coupled with customized support for educators to use these tools effectively. We have a nine year track record of working with schools across the country to help all of their students catch up and get ahead academically. ANet’s guidance, resources and services help our 470 partner schools build a culture of continuous improvement, where every educator in the building deeply understands the Common Core standards and is regularly using data-driven strategies to adapt and target instruction to meet the unique learning needs of each student.

ANet launched its Michigan network this past year, with fifteen initial schools. In the coming years, we expect to continue growing in Michigan, serving 70 schools by our fifth year in the state. Our aim is to be the premier school support organization in Michigan’s Common Core era, bringing schools together to achieve breakthrough results for ALL students across governance structures. ANet coaches - former educators themselves - will be instrumental in building school capacity to implement best practices and serve as first-line thought partners to school leaders. As a result, ANet’s Michigan partner schools will achieve results that far exceed their non-ANet peers.

We understand the need that Michigan faces to provide schools with high quality tools and resources to increase achievement in lower-performing schools. With our expanding network of Michigan schools as partners, ANet aims to create an instructional environment in which teachers are able to use student data to deploy high quality information and tools to individualize learning. In this way, teachers can customize content and instruction to meet the unique needs of each learner, and district and school leaders can support teachers in meeting the high expectations of rigorous standards. We see this as a critical piece of Michigan’s School Improvement Framework, which calls for increased attention to data-driven, customized instruction. We are enthusiastic about this strategy and would be excited to be a partner in its execution.

ANet’s model also helps develop professional learning communities within and across schools, based in the use of these tools, data, and practices: ANet partner schools carve out time for teachers to work together to share ideas for planning and reinstruction, and they are able to connect with other schools in the network to collaborate and learn from each other.

Our History
ANet was founded in 2005 in response to a need expressed by a group of seven Massachusetts charter school leaders. These leaders were frustrated that end-of-year test data came too late to be helpful in improving instruction. Without timely, granular data on student learning, these school leaders realized they could not deliver an effective personalized learning environment for their students. Their teachers needed the tools to know precisely where students were struggling and to uncover misconceptions that would bring to light why. They wanted their teachers to collaborate more effectively, using these data and tools, to form different teaching strategies that would help each student make progress. And as school leaders, they wanted a way to learn more from their peers as well.

ANet’s tools and routines are designed to help schools implement a cycle of teaching and learning that empowers teachers to deliver personalized instruction in a collaborative environment. This cycle is anchored around ANet-developed formative assessments in ELA and math that hold a high bar for rigor and are aligned to the Common Core. These assessments are delivered four times a year at regular intervals; we score and return each assessment within 48 hours of administration via a proprietary online
platform, myANet, which allows district leaders, school leaders, and teachers to identify trends in student learning and misconceptions, then access materials to allow them to provide individualized, aligned support for each student.

**The Achievement Network model**

Many schools and districts have scrambled to buy new curricula or to conduct “one-and-done” professional development sessions for their teachers as their primary strategy for implementing the Common Core. As we have worked with schools across the country, we have seen that this approach rarely works. Instead, we have found that adoption of a consistent set of routines for planning and delivering instruction enables the most successful implementation of the Common Core. Through this set of routines, which are anchored around quarterly teaching and learning cycles, teachers engage in four core activities: 1) study and plan from the new standards, 2) deliver lessons based on those standards, 3) use evidence from assessments, in collaboration with peers, to identify student misconceptions, and 4) adapt instruction to close any gaps in understanding before the next quarterly cycle begins. Specifically, our program consists of four elements:

**Tools that support teachers through each step of the teaching and learning cycle**

1) *Instructional resources.* ANet provides school partners with instructional resources, such as guides that help teachers understand and break down the Common Core standards and planning templates that help teachers develop strong lessons. These materials are drawn from the highest performing schools in our 470-school network and reflect the best practices of schools making a strong transition to the Common Core.

2) *Interim assessments, reports, and data analysis tools.* ANet provides school partners with four interim assessments in ELA and math over the course of the school year. These assessments form the anchor of the teaching and learning cycle, helping teachers develop a clear picture of what the standards actually require of students so that they can plan great lessons, and where students are struggling with material that has been taught so that they can directly address those needs. The data from these assessments is returned to teachers within 48 hours through our user-friendly online platform called myANet, which allows teachers to analyze the data in a granular and instructionally relevant way.

**Training that helps school leaders guide the implementation of the teaching and learning cycle**

3) *Job-embedded coaching.* Each ANet partner school works with a dedicated ANet coach who visits the school roughly 20 times over the course of the year. That coach’s role is to build the principal’s capacity to lead teachers through the teaching and learning cycle, and to ensure that the school is building the right behaviors and culture to fully utilize the tools ANet provides.

4) *Network learning communities.* In addition to the direct coaching that schools receive, ANet also offers professional development events and learning walks, both in-person and virtually, so that educators across the national network can collaborate with and learn from peers.

The training is guided by three rubrics that codify the teacher actions, the leader actions, and the school structures that enable schools to execute each element of a strong teaching and learning cycle. Typically, schools receive about three years of intensive support to build their own capacity along the dimensions of these rubrics, and then the school is “gradually released.” This gradual release model is intended to ensure the work ultimately is sustained by the team within the school.
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)

ANet’s approach to raising student achievement through empowering teachers and school leaders to personalize instruction for students aligns with the evidence based on what produces results. This evidence base emphasizes the importance of data-driven culture, which is shaped by the use of high quality interim assessments. Several studies of schools that have achieved breakthrough results in student achievement in high-poverty communities point to a culture of data-driven instruction as an essential element of the success formula. Additionally, studies of interim assessment programs point to the value of these interventions to districts’ and schools’ ability to improve student achievement and the relative importance of aligned supports for school leaders and teachers. Two large-scale studies produced statistically significant evidence of student achievement gains made by districts and schools after implementing interim assessment programs – including an intervention marrying the use of interim assessments and school leader and teacher support. We believe these studies show that teacher ability to use assessment data in a way that is closely aligned with instructional planning is a key element for personalized learning.

ANet’s coaching and professional development conform to evidence-based characteristics of effective professional development: it should 1) be aligned to a school’s curriculum, standards and assessments; 2) build teachers’ skills for using data to improve instruction; and 3) be delivered through coaching and peer visits. A study published by David Cohen and Heather Hill underscores this: “to be effective, professional development must provide teachers with a way to directly apply what they learn to their teaching. Research shows that professional development leads to better instruction and improved student learning when it connects to the curriculum materials that teachers use, the district and state academic standards that guide their work, and the assessment and accountability measures that evaluate their success.” Another study demonstrated that most effective medium for delivering professional development is coaching feedback and peer visits. Coaching combined with access to other professionals is proven to result in teachers applying the skills and knowledge they have learned at a rate of 80%-90%.

ANet’s model builds on the Kolb Cycle, developed by David A. Kolb; this defines a cycle of reflection on data (problems and causes), action planning, taking action, and reflecting on results. The Kolb cycle has informed the data cycle we help schools adopt and the tools we create to support the data analysis process. Other research that informs ANet’s model include work by Paul Bambrick-Santoyo, instructional coaching research by James Knight, and The Framework for Teaching created by Charlotte Danielson (otherwise known as “The Danielson Framework”). Leveraging these resources help ground our materials in best practices to inform instruction.

---

1 Chicago School Reform Consortium: based on 7 years of research in CPS; Will Dobbie, Roland G. Fryer, Jr., 2011. Getting Beneath the Veil of Effective Schools: Evidence from New York City (Working Paper No. 17632)
3 Carlson, D., Borman, G., Robinson, M. A Multistate District-Level Cluster Randomized Trial of the Impact of Data-Driven Reform on Reading and Mathematics Achievement. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. September 2011 vol. 33 no. 3 378-398
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ANet also engages in deep evaluation of our program through internal as well as external analysis. We measure ANet’s impact across each part of our Theory of Change to understand the effectiveness of our program. That Theory of Change is as follows:

- If ANet provides its partners with **high quality instructional resources, assessments, coaching, and group professional development** sessions...
- Then school leaders will develop **more effective management practices around the Teaching and Learning Cycle** so that teachers can better plan from the Common Core standards and use data to shape instruction...
- Which will, in turn, drive **increases in student proficiency rates**.

We have evidence to demonstrate that we are succeeding in each element of our Theory of Change. A randomized control study of our work conducted by Harvard’s Center for Education Policy Research (CEPR) is showing both that we are delivering higher quality tools and support than schools can otherwise access and that our support is leading to more effective practice in schools. In this study, CEPR has identified matched comparison schools in several of our networks that are implementing interim assessments of their choice without ANet’s support. These matched comparison schools are intended to be similar to the schools implementing ANet’s model so that we can understand our unique value add compared to what schools are able to do on their own.

To date, our study has shown that ANet tools and coaching are changing school structures, encouraging more and more effective teacher collaboration to support data-driven instruction, building a more positive culture around assessment to shape instruction, and leading to more frequent use of data to shape instruction as compared to control schools.

While we do not have student achievement results from our i3 study yet, internal analysis of school performance shows that when we see the type of improvements in school practice demonstrated by our CEPR study, we also see better performance by ANet schools than their non-ANet counterparts across the country. From 2010 to 2012, ANet partner schools achieved an average of 10 percentage point gains in student proficiency in ELA and math. Our schools have consistently improved at more than twice the rate of their peers in most states in which we operate, and these results have proven to be replicable in a variety of settings. While we are proud of the gains our schools made in recent years, our long-term results are the true indicator of our ability to set and achieve goals: our founding corps of six Boston schools has virtually closed the achievement gap with non-low-income schools in Massachusetts.

For the most recent school year, ANet partner schools continued their strong performance, on average achieving twice the gains on non-ANet schools in their state in math and 1.5 times the gains in ELA. In a year where the nation as a whole was largely stagnant in terms of student achievement gains we feel these results were strong.
Strong national level results were also reflected in the performance of our individual networks. Using the example of just one network, in Washington, D.C. we saw a 7.5% gain in ELA proficiency on the DCCAS from spring 2012 to spring 2013 and 8.5% in math. This year, more than 30% (nine of 31) of schools named as DC Reward Schools were ANet partners, and five of the nine DCPS schools named in the top 5% for growth this year are also in our network.

ANet has also managed to sustain these gains across both high and low proficiency schools, a rarity in a field where organizations tend to tailor efforts to one type or the other. In 2011-12, the last year for which we have these data, internal analysis showed that low proficiency ANet schools (ie those starting with less than 50% of students rating advanced/proficient on end of year summatives) saw 3.2% gains, while high proficiency schools (those starting with greater than 50% advanced/proficient) achieved 5.3% gains; these numbers are consistent with the year prior, and we expect the trend to continue. While low-profiency schools often lack the resources or capacity to effectively enact and sustain reforms, our services take root because they are developed in response to school need and designed for implementation in a variety of settings - across district and charter, low and high performing, and well- or poorly supported schools. The combination of a proven model with a responsive, tailored implementation strategy has deepened our school and network relationships and has further underscored our commitment to continued growth.

Finally, ANet’s analysis of student summative data from its partner schools is validating our Theory of Change by showing a link between stronger practice and student achievement gains. We recently analyzed student performance on end of year summative exams for the cohort of schools that joined ANet in 2010 (n=47 schools). Over three years, 17 of those schools advanced 2 practice levels on our rubric. These schools saw 3-year proficiency gains of 13% in math and 9% in ELA. For the 25 schools that improved one level on our rubrics, student proficiency increased by 12% in math and 4% in ELA. For the 5 schools that did not improve, student proficiency declined by 5% in math and 6% in ELA. Not only is our support improving practice (roughly 90% of schools were able to advance at least one level with our support), but also those schools advancing the most in practice quality are achieving the highest gains in student performance.

ANet also has deep experience working with Turnaround Schools in many of our networks. In 2010, for example, the Springfield (MA) Public School District brought in ANet to support all 9 Turnaround Schools serving grades 2-8. In coordinated efforts with the district, ANet is working to build the capacity of teachers and leaders in these schools, and to put in place data driven instructional strategies that have proven to help improve student learning. Five of the ten Turnaround Schools recognized in 2012 for combined two year gains by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education are ANet partners. Among these, the Zanetti School, a Turnaround School in Springfield, achieved gains of 18 percentage points in ELA and 27 percentage points in math. ANet partner school Orchard Gardens, a Boston Turnaround School highlighted by Governor Deval Patrick during his speech at the 2012 Democratic National Convention, saw gains of 16 percentage points in ELA and 20 percentage points in math. In 2012, Holland Elementary School, a Turnaround School in Boston, achieved 8.2 percentage point gains in math and 7.9 percentage point gains in ELA over 2011 summative results.


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 success of ANet’s program rests on our customized, job-embedded coaching. This coaching is guided by three rubrics that codify the teacher actions, the leader actions, and the school structures that enable schools to execute each element of a strong teaching and learning cycle. We have three proprietary rubrics that guide this coaching and help schools make concrete improvements in practice over time. These improvements ensure that schools have regular rhythms in place to build teacher knowledge of the Common Core and capacity to tailor instruction for students.

As our coaches work with each of their partner schools, they shift the exact number, nature and outcomes of our interactions with the school to address each element of our rubrics. For example, a school new to ANet will see their coach 20 times over their first year and focus on building their teachers’ capacity to analyze and act on the data supplied by our assessment. In its second year, that school might again see its coach 20 times, but focus on unpacking standards and planning high quality lessons. Coaching is integrated into existing structures such as common planning time and school-wide meetings. Our gradual release model builds schools’ capacity for this work over time: coaching interactions are more frequent early in the year and for low-capacity schools, and fade over time as schools develop stronger practices.

We have a track record of successfully delivering excellent professional development and coaching – in-person, online and in group settings – that drives student achievement outcomes. ANet’s model reflects current best practices for adult learning. Our professional development and coaching is on-site and embedded in existing school structures; we leverage professional learning communities, incorporate peer feedback, and reflect on practice; training is shaped by the insights surfaced by student learning data. We believe this method of professional development that combines building teacher capacity in analyzing student achievement data with close examination of Common Core standards as they actually appear in assessment items is the best way to help teachers and leaders learn the Common Core.

School leaders also participate in several network-based professional development sessions throughout the year. Last year, for example, we hosted more than 150 network learning and development events with more than 3,000 total participants and an average satisfaction rating of 8.9 out of a possible 10. These sessions address topics of common concern, such as aligning assessments with Common Core-integrated curricula based on Common Core transition plans, and analyzing student work to adjust teaching and instructional planning. In Tennessee last year, we hosted 12 total Network Learning & Development events; overall, 100% of school leaders agreed that they were satisfied or highly satisfied with these trainings, finding them helpful and informative to their leadership practice.

ANet’s network events also provide a venue for sharing best practices and resources across schools in our regional and national network. For instance, one of our fall network meetings last year included a session led virtually by leaders at UP Academy, a turnaround school in Boston that has become one of Massachusetts’ highest growth schools. ANet network leaders heard from UP leaders several strategies for using assessment data and planning routines to personalize learning for schools, and were able to have their questions answered in real time.

With the help of ANet’s data, digital tools, and customized implementation support, educators in our partner schools are better able to meet students where they are. Teachers can better work with each student to determine specific, customized learning goals and monitor progress toward those 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)
A partner to 470 schools across nine geographic networks, ANet has a unique appreciation for the importance of state context. Our Michigan network is no exception; prior to our launch in 2013, we engaged with state and district education leaders in order to best understand, and prepare to apply, the various curricular, assessment and general reform strategies particular to Michigan. As a result, our customized response across our growing network is grounded in a thorough knowledge of Michigan state priorities, in conjunction with federal mandates and improvement processes.

As one of the critical initial steps in our partnership with a school, ANet engages in an intensive diagnostic process, the components of which correspond directly to those detailed in the Michigan Comprehensive Needs Assessment. This process, which underlies all of our proposed work with each of our partners, allows us to get a complete picture of the strengths and challenges facing a school community. Through observations, interviews with leadership and key staff, and examination of past and present data, we collaborate with data and leadership teams to determine their ability to understand and fulfill district and school priorities, and enact a comprehensive assessment and school improvement strategy. ANet has developed an extensive set of questions based on our school-level partnerships framework (see Appendix), encompassing teachers’ planning and instruction, school systems and structures to support effective data work, and leaders’ actions to create and sustain a culture of data-driven achievement for students; their alignment to the Michigan Comprehensive Needs Assessment has helped our MI team and partner schools to craft thoughtful, effective improvement strategies.

These strategies, as executed by ANet in collaboration with our Michigan partner schools, align closely to Michigan’s School Improvement Framework, with particular emphasis across Strands I-III and V (Teaching for Learning; Leadership; Personnel & Professional Learning; and Data & Information Management), and strong attention given to Strand IV through leadership coaching around school priorities and school structures development. As documented throughout this application, our integrated approach encompasses the creation of assessments aligned to state standards, leadership coaching and job-embedded professional development in the analysis and use of assessment data, resources for teachers and leaders to support data-driven instruction, and ongoing sharing of best practices through our networks – all of which, in combination, form the foundation for the effective implementation of the School Improvement Framework.

Additionally, ANet’s teaching and learning cycle – through which school leaders and teachers are coached and supported to plan from the standards, administer interim assessments, analyze and act upon assessment data, and learn from the resulting impact – reflects the elements of the Process Cycle for School Improvement that Michigan has set forth for individual schools. This is the core of our model; our Michigan team has deep knowledge of the Michigan Curriculum Framework (MCF), and ensures that all assessments, standards, curricula and instructional strategies are aligned in order to increase teacher effectiveness and, in turn, raise student achievement. To that end, ANet’s Michigan team utilizes data from the Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) and the Michigan Merit Exam (MME) to best understand a school’s particular gaps and projected needs, and works with school leaders and teachers to ensure that students are provided with the highest-quality instruction incorporating the grade-level content expectations (GLCEs). We appreciate that the state’s expectations and curricular frameworks represent rigorous expectations for student performance.

Anet’s work also supports the four key components of the US Department of Education’s Transformation and Turnaround school models, which incorporate the aforementioned integrated set of four ANet services to help schools to reorient management practices around the use of data.
Implementing these practices enables our partner schools to set consistently high expectations for students and to adjust instruction so that each student can meet those high expectations. As an i3 grantee since 2010, we have extensive experience in understanding and responding to federal requirements for school-based work.

ANet also works across a variety of contexts, and understands the needs of Title 1 schools. We have experience both with targeted assistance schools which receive Part A funds but are ineligible or may not operate a school-wide program, and school-wide programs in which schools combine Title I, Part A funds with other federal funds as a mechanism for improving the whole-school educational program to increase achievement for all students. We also understand and incorporate Section 504 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act into all of our efforts with schools, ensuring that leaders and teachers have the tools through which to provide high quality instruction for all students, in all circumstances.
**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)

ANet’s economic model is designed for sustainability. The principle we operate toward is a model of school fees covering our operating costs to deliver services. This past year, earned revenue covered 80% of total operating costs on the national level. We leverage local philanthropic support in our networks for discrete innovations and early startup costs that are ultimately covered by school fees as we approach scale. Each new network, Michigan included, is on a targeted plan to reach sustainability by year five of its development; we ensure that all conversations with potential and returning school and philanthropic partners center around this goal.

From a school perspective, costs decline over time as schools build more capacity for driving this work internally. The overall cost per student makes the partnership affordable: a recent third-party analysis benchmarked ANet against eight other high performing education nonprofits and found it to have the lowest cost per student by a significant margin. This affordability, coupled with consistently high partner satisfaction and student outcomes, has allowed ANet to grow its school partnerships by more than 80% per year for the last four years.

On a national level, we expect to increase the percentage of operating expenses covered by earned revenue in our existing networks to increase from 80% to 90% over the next four years as a result of efficiencies in the delivery of our core model as well as adjustments to our pricing approach. We have confidence in our ability achieve the national cost savings necessary to reach sustainability. For example, we have a team of analysts that is currently responsible for ensuring that our student data is accurate and that schools are receiving data reports that identify key trends in student mastery of standards. Over the last four years we improved our analyst to school ratio from 1:12 to 1:60. We have realized similar improvements in our assessment creation process, which ensure greater speed and accuracy. While school budget pressures are likely to limit the absolute pricing increases we are able to achieve, in the past year we saw a 10% increase in the amount of fees we earned per school and are conservatively estimating another 10% increase over the next four years.
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)

Our Michigan Network has a locally-based staff dedicated to providing school support (see resumes, attached). This staff, currently comprised of an Executive Director and a Director of School Support ("coach"), brings a wealth of experience to our Michigan efforts. Amrutha Nagarajan, our Michigan Executive Director, earned her Ed.M. in education policy and management from Harvard’s Graduate School of Education. Prior to her appointment as ED, she worked for ANet as a Director of School Support, providing coaching on data-driven instructional improvements to school leaders in our Washington, DC network. As a lead teacher and former teaching fellow in DC public schools, she received the Elementary Teacher of the Year award, and has continued that focus on driving student achievement improvements in her current work with the Michigan network.

Our Michigan Director of School Support, Kim Lijana, is pursuing her Ed.D. at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, after having received her MA in Teaching from Johns Hopkins. She brings extensive expertise in curriculum writing and mapping, program evaluation, data collection and analysis, and professional development for teachers and leaders. In her coaching efforts with our Michigan schools, Kim has also integrated her experiences as a college counselor in a DC charter school and a teacher in DC public schools, guiding school leaders in effective use of data to drive student improvement while maintaining a critical focus on educational equity and college and career readiness.

In addition, the Michigan Network receives support from our national team for both programmatic and operational needs. The team will draw on three key programmatic teams at the national level:

- **Our Assessment Team** works with national experts to ensure our assessments reflect the latest CCSS updates and that the assessments we provide to our schools help them hold a high bar.
- **Our Network Learning & Development team** identifies and shares best practices of schools from across our nine networks, and creates opportunities for educator collaboration.
- **Our Coaching Strategy & Instructional Resources team** ensures our coaches continue to hone their own skills as part of a community of other coaches across our networks.
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.