LEA Application

Michigan SIG Cohort IV

APPLICATION COVER SHEET

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS (SIG)

Legal Name of LEA Applicant: **Lansing School District** District Code: **33020**	Applicant's Mailing Address: **519 W. Kalamazoo St.** **Lansing, MI 48933-2008**
LEA Contact for the School Improvement Grant Name: **Dr. Mark Coscarella** Position and Office: **Associate Superintendent for Instruction** Contact's Mailing Address: **519 W. Kalamazoo, Lansing, MI 48933-2008** Telephone: **(517) 755-2946** Fax: **(517) 755-1029** Email address: **mark.coscarella@lansingschools.net**	
LEA School Superintendent/Director (Printed Name): **Ms. Yvonne Caamal Canul**	Telephone: **(517) 755-1010**
Signature of the LEA School Superintendent/Director:	Date: 6-30-2015
LEA School Board President (Printed Name): **Mr. Peter Spadafore**	Telephone: **(517) 755-1005**
Signature of the LEA Board President: X_____	Date: 6/30/15
Union Representative (Printed Name): **Mr. Chuck Alberts**	Telephone: **(517) 999-4002**
Signature of Union Representative: X	Date: 6-30-2015

The LEA, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the conditions that apply to any waivers the State of Michigan receives through this application.

ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATION: By signing this cover sheet, the applicant certifies that it will agree to perform all actions and support all intentions stated in the Assurances and Certifications in **Attachment H**, and will comply with all state and federal regulations and requirements pertaining to this program. The applicant certifies further that the information submitted on this application is true and correct.

LEA APPLICATION

SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED

SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the Eligible schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.

The LEA must identify each Eligible school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Eligible school. Detailed descriptions of the requirements for each intervention are in attachments E.1 – E.6

An LEA in which one or more priority schools are located must serve all of these schools before it may serve one or more focus schools.

Note: Weight will be given to applicant schools that:

- have not previously received a SIG award
- are identified as priority
- choose the transformation, turnaround, whole-reform, or early learning models

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	PRIORITY (check)	FOCUS (check - if applicable)	INTERVENTION MODEL
Cavanaugh Elementary	262115005789	X		Transformation/Early Intervention
REO Elementary	262115005803	X		Transformation/Early Intervention
Vivian Riddle Elementary	262115001866	X		Transformation/Early Intervention
Willow Elementary	262115005820	X		Turnaround/Early Intervention
				Note: We would like to augment our existing reform and redesign plans (i.e., transformation and turnaround) with elements from the early intervention model … hence the two models above.

Note: The **"Rule of Nine" has been eliminated**. In previous years, an LEA that has nine or more Priority schools could not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools. That requirement is **no longer in effect.**

OVERVIEW OF APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

- DO NOT RESPOND HERE -

1. **Analysis of Need:** (Section B, Question 1) For each priority and focus school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that the LEA has analyzed the needs of each school, such as instructional programs, school leadership and school infrastructure, based on a needs analysis that, among other things, analyzes the needs identified by families and the community, and selected interventions for each school aligned to the needs each school has identified.
2. **Family and Community Input:** (Section B, Question 1.b) For each priority and focus school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that it has taken into consideration family and community input in selecting the intervention.
3. **Intervention Plan:** (Section B, Question 3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to design and implement a plan consistent with the final requirements of the turnaround model, restart model, school closure, transformation model, evidence-based whole school reform model, early learning model, or state-determined model.
4. **Capacity to Provide Adequate Resources**: (Section A, Question 1) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to determine its capacity to provide adequate resources and related support each priority and focus school, identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected on the first day of the first school year of full implementation.
5. **External Service Provider Selection:** (Section B, Question 5) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality, and regularly review and hold accountable such providers for their performance.
6. **Resource Profile:** (Section B, Question 4) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to align other resources (for example, Title I funding) with the selected intervention.
7. **LEA Actions to Support the Intervention Model:** (Section A, Question 1) The LEA (district/central office) must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively.
8. **LEA Oversight of SIG Implementation:** (Section A, Question 2) The LEA must describe how it will provide effective oversight and support for implementation of the selected intervention for each school it proposes to serve.
9. **Family and Community Engagement:** (Section B, Question 3.b) The LEA must describe how it will meaningfully engage families and the community in the implementation of the selected intervention on an ongoing basis.
10. **Sustaining Reforms:** (Section B, Question 9) The LEA must describe how it will sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
11. **Reform Model Implementation:** (Section B, Question 3, Attachments E.1 – E.6) The LEA must describe how it will implement, to the extent practicable, in accordance with its selected SIG intervention model(s), one or more evidence-based strategies.
12. **Annual Goals:** The LEA must describe how it will monitor each priority and focus school, that receives school improvement funds including by

a. Establishing annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics (Section B, Question 8)

b. Measuring progress on the leading indicators from attachment A, Baseline Data. (Section A, Question 3)

13. **Charter School and External Service Provider Accountability:** (Section A, Questions 4 and 5) An LEA must hold the charter school operator, CMO, EMO, or other external provider accountable for meeting these requirements, if applicable.

14. **Pre-Implementation Activities** (Section B, Question 3, Attachments E and F) An LEA that intends to use the first year of its School Improvement Grants award for planning and other pre-implementation activities for an eligible school, the LEA must include a description of the activities, the timeline for implementing those activities, and a description of how those activities will lead to successful implementation of the selected intervention.

15. **Rural LEA Model Modification:** (Section B, Question 3.c) For an LEA eligible for services under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of Title VI of the ESEA (Rural Education Assistance Program) that chooses to modify one element of the turnaround or transformation model, the LEA must describe how it will meet the intent and purpose of that element.

16. **Evidence-Based, Whole-School Reform Model:** (Section B, Question 3, Attachment E.4) For an LEA that applies to implement an evidence-based, whole-school reform model in one or more eligible schools, the LEA must describe how it will

    a. Implement a model with evidence of effectiveness that includes a sample population or setting similar to the population or setting of the school to be served; and

    b. Partner with a whole school reform model developer, as defined in the SIG requirements.

17. **Restart Model:** (Section B, Question 3, Attachment E.5) For an LEA that applies to implement the restart model in one or more eligible schools, the LEA must describe the rigorous review process (as described in the final requirements) it has conducted or will conduct of the charter school operator, CMO, or EMO that it has selected or will select to operate or manage the school or schools.

18. **Implementation Timeline:** (Section B, Question 7, Attachment F) the LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each school identified in the LEA's application.

Section A
District/Central Office Level Responses

1. Actions to Support the Intervention Model:

- **(A) The LEA (district/central office) must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively**

1A: The Lansing School District (LSD) has several formal and informal strategies for modifying its practices, policies, or guidelines to ensure implementation fidelity and effectiveness. For instance, based on data attained through a federally funded counseling grant and locally funded attendance grant the district documented problems that arose from lack of consistent implementation of attendance policies, incomplete attendance data recording, and conflicting definitions of tardiness and absences. As a result several school-level and district-wide steps, including adopting a new definition of absence and tardy in our administrative guidelines and the implementation of a new student management system, were taken to address the issues. Lansing schools have a long tradition of site-based decision-making. To that end internal structures such as the Instructional Council and Professional Council, as well as professional bargaining units provide avenues for school-based flexibility while protecting system coherence. Schools have long had the flexibility to make requests to a joint administrative/bargaining unit committee (i.e., Professional Council) for school-level flexibility, waivers, and pilot programs. The result is support to schools that simultaneously encourages innovation and results-orientation while avoiding the costs of disjointed practices, policies, and guidelines on students, families, learning outcomes, and district resources. Extended year learning opportunities represent another example of how the district has shifted practices in order to better meet the needs of students. During the summer of 2013 the district implemented an extended year program that, while ambitious was limited in scope. After reviewing data and listening to the needs of students, families, and the community, the district modified its extended year learning opportunities and greatly expanded the program. In the summer of 2014, Lansing offered a comprehensive extended year learning program available to every student (3-12) in the district. In the summer of 2015, again based on needs of students, families, and the community the extended year program was further expanded to provide Lansing students with a wider variety of learning opportunities. As implementation of the Early Intervention programs and services described in this application unfold, the Lansing School District will proactively revisit practices, policies, and guidelines that potentially inhibit aspects of implementation and modify (within the legal limits) those practices, policies, and guidelines as needed in order to ensure full and timely implementation of all programs and services.

- **(B) Describe how the district/building's human resources will be more involved in intentional hiring of the best staff possible to implement the grant and build capacity**

1B: The Lansing School District's Department of Human Resources (in collaboration with the Instructional Division and the Superintendent) recently redesigned and implemented a new staff selection process in order to ensure that Lansing students work with the best possible teaching and administrative staff. This same staff selection process will be used to

screen and hire individuals associated with the programs and interventions described throughout the SIG IV application. Specifically, the selection process includes: *Compact* – candidates sign a compact that outlines the major commitments, responsibilities, and expectations for the building staff; *Writing Exercise* – candidates complete three short-response questions which provide the selection committee with writing samples/information about the candidate's approach to the work; *Group Data Exercise* – candidates participate in a facilitated conversation with a small group. The group will interpret data and develop strategies for providing targeted student interventions; *Lesson Explanation* – candidates complete a lesson explanation in which they showcase best practices and sound instructional planning; and *Interview* – candidates respond to a small set of questions developed by the selection committee in order to gather information about professional experience and expertise. While the selection process is coordinated by the Department of Human Resources, it is done in collaboration with building principals and the Instructional Division of the Central Office. Another benefit of this staff selection process is the opportunity to build capacity in the district and building leaders that participate (as screeners) in the actual selection activities. Many principals report great benefit from their participation in the selection process.

- **(C) Describe how community resources will be aligned to facilitate implementation of the selected intervention**

1C: The Lansing School District has a demonstrated track record of aligning community (and other) resources in order to ensure implementation fidelity and effectiveness. In the past, the district has successfully sought local, state, and federal funds to advance improvement efforts. In such cases, the input of various key community partners is sought early in the process, plans are aligned for optimal coherence, and programming decisions are driven by data and evidence-based best practices. For example, past and present USDOE magnet grants have resulted in site-level design and innovation aligned to district standards and improvement goals. Community partners such as Impressions 5 Museum, Michigan State University, Board of Water and Light, CASE Credit Union, Potter Park Zoo, REACH Art Studio, and the Wharton Center have been instrumental in enacting selected programs and interventions. These community resources support PD, MTSS programming, and enrichment opportunities that are consistent with, and driven by, the comprehensive model described in this application. The outcome is a seamless system of support that is coherent and well aligned for efficient, effective, and sustainable use of resources across each building (and across the district).

- **(D) If the applicant is a priority school, how does this align with and support the existing state reform/redesign plan?**

1D: As all of the Lansing schools applying for SIG IV are currently in priority status great care was taken to ensure a high degree of alignment between the components described in this application and the existing reform and redesign plan components. Plans are aligned for optimal coherence and driven by data and evidence-based best practices. Each school (and the district), aligns Title I, Title II and Section 31a funds and other resources (including federal, state, and local grants) to both the school and district-level improvement plans. Because we are opting for the Early Intervention Model much of the substance of this application complement existing R&R plan components.

2. **Oversight of SIG Implementation: The LEA (district/central office) must describe how it will provide effective oversight for implementation of the selected intervention for each school it proposes to serve. Who will perform this work? Will it be existing staff, or does the LEA propose to add additional staff or contract with another entity to perform this work?**

2: The Lansing School District (LSD) has extensive capacity and experience in supporting the purposeful use of school improvement funds. The district has an effective central office support team that provides core district functions, and a stable budget that allows school-based support needs to be met. For instances, material and equipment purchases occur in timely manner and are inventoried to meet federal/state audit standards. Internal program and fiscal audits assure appropriate use of grant funds. Vendor payments are made in a timely manner and school facilities are maintained in accordance with a district maintenance schedule. Our planning process considers both financial and programmatic sustainability and allocates district resources to best support capacity building in our principals and teachers. Grants and general fund expenditures are monitored to ensure that they are coordinated to meet grant intent and provide the best value added for the schools and students of the district, consistent with grant guidelines and regulations. Rapid improvement capacity has been built over the past few years through careful and intentional allocation of district resources including Title I and Title II. Our district data team ensures that the building leaders and teachers have timely and creditable data to support informed decision-making. Specific software support programs and software applications provide formative and summative assessment data needed for monitoring student, school, and district success, as well as analysis of practices and outcomes. Despite facing the challenge of "right sizing" district operations the district continues to maintain strong relationships with its bargaining units and employees. The Board of Education carries out its policy and accountability responsibilities effectively working in partnership with the administrative leadership team. The change model used by the Lansing School District is based on a high-level of collaboration and is designed for rapid improvement.

District-Level Oversight of SIG IV Implementation		
Division/Department	Leads	Responsibilities
Instructional Division	▪ Dr. Mark Coscarella – Associate Superintendent for Instruction ▪ Ms. Mara Lud – Director of Elementary Schools ▪ Mr. Troy Scott – Director of Personnel	Provide district-level guidance and administrative support.
Department of Accountability and School Improvement	▪ Mr. Sergio Keck – Director of Instructional Support ▪ Mr. Ben Botwinski – District Transformation Coordinator ▪ Ms. Bethany Deschaine – State/Federal Compliance Officer	Provided site-based support to priority schools related to program implementation, budget development, and data.
Department of Finance	▪ Ms. Kim Adams – Director of Finance ▪ Mr. Jon Laing – Purchasing Manager ▪ Mr. Joe Ishirini – Accountant ▪ Mr. Mark Graham – Accountant	Provided fiscal support and guidance.
Note: Other than the MDE required SIG Coordinator, no new positions will be added related to SIG oversight.		

3. **Monitoring Progress on Annual Goals: The LEA must describe how it will monitor the progress on meeting annual goals for each school receiving a SIG. Refer to attachment G, Annual Goals, as appropriate.**

3: The Lansing School District has established a comprehensive process for monitoring, accountability, and site-based support. Each school, working with central office support, analyzes its core metrics and uses disaggregated longitudinal data from several sources (see table below) to develop specific measurable goals and outcomes. Priority Schools work with the District Transformation Coordinator (Title I funded) to develop a comprehensive Reform & Redesign Plan based on data, and to implement and monitor plan outcomes. Monitoring visits are conducted multiple times each month and a specific written walkthrough protocol is used when conducting the monitoring visits. Technical support and monitoring are also available to Priority Schools from the Ingham Intermediate School District (IISD) through the MIExcel program. Building leaders have access to Successline's Golden Package (and MISchool Data) and will continue using these valuable sources of school and student-level data. From these sources ongoing process needs are identified and resources allocated. A district-developed data dashboard is used to assess progress in meeting goals and outcomes, provide monitoring evidence, and district-level feedback and quarterly data reviews occur using Instructional Learning Cycle data. Intervention strategies are based on evidence-based best practices and we actively monitor rates of positive impact for selected interventions against our Annual Goals (see **Attachment G**). Plans were designed to reflect systemic coherence and alignment of plan strategies and interventions across subject areas and grade levels across the district. Interventions that are found to not deliver the planned outcomes are adjusted or replaced. The Reform and Redesign plans (through the Unpacking Tool) are constantly being fine-tuned and reviewed by teams that include teachers, parents, community stakeholders, principals, and central office personnel. Based on assessment of plan outcomes revisions have already been made (to the Unpacking Tool) resulting in increased effectiveness in meeting Annual Goals and outcomes. During the 2014-15 school year the district provided every principal with training in "data dialogues" along with extensive job-embedded support for analysis of data. This comprehensive and transparent system of monitoring, providing feedback and reporting facilitates continuous improvement at the school and district levels.

District & School Data Sources	
High Schools 7-12	**Elementary Schools PK-6**
M-Step/WorkKeys/ACT	M-Step
AIMSweb	AIMSweb
SWIS	SWIS
READ 180 - Lexile Scores	Scholastic Reading & Math Inventory
CIMS	CIMS
School Report Cards	School Report Cards
ACT EXPLORE & PLAN	DIBELS / DRA II
Student discipline and suspension data	Student discipline and suspension data
Student attendance data	Student attendance data
CLASS - classroom based summary of teacher instructional practices	SNAPSHOT & CLASS – classroom based summary of teacher instructional practices

4. **Charter School Accountability: If the applicant is a Michigan charter school, describe how district/central office will regularly review the charter school operator, CMO, or EMO and hold them accountable for meeting the SIG requirements. (maximum length 1 page; please respond "N/A" if the applicant entity is not a charter school)**

N/A … there are no charter schools operated by the Lansing School District.

5. **External Service Provider Accountability: Describe how the district/central office will regularly review the performance of external service providers (ESP) and hold them accountable for meeting the SIG requirements.**

5: The Lansing School District has established a comprehensive process for monitoring and internal accountability. The support provided by an External Service Provider (ESP) is subject to the intensive scrutiny and oversight. The ESPs, working with central office and building level support, analyze the impact of services on core metrics and use disaggregated data from several sources to monitor service and program impact on measurable goals and outcomes (see **Attachment G**). ESPs working with SIG-funded schools and the District Transformation Coordinator (Title I funded) develop a comprehensive plan of support based on data and unique building needs. The ESP then executes the plan and (in collaboration with district and building leaders) monitors outcomes. Formal monitoring visits are conducted multiple times each month and a specific written walkthrough protocol is used when conducting the monitoring visits and providing feedback. Implementation fidelity checks are also regularly conducted, and ESPs participate in quarterly data dialogues meetings in which data is reviewed, program implementation is discussed, and service adjustments are made as needed. As an example, the Lansing School District has successful experience working with SIG-related ESPs. Our current SIG III schools are working with Ingham ISD (IISD) as their primary ESP. The selection of Ingham ISD as ESP allowed for the continuity of practice needed to achieve the goals and strategies identified in our SIG III application. IISD has provided on-going technical assistance and support related to the Instructional Learning Cycles, as well as site-based support through content coaching. Monitoring of these efforts through walkthroughs, implementation fidelity checks, and data dialogues has led to several adjustments in the implementation and support provided to teachers in order to ensure maximum effectiveness and efficiency. Ingham ISD has proven responsive to our monitoring and oversight model and acted efficiently to ensure maximum impact (e.g., responded to requests for additional staff training). In addition to our on-going monitoring efforts, our relationships with ESPs is formalized through a written contract (i.e., a Contract Service Agreement) that specifies costs, deliverables, a timeline for services and supports, and a termination/non-renewal clause that allows the district to terminate the relationship if the district is not satisfied, in any way, with services and supports being provided. In cases where the ESP is not responsive to the needs of our schools and staff, or where the program is failing to have the intended impact, relationships are terminated swiftly and professionally.

6. **District Level Budgets:**
   a. **Complete a five year budget overview for all eligible schools and applying for the SIG. Include annual district costs.**

   b. **Complete a budget specific to district level costs that covers the full five years of SIG that is separate and distinct from the individual school level budgets.**

NOTE: Preliminary budgets are for planning and review purposes only. Initial approval of the grant application does not grant explicit approval to all preliminary budget items. Final approval of SIG budget items occurs in the Michigan Electronic Grants System Plus (MEGS+) and is subject to Title I rules of supplement vs. supplant, tests of allowability, and reasonable and necessary expenditures to support the approved reform model. Inclusion of an item in the preliminary budget does not guarantee it will be approved as a line item submitted in MEGS+.

Lansing Note: Our budget is reflective of the fact that we are opting for the 3 years of immediate funding followed by 2 year of sustainability (district carries some costs). The budget is also reflective of the fact that we are presenting a coordinated, cross-building, Early Intervention Model that maximizes program and support impact while minimizing costs.

X **Budget Overview** completed and attached as **Attachment C.2**.

X **Preliminary District** Level Budget completed and attached as **Attachment C.3**.

   c. **Describe how the district budget represents the costs incurred by the district over each of the five years of the grant will support grant implementation, monitor the progress of each school, and monitor external service providers and charter school operators/CMOs/EMOs to hold them accountable for meeting SIG requirements. How does this align with and support the existing state reform/redesign plan? (N/A for focus schools) If proposing to add SIG-funded positions at the district level, describe how these will be funded and sustained when the grant ends.**

6c: The Lansing School District (LSD) has extensive capacity and experience in supporting and monitoring the purposeful use of school improvement and grant funds. The district has an effective central office support team for core district functions, and a stable budget that allows school-based support needs to be met. In order to maximize the amount of grant monies that are provided directly to the schools in support of student achievement, central office support (in regards to this grant) will be provided – in kind. There are existing personnel, systems, and structures in place that are already funded through a variety of general and categorical funds to provide district-level fiscal management and oversight of the grant. Other than indirect (4.5%), there is no district-level budget. As such our budget reflects only an indirect expense.

Describe how the district will monitor the progress of each school. The Lansing School District (LSD) has extensive capacity and experience in supporting the purposeful use of school improvement funds. The district has an effective central office support team that provides core district functions, and a stable budget that allows school-based support needs to be met. For instances, material and equipment purchases occur in timely manner and are inventoried to meet federal/state audit standards. Internal program and fiscal audits assure appropriate use of grant funds. Vendor payments are made in a timely manner and school facilities are maintained in accordance with a district maintenance schedule. Our planning process considers both financial and programmatic sustainability and allocates district resources to best support capacity building in our principals and teachers. Grants and general fund expenditures are monitored to ensure that they are coordinated to meet grant intent and provide the best value added for the schools and students of the district, consistent with grant guidelines and regulations. Rapid improvement capacity has been built over the past few years through careful and intentional allocation of district resources including Title I and Title II. Our district data team ensures that the building leaders and teachers have timely and creditable data to support informed decision-making. Specific software support programs and software applications provide formative and summative assessment data needed for monitoring student, school, and district success, as well as analysis of practices and outcomes. Despite facing the challenge of "right sizing" district operations the district continues to maintain strong relationships with its bargaining units and employees. The Board of Education carries out its policy and accountability responsibilities effectively working in partnership with the administrative leadership team. The change model used by the Lansing School District is based on a high-level of collaboration and is designed for rapid improvement.

District-Level Oversight of SIG IV Implementation		
Division/Department	Leads	Responsibilities
Instructional Division	▪ Dr. Mark Coscarella – Associate Superintendent for Instruction ▪ Ms. Mara Lud – Director of Elementary Schools ▪ Mr. Troy Scott – Director of Personnel	Provide district-level guidance and administrative support.
Department of Accountability and School Improvement	▪ Mr. Sergio Keck – Director of Instructional Support ▪ Mr. Ben Botwinski – District Transformation Coordinator ▪ Ms. Bethany Deschaine – State/Federal Compliance Officer	Provided site-based support to priority schools related to program implementation, budget development, and data.
Department of Finance	▪ Ms. Kim Adams – Director of Finance ▪ Mr. Jon Laing – Purchasing Manager ▪ Mr. Joe Ishirini – Accountant ▪ Mr. Mark Graham – Accountant	Provided fiscal support and guidance.
Note: Other than the MDE required SIG Coordinator, no new positions will be added related to SIG oversight.		

Describe how the district will monitor external service providers. The Lansing School District has established a comprehensive process for monitoring and internal accountability. The support provided by an External Service Provider (ESP) is subject to the intensive scrutiny and oversight. The ESPs, working with central office and building level support, analyze the impact of services on core metrics and use disaggregated data from several sources to monitor service and program impact on measurable goals and outcomes (see **Attachment G**). ESPs working with SIG-funded schools and the District Transformation Coordinator (Title I funded) develop a comprehensive plan of support based on data and unique building needs. The ESP then

executes the plan and (in collaboration with district and building leaders) monitors outcomes. Formal monitoring visits are conducted multiple times each month and a specific written walkthrough protocol is used when conducting the monitoring visits and providing feedback. Implementation fidelity checks are also regularly conducted, and ESPs participate in quarterly data dialogues meetings in which data is reviewed, program implementation is discussed, and service adjustments are made as needed. As an example, the Lansing School District has successful experience working with SIG-related ESPs. Our current SIG III schools are working with Ingham ISD (IISD) as their primary ESP. The selection of Ingham ISD as ESP allowed for the continuity of practice needed to achieve the goals and strategies identified in our SIG III application. IISD has provided on-going technical assistance and support related to the Instructional Learning Cycles, as well as site-based support through content coaching. Monitoring of these efforts through walkthroughs, implementation fidelity checks, and data dialogues has led to several adjustments in the implementation and support provided to teachers in order to ensure maximum effectiveness and efficiency. Ingham ISD has proven responsive to our monitoring and oversight model and acted efficiently to ensure maximum impact (e.g., responded to requests for additional staff training). In addition to our on-going monitoring efforts, our relationships with ESPs is formalized through a written contract (i.e., a Contract Service Agreement) that specifies costs, deliverables, a timeline for services and supports, and a termination/non-renewal clause that allows the district to terminate the relationship if the district is not satisfied, in any way, with services and supports being provided. In cases where the ESP is not responsive to the needs of our schools and staff, or where the program is failing to have the intended impact, relationships are terminated swiftly and professionally.

Describe how the district will monitor charter school operators/CMOs/EMOs. N/A

Describe how these efforts will align/support the state-approved R&R plans: As all of the Lansing schools applying for SIG IV are currently in priority status great care was taken to ensure a high degree of alignment between the components described in this application and the existing reform and redesign plan components. Plans are aligned for optimal coherence and driven by data and evidence-based best practices. Each school (and the district), aligns Title I, Title II and Section 31a funds and other resources (including federal, state, and local grants) to both the school and district-level improvement plans. Because we are opting for the Early Learning Model much of the substance of this application complement existing R&R plans.

Describe how district-level positions will be funded when the grant ends. N/A because there are no grant funded district-level positions being created.

Attachment C.2: Five Year Budget Overview

NOTE: Preliminary budgets are for planning and review purposes only. Initial approval of the grant application does not grant explicit approval to all preliminary budget items. Final approval of SIG budget items occurs in the Michigan Electronic Grants System Plus (MEGS+) and is subject to Title I rules of supplement vs. supplant, tests of allowability, and reasonable and necessary expenditures to support the approved reform model. Inclusion of an item in the preliminary budget does not guarantee it will be approved as a line item submitted in MEGS+.

Lansing Note: Our budget is reflective of the fact that we are opting for the 3 years of immediate funding followed by 2 year of sustainability (district carries some costs). The budget is also reflective of the fact that we are presenting a coordinated, cross-building, Early Intervention Model that maximizes program and support impact while minimizing costs.

5 YEAR BUDGET OVERVIEW (Lansing School District)						
School	**Year 1**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4 (Sustain)**	**Year 5 (Sustain)**	**5 Year Total**
Cavanaugh Elementary	$348,135	$334,935	$334,935	$132,900	$132,900	$1,283,805
REO Elementary	$348,135	$334,935	$334,935	$132,900	$132,900	$1,283,805
Riddle Elementary	$348,135	$334,935	$334,935	$132,900	$132,900	$1,283,805
Willow Elementary	$348,135	$334,935	$334,935	$132,900	$132,900	$1,283,805
District Costs (Indirect 4.44%)	$58,689	$56,464	$56,464	$22,405	$22,405	$216,427
Total Budget	$1,451,229	$1,396,204	$1,396,204	$554,005	$554,005	$5,351,647

Attachment C.3: Preliminary District Level Budget

a. **Complete a budget specific to district level costs that covers the full five years of SIG that is separate and distinct from the individual school level budgets.**

NOTE: Preliminary budgets are for planning and review purposes only. Initial approval of the grant application does not grant explicit approval to all preliminary budget items. Final approval of SIG budget items occurs in the Michigan Electronic Grants System Plus (MEGS+) and is subject to Title I rules of supplement vs. supplant, tests of allowability, and reasonable and necessary expenditures to support the approved reform model. Inclusion of an item in the preliminary budget does not guarantee it will be approved as a line item submitted in MEGS+.

Lansing Note: Our budget is reflective of the fact that we are opting for the 3 years of immediate funding followed by 2 year of sustainability (district carries some costs). The budget is also reflective of the fact that we are presenting a coordinated, cross-building, Early Intervention Model that maximizes program and support impact while minimizing costs.

YEAR 1 - District/Central Office Budget (may not exceed 5% of total allocation)								
FUNCTION CODE	FUNCTION TITLE	SALARIES	BENEFITS	PURCHASED SERVICES	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	CAPITAL OUTLAY	OTHER EXPENDITURES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
221	Improvement of Instruction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
226	Supervision and Direction of Instructional Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
232	Executive Administration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
233	Grant Writer/Grant Procurement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
249	Other School Administration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
252	Fiscal Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
266	Operation and Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
281	Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
283	Staff/Personnel Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
331	Community Activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Indirect Costs 4.44% Restricted Rate	0	0	0	0	0	$58689	$58689
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	$58689	$58689

YEAR 2 - District/Central Office Budget (may not exceed 5% of total allocation)								
FUNCTION CODE	FUNCTION TITLE	SALARIES	BENEFITS	PURCHASED SERVICES	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	CAPITAL OUTLAY	OTHER EXPENDITURES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
221	Improvement of Instruction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
226	Supervision and Direction of Instructional Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
232	Executive Administration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
233	Grant Writer/Grant Procurement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
249	Other School Administration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
252	Fiscal Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
266	Operation and Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
281	Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
283	Staff/Personnel Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
331	Community Activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Indirect Costs 4.44% Restricted Rate	0	0	0	0	0	$56464	$56464
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	$56464	$56464

YEAR 3 - District/Central Office Budget (may not exceed 5% of total allocation)								
FUNCTION CODE	FUNCTION TITLE	SALARIES	BENEFITS	PURCHASED SERVICES	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	CAPITAL OUTLAY	OTHER EXPENDITURES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
221	Improvement of Instruction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
226	Supervision and Direction of Instructional Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
232	Executive Administration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
233	Grant Writer/Grant Procurement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
249	Other School Administration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
252	Fiscal Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
266	Operation and Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
281	Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

283	Staff/Personnel Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
331	Community Activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Indirect Costs 4.44% Restricted Rate	0	0	0	0	0	$56464	$56464
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	$56464	$56464

YEAR 4 SUSTAIN - District/Central Office Budget (may not exceed 5% of total allocation)								
FUNCTION CODE	FUNCTION TITLE	SALARIES	BENEFITS	PURCHASED SERVICES	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	CAPITAL OUTLAY	OTHER EXPENDITURES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
221	Improvement of Instruction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
226	Supervision and Direction of Instructional Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
232	Executive Administration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
233	Grant Writer/Grant Procurement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
249	Other School Administration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
252	Fiscal Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
266	Operation and Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
281	Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
283	Staff/Personnel Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
331	Community Activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Indirect Costs 4.44% Restricted Rate	0	0	0	0	0	$22405	$22405
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	$22405	$22405

YEAR 5 SUSTAIN - District/Central Office Budget (may not exceed 5% of total allocation)								
FUNCTION CODE	FUNCTION TITLE	SALARIES	BENEFITS	PURCHASED SERVICES	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	CAPITAL OUTLAY	OTHER EXPENDITURES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
221	Improvement of Instruction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
226	Supervision and Direction of	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Instructional Staff							
232	**Executive Administration**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
233	**Grant Writer/Grant Procurement**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
249	**Other School Administration**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
252	**Fiscal Services**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
266	**Operation and Maintenance**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
281	**Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
283	**Staff/Personnel Services**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
331	**Community Activities**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Indirect Costs 4.44% Restricted Rate	0	0	0	0	0	$22405	$22405
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	$22405	$22405

SECTION B

LEA Application - School Building Level Information

MICHIGAN SIG COHORT IV

APPLICATION COVER SHEET

COMPLETE IN ENTIRETY FOR EACH SCHOOL APPLYING FOR A GRANT

Legal Name of School Building: **Willow Elementary** School Building Code: **04551**	Mailing Address: **1012 W Willow St** **Lansing, MI 48915**

School Building Contact for the School Improvement Grant

Name: **Mr. Steven Lonzo**

Position and Office: **Principal**

Contact's Mailing Address: **1012 W Willow St, Lansing, MI 48915**

Telephone: **517-755-1680**

Fax: 517-755-1689

Email address: **steve.lonzo@lansingschools.net**

Building Principal (Printed Name): **Mr. Steve Lonzo**	Telephone: **517-755-1680**
Signature of the Building Principal X	Date: 6-30-15

The LEA, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School Improvement Grants program, including the assurances contained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that the State receives through this application.

ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATION: By signing this cover sheet, the applicant certifies that it will agree to perform all actions and support all intentions stated in the Assurances and Certifications in **Attachment H**, and will comply with all state and federal regulations and requirements pertaining to this program. The applicant certifies further that the information submitted on this application is true and correct.

Identify the Intervention Model Used in This School:

- Transformation Model
- Turnaround Model
- Early Learning Intervention Model
- Evidence-Based Whole-School Reform Model
- Closure Model
- Restart Model

Intervention Model: <u>Turnaround/Early Learning Intervention Model</u>

Identification Status of the School (Priority or Focus): <u>Priority</u>

NOTE: Narratives should follow the sequence of the grant application.

1. Analysis of Need

When preparing responses, the school should consider evidence of need by focusing on improvement status; all core content achievement results, as measured by the state and local assessments, poverty level, graduation data, extended learning opportunities, special populations, etc. Refer to the School Data Analysis, EdYES! Report and results of the Data Dialogues facilitated by the Intervention Specialist (IS) or District Improvement Facilitator (DIF). Consider how subgroups within the school are performing and possible areas to target for improvement. The narrative should include, at a minimum:

- **Identified data source(s)**
- **Relevant student achievement data**
- **Connection(s) to student achievement data and targeted areas of improvement.**

a. Based on the information above, describe the school and LEA's method and rationale for how and why the implementation activities of the selection intervention model were identified.

1a: A comprehensive review of wide-ranging data (i.e., AIMSweb, DRA II, MEAP – from previous years, and ILC data) demonstrates that Willow (identified as Priority in 2013) students continue to struggle in foundational academic areas including mathematics and reading. These target areas were identified through a series of facilitated data dialogues with the principal, teacher-leaders, district representatives, and ISD partners (including the Intervention Specialist). A total of six data dialogues occurred throughout the 2014-2015 academic year. **Table 1a** details the specific target areas, subgroups, data sources, and implementation activities that will be the focus of interventions and supports provided through the Early Learning Intervention Model. The on-going data dialogues also shed light on the need for additional data (i.e., screeners and diagnostic measures), supplemental curriculum, and resources at the early grade levels. As such, the Willow staff and principal (along with district representatives) collaboratively decided (after reviewing, in detail, the

requirements) to apply for SIG IV and augment our state-approved Turnaround Plan with focused interventions aligned with the Early Learning Intervention Model.

Table 1a: Willow School Analysis of Need			
Targeted Area	Subgroups	Data Sources	Implementation Activities
Mathematics (Basic Computation)	Bottom 30% & Economically Disadvantaged	MEAP (2013-2014); AIMSweb M-Comp; and Z-Scores (2013-2014)	Early Learning Intervention Specialist, Extended Year, PD, Supplemental Curriculum, and Instructional and Data Coaching
Mathematics (Reasoning & Application)	Bottom 30% & Economically Disadvantaged	MEAP (2013-2014); AIMSweb M-Comp; and Z-Scores (2013-2014)	Early Learning Intervention Specialist, Extended Year, PD, Supplemental Curriculum, and Instructional and Data Coaching
Foundations in Mathematics (Number ID and Fluency)	Lower Elementary (i.e., PK-1) & Economically Disadvantaged	AIMSweb M-Comp; ILC Data (K-Pals and Rocket Math)	Early Learning Intervention Specialist, Extended Year, PD, Supplemental Curriculum, Instructional and Data Coaching, Family Engagement, and Tech.
Reading (Comprehension)	Bottom 30% & Economically Disadvantaged	MEAP (2013-2014); DRA II; and Z-Scores (2013-2014)	Early Learning Intervention Specialist, Extended Year, PD, Supplemental Curriculum, and Instructional and Data Coaching
Foundations in Reading (Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, and Vocabulary)	Lower Elementary (i.e., PK-1) & Economically Disadvantaged	DRA II; AIMSweb (LNF and LSF)	Early Learning Intervention Specialist, Extended Year, PD, Supplemental Curriculum, Instructional and Data Coaching, Family Engagement, and Tech.

There were several relevant factors that were considered when selecting the specific implementation activities embedded in this application. First, we wanted to ensure that all of the implementation activities would align to data-based needs of our students. Second, we wanted to ensure that the implementation activities were allowable and in accord with the requirements of the Early Learning Intervention Model. Third, we wanted to be able to connect implementation activities to on-going work underway. As an example of this third point, the data coaching and instructional support provided through SIG IV will be tied to the iCollaborate (the capture of instructional process data through the EDU-SNAP tool) initiative already underway throughout the district (Title II).

b. Describe the LEA's process for involving parents and the community in selecting the reform model.

1b: Because of the relatively short timeline associated with the SIG IV grant application, parents and community members were recruited to participate and provide input through existing channels and networks. Building-based PTAs or PTSAs served as the primary

conduit for the recruitment of parents and community members. Members were invited to participate by the building principal. Representatives from the district-level Parent Community Advisory Council (PCAC) were also invited to provide input into the selection of the reform model. Input and guidance was solicited and collected at two planning meetings (each approximately 60 minutes) in which each of the reform models were described. Parents and community members were asked to provide input about the model that they would most like to see implemented based on (a) the model requirements, (b) the data-based needs of our students, and (c) alignment with district and building initiatives. Parent and community member input, comments, and questions were collected and considered by the SIG IV planning and writing team when determining which intervention to select. One example of an area in which parent and community input shaped the nature of our reform model decision and implementation activities concerned the role of the Family & Community Liaison. In this application we are augmenting our existing Reform and Redesign plan with the Early Learning Intervention Model. The role of the Family and Community Liaison (see Job Description in Attachment D.3) to complete home visits and offer "Parent University" was shaped by direct feedback and input collected during the planning meetings.

2. Baseline Data (Attachment A)
Complete the baseline data worksheet.

X Completed and uploaded into MEGs.

3. Intervention Model – provide narrative on the following:

a. Describe in detail the appropriate interventions that will be implemented for the selected reform model using (Attachment E).

X Completed and included as **Attachment E**.

b. Describe how the school, to the extent practicable, will implement one or more evidence-based strategies in accordance with the selected SIG reform model.

3b: Note: Due to space constraints this narrative will address in detail just one of the evidence-based strategies (EBS) that will be implemented through SIG IV. For a list of the EBSs that will be implemented please see **Table 3b** and for a comprehensive description please see **Attachment E**.

One evidence-based strategy we will implement is Pearson's *My Sidewalks*, an intervention designed to assist in the development of early literacy skills. *My Sidewalks* is an evidence-based reading intervention that helps students improve and sustain their levels of reading achievement through a series of scientifically proven strategies to help children experience faster and sustainable achievement rates (Simmons et al. 2007). *My Sidewalks* is designed for students who are unable to read and comprehend grade-level material, and can be used to compliment core reading. The *My Sidewalks* program builds the foundational reading

skills of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension that are proven to increase student motivation and engagement. The *My Sidewalks* program will assist in aligning both the coordination and constancy of early literacy instruction across Pre-K, Kindergarten, and 1st Grade classrooms. The Lansing School District (LSD) has experience in supporting the implementation and maintenance of intensive interventions and will partner with the Ingham ISD (IISD) to provide job embedded PD to teachers and building principals in order to ensure the program is fully implemented with fidelity. LSD and IISD have partnered previously in the implementation of intensive math interventions in five elementary schools, during the 2014-2015 school year, that resulted in positive growth in math fluency in all grades as measured by AIMSweb.

To progress monitor the implementation of *My Sidewalks*, LSD and IISD staff will perform frequent walk-throughs and monitor embedded program assessments and AIMSweb literacy screeners, in order to gather both process and student achievement data. Staff will use this data, embedded within MDE's Instructional Learning Cycle (ILC) format, to collaboratively problem-solve, adjust instruction, improve implementation to maximize impact on student achievement. In addition, LSD and IISD will partner in training effective literacy strategies to parents and community partners whom support student learning outside of the instructional day in an effort to provide intense and frequent opportunities for students to receive literacy support. This student and parent support will continue into the summer via the 12 days of extended learning outlined in **Attachment E** of this application.

<u>References</u>

Simmons, D. C., Kame'enui, E. J., Harn, B., Coyne, M., Stoolmiller, M., Santoro, L., Smith, S., Thomas Beck, C., & Kaufman, N. (2007). Attributes of effective and efficient kindergarten reading intervention: An examination of instructional time and design specificity. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 40, 331-347.

Table 3b: Evidence-Based Strategies (SIG IV)		
EBS	Description	Early Learning Model Requirement
MySidewalks	A literacy intervention that helps students improve and sustain reading achievement.	Requirement #8
Preschool MTSS	Multi-tiered system of support to provided targeted intervention to Pre-K students.	Requirements #8 & #9
EDU-SNAP Data Collection	The systemic collection of instructional process data.	Requirements #9 & #10
EDU-SNAP Data Coaching	Site-based coaching to support teachers in improving instructional practices.	Requirements #9 & #10
Extended Year	12 days of additional instruction in core academic areas during the summer.	Requirement #2

c. Describe how the implementation of the SIG will be evaluated for effectiveness.

3c: The Lansing School District (LSD) has extensive capacity and experience in evaluating the effective use of school improvement funds and program impact. As noted in the LEA section of this application, the district has an effective central office team that provides support in the area of grant management, program evaluation, and monitoring. Grants fund

expenditures are managed to ensure that they meet grant intent, provide the best value added for the schools and students of the district, and are consistent with grant regulations. Program evaluation and monitoring capacity has been built over the past several years through the careful and intentional development of policies and procedures for monitoring program implementation and completing robust program evaluations. The LSD Department of Accountability and School Improvement (DASI) ensure that the district representatives, building leaders, and teachers have timely and creditable data to support informed decision-making and program evaluation. Below is a description of the program evaluation process that will be used to continually monitor SIG outcomes and effectiveness.

Step 1: Engage Stakeholders – DASI will convene an initial meeting to clarify the goals and objectives of the SIG. They will engage in a discussion with key stakeholder about the intent of the grant in order to clarify how the grant is expected to lead to the stated goals and outcomes. Key stakeholders will be involved early in the evaluation process to ensure a variety of perspectives. Key stakeholders could include district and building leaders, teachers, students, family members, and other members of the grant's target audience.

Step 2: Describe the Program – DASI will then articulate (in writing) what the grant does and what it is supposed to accomplish. This description should answer questions such as: What is the goal of the grant? Which activities are essential to pursue in order to reach the grant goal? How many people is the grant expected to serve? What are the interim indicators of grant success? Etc. It is important to note that program planning and evaluation go together. It is good practice and, in fact, recommended that key stakeholders articulate a shared understanding of the conceptual model prior to implementation.

Step 3: Focus the Evaluation - The evaluations can be either summative or formative in nature. DASI can focus on different aspects or programs within the grant as well as goals (i.e., did we meet the desired outcome) or both. DASI will consider purpose and timing of the evaluation by considering questions such as, how will the evaluation information be used? What data-gathering methods are best suited for the evaluation? What constraints are present (i.e., time, money, availability of key stakeholders)? Once there is clarity and shared understanding about these questions, DASI will create a focused evaluation plan.

Step 4: Gather Evidence - Qualitative and quantitative data are the two main forms of data will be collected. Qualitative data offers descriptive information that captures perception, opinions, feelings, or observable phenomena. Three commonly used methods for gathering qualitative evaluation data are: interviews, focus groups, and participant observation. Quantitative data refers to information that may be measured by numbers or tallies. Methods for collecting quantitative data include numerical based systems such as assessments, attendance rates, and disciplinary referrals, as well as, scale-based surveys and questionnaires.

Possible metrics for measuring SIG effectiveness include:

- All of the academic and behavior data included in the Baseline Data Table (see **Attachment A**) included in this application;
- Building leader and teacher perception surveys;
- Student, family, and community partner surveys;
- Parental attendance at SIG-related evening functions;

- Changes in instructional processes (as measured by EDU-SNAP); and
- Changes in student achievement (as measured by local assessments such as DRA II and AIMSweb).

Step 5: Draw Conclusions - In this step, DASI will attempt to answer essential program evaluation questions. Is the grant or program having the intended impact? Are the desired goals or outcomes being achieved? Why or why not? DASI will use data to show trends, gaps, strengths, and weaknesses. Compare evaluation data with a) targets set for the grant or program, b) against standards established by stakeholders, and/or c) make comparisons with other grants and initiatives.

Step 6: Share Lessons Learned **-** It is important that the work put into evaluations is used for grant and program improvement. DASI will present findings and recommendations to a broad set of relevant stakeholders (including district and building leaders, teachers, students, and family and community members). Findings will be sharing in written and presentation format at evening parent activities and on-going data dialogues.

Table 3c details the individuals that will be involved in continuously monitoring and evaluating SIG effectiveness.

Table 3c: Evaluated SIG Effectiveness	
Division/Department/School	Leads
LSD Instructional Division	▪ Dr. Mark Coscarella – Associate Superintendent for Instruction ▪ Ms. Mara Lud – Director of Elementary Schools ▪ Ms. Sue Land – Student Services/PACE
LSD Department of Accountability and School Improvement	▪ Mr. Sergio Keck – Director of Instructional Support ▪ Mr. Ben Botwinski – District Transformation Coordinator ▪ Ms. Bethany Deschaine – State/Federal Compliance Officer
LSD Department of Finance	▪ Ms. Kim Adams – Director of Finance ▪ Mr. Jon Laing – Purchasing Manager ▪ Mr. Joe Ishirini – Accountant ▪ Mr. Mark Graham – Accountant
School	▪ Building Principal ▪ SIG Coordinator – TBD ▪ Teachers ▪ Students ▪ Family and Community Partners
Michigan Department of Education	▪ SIG Monitor ▪ OEII – SIG Program Supervisors

For additional details about how the school will meaningfully engage parents and community partners in the implementation of the reform model, please see **Section 3e**.

d. Title VI Rural Schools Element Modification

i. If the LEA receives rural school funding Title VI, it is allowed to modify one element of the transformation or turnaround model. Indicate which element the school will modify, and describe how it will meet the intent and purpose of the original element. NOTE: this modification does not

apply to the other models. If the LEA does not receive Title VI rural school funding, mark section 6.d as "N/A."

N/A as it applies to this application.

e. Describe how the school and district will meaningfully engage families and the community in the implementation of the reform model on an ongoing basis.

3e: Our work engaging family and community partners in the implementation of the reform model began in earnest after our school was identified as "priority". At that time several efforts were made to meaningfully engage families and community partners in wide variety of reform related activities. Minimally evidence of work underway would be: newsletters, parent-teacher conference attendance; PTSA meetings; updated web pages; family theme nights; the involvement of volunteer organizations; and community mentoring programs.

In regards to specific reform model and interventions described in this application, parents and community partners have already had a chance to provide input and guidance about the selected model and many of the interventions. In addition, as described above, parents and community partners will be included in the continuous monitoring and evaluation of the SIG. Having said that, there is always good work to be done. As such, we have chosen to focus on the following categories of family and community involvement:

- Building Caring Relationships: The quality of relationships at the school is among the strongest known predictors of student achievement and teachers career satisfaction (Hattie, 2009; Grayson & Alvarez, 2008);
- Creating Opportunities for Meaningful Participation: Meaningful participation at school helps cultivate student autonomy, classroom engagement, and commitment (Leithwood & Mascall, 2008);
- Cultivating School Connectedness: Despite challenges at home and in neighborhoods, connected youth look forward to seeing their friends, families, and neighbors at school because they feel valued, respected, and supported (Goodenow, 1993).

To this end, here are 3 specific strategies we will implement to foster greater meaningful family and community engagement in the implementation of the reform model.

- School-based SIG Steering Committee. The steering committee will be composed of five to seven members including teachers, family members, and community partners. This committee will meet, at least, quarterly to review SIG related data, share perceptions about implementation, and provide feedback about on-going program adjustments. The committee could also participate in periodic school walk-throughs and formal monitoring of SIG-related program implementation.
- Parent University. In collaboration with the district, our ISD colleagues, and several community partners. The school will offer a series of workshops that parents can attend to share best practices. Tentative topics include: Parenting Awareness - these offerings will provide information that can empower parents to raise confident,

educated children; Helping Your Child Learn in the 21st Century – these offerings will provide parents information about how to support children's academic opportunities and challenges today; Health and Wellness – these offerings will help families build healthy lifestyles physically as well as emotionally; and Personal Growth – these offerings will help parents to grow personally and professionally, so they can become the most effective advocates for their children.

- Parent and Community Data Wall. In order to make transparent to parents and community members we will create a data (in a highly visible area of the building) which depicts aggregate data related to key metrics of success related to the grant.

4. Resource Profile

a. Describe how the district will leverage state and federal funds and coordinate resources to implement the selected intervention model. As you develop your response, consider how SIG funds will be used to supplement and support other funding resources such as general funds, Title I, Part A, Title II, Part A, IDEA special education funds, and Michigan Section 31a At-Risk funding.

4a: The LSD has a demonstrated track record of aligning resources (i.e., local, state, federal, and other) in order to ensure implementation fidelity and effectiveness. In such cases input from a variety of stakeholders (i.e., district, building, family, and community) is sought early in the planning and implementation process. In the case of this grant, multiple funding sources will be leveraged to support the implementation of the selected intervention model (i.e., Early Learning Intervention Model). As an example, state funding streams such as the foundation allowance (in combination with Title I) are already being used to provide all students in the district with a full day of kindergarten. In addition, we also have a robust Pre-K program (GSRP) in place. SIG funds will be used to expand these programs, through extended year opportunities, and bring greater alignment between Pre-K, K, and 1st Grade learning experiences. As noted above, in order to ensure coherence and maximize impact decisions about use of local, state, federal, and other funds are driven by data-based student needs and evidence-based best practices. Reform plans (and the Unpacking Tool) also serve to ensure program and intervention coherence. **Table 4a** depicts how some of the major funding sources will be leveraged in support of the implementation of the Early Learning Intervention Model.

Table 4a: Funding Source Alignment

Current Intervention	Funding Source	SIG Supplement/Alignment
Full Day Kindergarten	(State) Foundation Allowance (Federal) Title I	Extended Year (12 Days)
Pre-K (GSRP)	(State & ISD) GSRP Grant (Federal) Title I	Extended Year (12 Days)
iCollaborate – the systematic collection of instructional process data	(Federal) Title II (Federal) Title I PRIORITY	Site-Based Data Coach for 72 days per year, use of EDU-SNAP tool
High Scope Curriculum – GSRP Reading Street (Core Curriculum)	(State & ISD) GSRP Grant & (Federal) Title I & (State) Foundation Allowance	High Scope Training & My Sidewalks

Literacy & Math Specialists – Tier 2 & Tier 3 Student Support	(Federal) Title I & (Federal) 31a	Supplemental materials, curriculum, and technology
Student Assistance Provider – provide social and emotional student support	(Federal) Title I	Family & Community Liaison & Parent University
High-quality PD aligned to selected reform model, PLCs	(Federal) Title I and Title II	Early Childhood Learning & Brain Research PD & Site-Based Coaching

In order to best serve the students Cavanaugh, Reo, Riddle, and Willow (all of the LSD schools applying for SIG IV), LSD and Ingham ISD propose to use an intentionally reduced sum of both SIG and RAG funds in order to continue the highly impactful work which began during the 2014-2015 school year and add the much needed support and coordination of early interventions at the Pre-K level which are currently not allowed under RAG rules and guidelines. See **External Service Provider Selection** for additional details about how RAG funds and SIG funds could be coordinated to maximize the impact of both.

b. Describe how these positions will be operationalized, how they will be funded, how the appropriate FTEs will be assigned at the school level, and how they will support the SIG.

4b: This application (and the three other LSD applications) represent a coordinated and intentionally targeted joint SIG IV grant application. They are meant to be funded in concert in order to realize the resource efficiencies embedded in the implementation of the Early Learning Intervention Model as described throughout the application. As such we are requesting a slight deviation (for the SIG Coordinator) from the MDE FTE recommendations outlined above. Note: This school has less than 250 students.

SIG Coordinator: The SIG Coordinator position will be jointly funded between all four sites implementing the Early Learning Intervention Model (and applying for a SIG). As such it would be represented as a **.25 SIG-Funded FTE** at each of the four sites. This individual will work with building principals, the district transformation coordinator, and teacher leaders to support and oversee all aspects of reform plan implementation and monitoring. In addition, the SIG Coordinator will work with the building principals to plan and coordinator program budgets in accordance with SIG guidelines and federal regulation. The SIG Coordinator will also work with the MDE SIG Monitor to coordinate and complete SIG monitoring and compliance mandates and reports (e.g., leading and lagging, quarterly, and annual), ensure alignment between SIG and RR plans, as well as other district and building improvement efforts, and support the development of tools and mechanisms to assess SIG implementation and impact. The SIG Coordinator will also communicate, coordinate, and support the work with external service providers on the implementation of SIG. While we are requesting that this position be shared among all four sites, we do have support personnel at this district level (i.e., District Transformation Coordinator, Director of Instructional Support, State and Federal Compliance Officers, etc.) to provide assistance to the SIG Coordinator. In order to ensure the highest quality candidate for this position, the selection and hiring process will mirror the process described in **Section 1B** of the LEA

portion of this application. All four building principals will be closely involved in the selection of the SIG Coordinator position.

Data Coach: Because of our specialized vision for the data coaching role (i.e., be trained in the EDU-SNAP data collection instrument), the data coaches will be a contracted service at the equivalent of a **.5 SIG-Funded FTE** at each site. This individual will work with building principal, the district transformation coordinator, and teacher leaders planning and conducting staff development activities that focus on the use of data and assessments to enhance learning and collaborative instructional planning. The data coach will work with small groups of teachers and/or instructional leaders in analyzing data and using data to differentiate instruction and make data-driven decisions. He/She will facilitate meetings of Professional Learning Communities with a focus on data-driven dialogues, support teachers in the use of state and local assessment data, support the development of data-driven tools and mechanisms to assess SIG implementation and impact, and work with the building principal, district transformation coordinator, and teacher leaders to develop and disseminate data-based information on the School Improvement.

As previously noted, the LSD has a cadre training data coaches that have been working in support of our district-wide iCollaborate Initiative. Based on the success of the iCollaborate initiative in reflecting on and changing teacher practice, we will expand this process at SIG schools and go into more depth with early childhood research, data analysis, and connection to student achievement. Specifically, the data coaches will conduct targeted classroom observations using the EDU-SNAP instrument, and data will be shared at the school level, grade level, and across grade levels. A process of collaborative inquiry will be used with a focus on teachers making decisions that are not judgmental or evaluative. Individual teachers will use their own data to examine practice. Opportunities for change will be identified and action plans developed and put into practice. The data coach will follow up with classroom visits and conversations about practices. Video will be used to share practices with other teachers. Walkthroughs by other teachers and the principal will incorporate components of EDU-SNAP so there is coherence and a common language between observation instruments. The data coach will also coordinate classroom visits to view other grade levels to help create seamless transitions between grades, and finally an analysis of EDU-SNAP and student achievement data will be completed. In order to ensure the highest quality candidate for this position, the selection and hiring process will mirror the process described in **Section 1B** of the LEA portion of this application. All four building principals will be closely involved in the selection of the Data Coaches.

Family & Community Liaison: Because of the exceedingly important connection between school and home (especially in the early years) the Family & Community Liaison will be a **1.0 SIG-funded FTE** at each site. The Family and Community Liaison will assist in recruiting parents as volunteers within the school (e.g., classroom volunteers) for the purpose of increasing parent participation and student achievement. The Liaison will also collaborate with school staff and community partners to develop programs and classes to support parents and students outside of school (i.e., Parent University); facilitate outreach

to low income communities, community leaders and organizations for the purpose of developing resources and building partnerships with community members, assist in the preparation of a variety of written materials (e.g., newsletters, reports, logs, memos, handouts) for the purpose of documenting activities, providing written reference and/or conveying information, provide appropriate referrals and advocacy for families as needed and provides follow up to determine the outcome of services provided for the purpose of supporting families in working toward their goals, provide data for a variety of reports (e.g., program participation, activity) for the purpose of meeting program, district, state and federal requirements, confer with teachers, parents and/or appropriate community agency personnel for the purpose of assisting in evaluating student progress and/or implementing student objectives, participate in a variety of presentations, meetings, workshops and committees for the purpose of conveying and/or gathering information required to perform functions and remaining knowledgeable with current professional program regulations. In order to ensure the highest quality candidate for this position, the selection and hiring process will mirror the process described in **Section 1B** of the LEA portion of this application. All four building principals will be closely involved in the selection of the Family and Community Liaisons.

c. **Describe how this work will be operationalized, how it will be funded, how the appropriate FTE will be assigned at the school level, and how it will support the SIG. If not providing this service, no response is necessary.**

4c: In the Lansing School District, we understand that the social and emotional needs of our students must be met in order to for them to achieve at high levels. As such, we have proactively taken steps to ensure the social and emotional support students need is place in our schools. Through the use of Title I Priority and 31a funds, every school in Lansing is provided a Student Assistance Provider (SAP). The SAPs are funded at .5FTE or 1.0 FTE depending upon the size and need of the building. SAP are required to have a Masters Degree in Social Work (or the equivalent). Because this bold step has been taken and the social, emotional, and mental health support our students need is already in place. We have opted to **not** allocate SIG IV funds towards a Mental Health Specialist.

d. **Professional development must be provided throughout the school year (late start, early releases, school days without students, etc.) at least 8 hours per month for all professionals in the building including the administrators and support staff. All professional development cannot occur during the summer. Professional development should be job-embedded and tied to demonstrated need. Describe how student data will be used to identify content of professional learning and how the school will deliver the required professional development throughout the year. Provide a draft professional development calendar for year 1 of the grant (Attachment B)**

4d: The enormous challenges that we face, and needs of our students, have led the district and school leaders to pursue significant changes to the way we approach the education of our students. These changes require a comprehensive and systemic approach to supporting meaningful professional learning. With our focus on implementing SIG in order to increase academic excellence and improve climate and culture we will utilize **nine hours** of monthly teacher collaboration time. Eight of these hours will occur during weekly (two hours each Wednesday morning) delayed starts and one additional hour for grade-level PLCs. This time will be used to expand high-quality instructional strategies, data-based collaboration, and develop skills among the instructional and non-instructional staff to meet the needs of our students. During these 9 hours the staff will utilize a closely monitored and facilitated PLC model that will support the implementation of our reform strategies. Detailed below are two specific areas we will devote on-going, job-embedded, professional learning time:

- iCollaborate: The iCollaborate initiative has become an important catalyst for improvement in our PK-3rd grade schools for the past 3 years. It is an initiative to improve instructional effectiveness while building a culture of collaborative inquiry where educators feel safe to reflect on their practice, adopt a mindset of continuous improvement, and a willingness to use data as the impetus for discussion and exploration. As previously noted, classroom observations are conducted in each classroom by a trained data coach with the web-based EDU-SNAP observation instrument (Ritchie, Wiser, Mason, Holland, and Howes, 2010). This provides teachers with valuable, quantifiable information regarding how children spend their day. The information permits teachers to reflect critically on their instructional practices. Driven by this data, job-embedded support and is provided to teachers in the form of instructional/data coaching. This data also guides professional learning communities in order to increase students' exposure to quality instruction.
- Tiered Support: The staff will also be trained on an evidence-based, three-tiered model of prevention and intervention (IIBlocks). The implementation of IIBlocks is right in line with Early Learning Intervention Model and ensures that students receive high quality instruction and interventions matched to their needs. In this model, teachers monitor progress frequently to make decisions about changes in instruction or goals and apply student response data to important educational decisions. The IIBlock structure allows staff to make instructional decisions in general, remedial, and special education tiers, creating a well-integrated system of instruction/intervention guided by student outcome data. The staff will be implementing screeners in the areas of math and ELA to determine student needs. Based on students' performance data and student work samples further training in appropriate interventions, for MySidewalks, will be provided during the 9 hours of monthly collaboration time. The data collected on walkthroughs and progress monitoring will be analyzed during the weekly "delayed start" team meetings. Adjustments to inventions will be made using progress monitoring and student work samples.

For additional information and details about professional learning in Year 1, please see **Attachment B**.

5. External Service Provider Selection

Describe the process the building and district has used or will use to screen and select external service providers (ESPs) or Whole School Reform Model Developer from the MDE approved ESP list. Include the following:

- **How the individuals, team, or committee responsible for vetting and selecting ESP was determined**
- **Process used to research provider and review evidence of effectiveness**
- **A description of the decision making process (i.e. voting or staff consensus)**

5: The selection of an External Service Provider (ESP) is not one that is taken lightly. Ideally, an ESP serves as a true partner in the implementation of the SIG reform model, assisting in the planning, implementation, and monitoring of grant outcomes and goals. Because the Lansing School District has been previously awarded a SIG (two schools were awarded in the SIG III cohort) we have had some experience screening and selecting ESPs. Initial screening and selection is completed early in the process by the SIG planning and writing team (composed of members from the central office and schools). Members of this team are selected based on previous SIG experience, professional specializations (i.e., knowledge of state and federal regulations), and/or knowledge of the SIG reform interventions and strategies. The initial screening and selection of an ESP is driven by (a) a review of our data-based needs, (b) a review of MDEs Preferred ESP list (no longer available), (c) the requirements embedded in the specific reform model selected for implementation (the Early Learning Intervention Model), (d) recommendations from colleagues that have previously worked with a given ESP, and (e) review of evidence of prior effectiveness. Specifically we asked the ESP to provide documentation of previous work, similar in scale and scope, along with evidence of impact data. Ultimately when selecting and ESP we strive for district and building-level consensus.

Fortunately, the Lansing School District has enjoyed successful experience working with Ingham ISD (IISD) as an external provider to Priority Schools. The selection of Ingham ISD (IISD) as an external provider allows for the continuity of practice needed to achieve the goals and strategies identified in the SIG. IISD has been willing to be flexible to school based needs, has provided on-going technical assistance and monitoring related to the Instructional Learning Cycles, as well as site-based support through content coaching. The Lansing School District schools have a strong and well planned model for rapid turnaround and IISD has proven responsive to that model with methods and strategies that meet the specific demographic and organizational needs of our students and families. Each LSD SIG IV applicant school has identified Ingham ISD as its external service provider. This selection allows the schools to maximize resources by coordinating support services and sharing processes and lessons learned.

In order to best serve our schools and students, and because we are submitting a targeted application that augments existing R&R plans with the Early Learning Intervention Model, we are submitted a SIG IV application with a very streamlined budget but are asking MDE to consider continued (at a pro-rated level) RAG funding. This would allow us to leverage RAG funds to (a) continue the highly impactful work which began during the 2014-2015 school year and (b) add the much needed support and coordination of early interventions at the Pre-K level which are currently not allowed under RAG rules and guidelines.

2014-2015 RAG Success and Why RAG should Continue in These Schools

- Implementation of comprehensive math interventions for all students.
  - Through the implementation of Rocket Math and Vanderbilt's University's K-Pals, LSD priority schools experience aggregate gains K-3 in foundational mathematic skills including math computation and math comprehension. Specifically in kindergarten classrooms, LSD priority schools saw an average of a 20% increase in oral counting, early numeracy, and math computation as measured by AIMSweb fall and spring benchmark assessment.
- Intervention Blocks in all schools
  - Each school implemented supplemental intervention time outside of core time to target specific data driven evidence-based interventions based on the individual needs of each students.
  - All certified staff assignments were prioritized to place the most skilled staff with the neediest students.
- Content Coaching
  - Teachers experienced both on-site and ISD driven professional coaching and development towards better instructional practices.
- Building Walk-Throughs
  - ISD personnel partnered with district personnel to conduct frequent walk-throughs to progress monitor and provide immediate feedback of RAG funded initiatives.

Proposed SIG/RAG Funding for 2015-2016 and Proposed RAG Reduction

- LSD and IISD administration will collaboratively prioritize SIG and RAG funding to ensure that efforts are sustainable and have a high impact within each the classroom.
  - In requesting a reduced amount of SIG funding in order to build a network of early intervention support between four priority schools, LSD and Ingham ISD will request MDE to reduce the RAG for each school by 30% (for these buildings) to partially off-set MDE's commitment of new SIG IV funding.
  - By utilizing both SIG and RAG funds, it is the goal of LSD and IISD to develop a sustainable and transferable Pre-K to 3rd grade model that can be reproduced throughout Lansing and all 12 Ingham County Districts.

The LSD has established a comprehensive process for monitoring and accountability. The support provided by an ESP is subject to the same intensive scrutiny and oversight. The ESPs, working with central office and building level support, analyze the impact of services on core metrics and use disaggregated data from several sources to monitor service and program impact on measurable goals and outcomes. ESPs working with SIG-funded schools and the District Transformation Coordinator (Title I funded) develop a comprehensive plan of support based on data and unique building needs. The ESP then executes the plan and (in collaboration with district and building leaders) monitors outcomes. In addition to our on-going monitoring efforts, our relationships with ESPs is formalized through a written contract (i.e., a Contract Service Agreement) that specifies costs, deliverables, a timeline for services and supports, and a termination/non-renewal clause that allows the district to terminate the relationship if the district is not satisfied, in any way, with services and supports being provided.

6. **Increased Learning Time**
   a. **Describe how increased learning time (lengthening the school day, week or year) will be scheduled.**
   b. **Describe how increased learning time will be spent engaging students in learning, not just adding clock time to a schedule.**
   c. **Indicate whether or not an agreement with the union will be required to support increased learning time, and if so, will the agreement be signed prior to the start of the school year?**

6: In order to mitigate summer learning loss (i.e., the summer slide) we have documented using AIMsweb and DRA II data, using SIG IV funds, we will increase the school year by 12 days. Specifically, we will add three four-day weeks throughout the summer. This is an extended year model that we have found to be effective in our Pre-K to 3 buildings in the district. In this model we will provide 48 hours of additional support in core academic areas for our students. Rather than being set-up as an extension of the school year, during these weeks students are placed in multi-grade/age classrooms and benefit from the use of a project-based learning model. Project-based learning is a dynamic approach to teaching in which students explore real-world problems and challenges. With this type of active and engaged learning, students are inspired to obtain a deeper core content knowledge. A tentative list of projects for students to explore include: energy conservation, composting, physics in motion, web design, health and wellness, graphic novels, etc. All students will be invited to attend the extended year program which will take place in June and August. In addition to the building-based (SIG-funded) extended year program, the LSD also offers 12 days of extended year programming (again using a project-based learning model) that students will also be able to participate in. This program is funded through a combination of Title I and Title I Priority funds and is offered in July. Between these two programs students will have six weeks (or approximately 96 hours) of summer extended learning time opportunities.

Also during the 2015-2016 school year the LSD will be moving to a district-wide delayed start on Wednesday mornings. As previously noted, this will allow for considerable teacher collaboration time each week (approximately 120 minutes). However, in order to accommodate for this change in schedule, 25 minutes were added to each school day. This results in a small net increase in learning time for students and 72 hours of teacher collaboration time (this entire change in schedule is cost-neutral and, as such, will not be reflected SIG budgets).

In order to provide the summer extended year program detailed in this section of the application, no specific contract deviations, amendments, or MOUs will be required. Our current contract does have existing language related to compensation rates for teachers beyond the normal academic year. The delayed start and addition of minutes to each school day does require a signed MOU. The details of this MOU are in the final stages of discussion (as of June 25, 2015) and the MOU should be signed within the next few weeks.

7. **Timeline**
   a. **Attach a comprehensive five-year timeline for implementing the selected intervention (Attachment F). Identify who is responsible for each implementation activity. (PRIORITY SCHOOLS ONLY): For year one, note which activities have already occurred due to being previously identified.**

X Completed and included as **Attachment F**.

8. **Annual Goals**
   a. **Determine the school's student academic achievement goals in the core content areas for each of the next five years as determined by local and state assessments. Take into account the changing state assessments and how that will affect goal setting. At a minimum, mathematics and reading must be included. For example, if the present proficiency rate in mathematics is 18%, what will it be at the end of years one through five? (Attachment G)**

X Completed and included as **Attachment G**.

   b. **Describe how data will be used for continuous improvement, and how often it will be analyzed.**

8b: On-going student data analysis will occur at weekly facilitated grade-level PLCs. In order to ensure continuous improvement, staff will review and refine existing student data to examine individual student progress and overall grade-level success. Staff will determine whether instructional interventions are being successful. This data will be used as a basis for guiding differentiated instruction and will be discussed and shared widely with stakeholders, at least monthly, at building-level PLC meetings and principal-led data conferences. Below is a list of assessments that are currently in use in the building.

Reading Assessments:
- Kindergarten – DRA II, WIDA, and AIMSweb (Note: We are exploring kindergarten screeners for future implementation)
- First & Second grade – DRA II, WIDA, and AIMSweb
- Third grade – DRA II, WIDA, AIMSweb, and M-Step

DRA data is collected three times per year for benchmarking and every four weeks for progress monitoring. WIDA is an annual assessment. AIMSweb is collected three times per year for benchmarking.

Math Assessments:
- Kindergarten – AIMSweb and K-Pals (Note: We are exploring kindergarten screeners for future implementation)
- First & Second grade – AIMSweb and Rocket Math
- Third grade – AIMSweb, Rocket Math and M-Step

AIMSweb is collected three times per year for benchmarking and every four weeks for progress monitoring. K-Pals and RocketMath is collected daily as part of an intensive math intervention.

Pre-K (GSRP) assessments: The Pre-School Program Quality Assessment (PQA) which is required for all GSRP programs collects process data used to examine classroom quality. Child Observation Record (COR) that examines 9 key areas of development and learning is then used by LSD and Ingham ISD staff to monitor the progress at three specific points throughout the year to gage the overall success of Pre-K efforts.

Other Data/Metrics: In addition, we are also systematically collecting attendance, behavior, and suspension data (monthly) to guide our continuous improvement process.

iCollaborate data (collected at least quarterly) will give teachers and administrators a keen sense of ways to improve the "how" and increase meaningful instructional time. As noted, classroom observation data is conducted in each classroom by a trained data coach with the web-based observation instrument. This data provides teachers with valuable, quantifiable information regarding how children spend their day. The data permits teachers to reflect critically on their instructional practices. Driven by this data, job-embedded support is provided to teachers in the form of instructional/data coaching.

9. Sustaining Reforms

Describe how the reforms from the selected intervention will be sustained in this school after the funding period ends. How will capacity be increased as a result of receiving the grant, and what commitment(s) will be made to sustain reforms after the grant period ends?

9: Sustainability and building capacity are the result of well-planned and purposeful program design, coherence, and planning. The interventions and strategies described in this plan are grounded in relevant school data, and are steeped in a comprehensive view rapid turnaround. The selection of the Early Learning Intervention Model (to augment the existing R&R plan) was not arbitrary, and as resources and conditions change, as they most certainly will, consistency in programming and the structures supporting this work is assured. The interventions and strategies outlined in this application are aligned with school and district Title I, Title II, Section 31a, and Regional Assistance Grant allocations, as well as the DIP which ensures multiple viable funding streams after the grant period ends.

Capacity building in the leaders (district and building) as well as other members of the staff will be developed through the site-based support of highly-skilled members of the SIG team including the SIG Coordinator, Data Coach, and Family and Community Liaison. The on-going, job-embedded, training and support provided by these individuals over the first three years of full implementation will result in new knowledge and skill acquisition by members of the leadership team and staff. Additionally, a solid foundation for changes in the structure and day-to-day operations of the school (i.e., PLCs, IIBlocks, Multi-Tiered Support System, and the use of data) will remain after the grant period ends. Furthermore, the

curriculum related tools and alignment work that will be completed between the Pre-K, K, and 1st grade teams will be able to spread throughout the district.

The SIG IV sustainability plan was the launching off point for how this grant application was written and developed. The plan was developed by the SIG IV writing and planning team, that is comprised of district and building leaders, as well as community partners. As the grant process continues to unfolder additional stakeholders will be invited to assist us in refining and improving our sustainability plan. Those stakeholders will be selected based on (a) their knowledge of plan components, (b) their professional expertise (e.g., state and federal funding regulations, and (c) their connection to the school and community. As noted elsewhere in the application, we anticipate Ingham ISD providing significant support as the ESP. And by utilizing both SIG and RAG funds, it is the goal of LSD and IISD to develop a sustainable and transferable Pre-K to 3rd grade model that can be reproduced throughout Lansing and, perhaps, the county. Because we are submitting a targeted application that augments an existing R&R plan with the Early Learning Intervention Model, we are submitted a SIG IV application with a very streamlined budget but are asking MDE to consider continued (at a pro-rated level) RAG funding. This would allow us to leverage RAG funds to (a) continue the highly impactful work which began during the 2014-2015 school year and (b) add the much needed support and coordination of early interventions at the Pre-K level which are currently not allowed under RAG rules and guidelines. Diversifying the funding streams, at the onset of the grant, will allow for greater long-term sustainability.

Our sustainability plan ensures that after the grant cycle has ended the leadership team will have the capacity, structures, and resources in place to support continuous improvement in teaching and learning. Additionally, the plan ensures that there will be multiple funding options available to ensure the most effective practices and supports remain in place. **Table 9** details some of the major components of the selected reform model and how they will be sustained after the duration of the grant.

Table 9: Sustaining Major Components of the Plan

EBS	Description	Sustainability Plan	Continued Funding
SIG Coordinator	Responsible for grant management and oversight	Shift to the district transformation coordinator	Title I Priority
Family & Community Liaison	Building relationships with families and community partners to support reforms	Capacity will be built in building principal and staff	N/A
Professional Learning (PLCs)	Facilitated teacher collaboration time to examine data and share best practices	PLCs will remain on Wednesday delayed start days	Title I & II
MySidewalks	A literacy intervention to improve and sustain reading achievement.	Resources will be secured during Years 1, 2, and 3	Title I (if needed)
Preschool MTSS	MTSS to provide targeted intervention to Pre-K students.	Structure and training will be in place by the end of Year 3	N/A
EDU-SNAP Data Collection	The systemic collection of instructional process data.	Capacity will be built in building principal and staff	Title II

EDU-SNAP Data Coaching	Site-based coaching to support teachers in improving instructional practices.	Fewer days of direct site-based support	Title II
Extended Year	12 days of additional instruction in core academic areas during the summer.	Student would participate in district-wide extended year	Title I & Title I Priority

The Lansing School District is committed to maintaining (and perhaps scaling-up) those practices and structures which prove to have a positive impact on student achievement through the use of other available funding sources including local, state, and federal funds.

10. Budget Narrative and Preliminary Budget

Provide narrative for this section that describes the following:

a. Description of appropriate staffing and activities to the support the intervention model at the school level for the full five years of the grant. <u>Indicate which option</u> the school is selecting from those detailed below.

10a: This application (and the three other LSD applications) represent a coordinated and intentionally targeted joint SIG IV grant application. They are meant to be funded in concert in order to realize the resource efficiencies embedded in the implementation of the Early Learning Intervention Model as described throughout the application. As such we are requesting a slight deviation (for the SIG Coordinator) from the MDE FTE recommendations outlined above. Note: This school has less than 250 students. Because so much of this work builds upon existing work underway we have decided to select **Option #2** with three years of full implementation and two years of sustainability.

<u>SIG Coordinator</u>: The SIG Coordinator position will be jointly funded between all four sites (all four schools have submitted SIG IV applications) implementing the Early Learning Intervention Model. As such it would be represented as a **.25 SIG-funded FTE** at each of the four sites. (Note: Additional SIG oversight and management will be provided by the District Transformation Coordinator, and Director of Instructional Support.) This individual will work with building principals, the district transformation coordinator, and teacher leaders to support and oversee all aspects of plan implementation and monitoring. For a detailed description of this position please see **Section 4b** or **Attachment D.1**.

<u>Data Coach</u>: Because of our specialized vision for the data coaching role (i.e., be trained in the EDU-SNAP data collection instrument), the data coaches will be a contracted service at the equivalent of a **.5 SIG-funded FTE** at each site. The data coach will work with small groups of teachers and/or instructional leaders in analyzing data and using data to differentiate instruction. For a detailed description of this position please see **Section 4b** or **Attachment D.2**.

<u>Family & Community Liaison</u>: Because of the exceedingly important connection between school and home (especially in the early years) the Family & Community Liaison will be a **1.0 SIG-funded FTE** at each site. The Family and Community Liaison will assist in recruiting parents as volunteers within the school (e.g., classroom volunteers) for the purpose of increasing parent participation and student achievement. The Liaison will also

collaborate with school staff and community partners to develop programs and classes to support parents and students outside of school (i.e., Parent University). For a detailed description of this position **Section 4b** or **Attachment D.3**.

Due to space constraints, we have opted to use the remaining space to detail one additional position we are building into our plan. For a detailed description of specific strategies and activities please see **Sections 3e, 4b, 4d, and 6** of this application.

Early Childhood Interventionist: This position will be a **1.0 SIG-funded FTE** at each site. This individual will promote enhanced early literacy/math instruction and student learning by helping Pre-K, K, and 1st grade teachers develop more effective teaching strategies that allow all students to reach high academic standards. The Early Childhood Interventionist will model research-based best practices that address how students learn in core academic areas, collaborate with individual teachers through co-planning and co-teaching, assist administrative and instructional staff in interpreting data and designing approaches to improve student achievement, promote teachers' delivery and understanding of the High Scope, K, and 1st grade curriculums through collaborative PLCs, and work with Tier I and Tier II students, in one-on-one or small group settings, in core academic areas. For a detailed description of this position please see **Attachment D.4**.

b. How the school's yearly budgets and activities will differ over the five year period of the grant. Indicate at the beginning of the narrative whether the school will use option 1 or option 2 detailed below.

10b: This application (and the three other LSD applications) represent a coordinated and intentionally targeted joint SIG IV grant application. They are meant to be funded in concert in order to realize the resource efficiencies embedded in the implementation of the Early Learning Intervention Model as described throughout the application. Because so much of this work builds upon existing work underway we have decided to select **Option #2** with three years of full implementation and two years of sustainability.

Year 0 – 2014/15 (Pre-Implementation): Even though we are opting for **Option #2**, we wanted to share some of the pre-implementation groundwork that has been laid to prepare us for full implementation in the Fall of 2015. To begin, this school already has in place a robust MDE-approved R&R plan that has been driving intensive intervention throughout the year. Instructional Learning Cycles, along with high functioning PLCs, are already in place. Building leaders and teacher are learning, with district and ISD-based support, to use data to differentiate instruction and drive decision-making. Additionally, we have a strong working relationship with our ISD. Ingham ISD provides very intensive support for Priority Schools in implementing MTSS and intensive intervention through the RAG (and SIG III as our ESP). This important groundwork and the targeted nature of our application, we believe, positions us nicely to jump right into full implementation.

Year 1 – 2015/16 (Full Implementation): In order to best serve our schools and students, both in the short-term (rapid change) and long-term (sustainability) we are submitting a targeted application that augments existing R&R plans with the Early Learning Intervention Model. Overhead costs and those associated with district–level oversight and fiscal

compliance are minimized. (Note: Oversight and fiscal compliance will be provided in-kind or through existing categorically funded positions within the district). At the district level only indirect at 4.41% is being taken out in order to streamline the budget and ensure that every possible dollar is used to support student and teachers in the implementation of the grant activities. Staffing constitutes the bulk of our SIG IV budget. During Years 1, 2, & 3 (Full implementation) there will be a total of 2.75 FTEs added to the building between the SIG Coordinator, Data Coach, Family/Community Liaison, and Early Childhood Interventionist positions. These individuals will provide site-based support and build capacity within existing leadership and staff to sustain reform efforts. Contracted service line items have also been built in to support our use of the EDU-SNAP classroom observation tools, provide on-going job-embedded PD, and ESP support through Ingham ISD. Additional hours for 12 days of extended learning, along with materials and supplies, and transportation have also been included. Finally, we have also built in line items for supplemental curriculum and assessment materials, as well as technology.

Year 2 – 2016/17 (Full Implementation): The Year 2 budget remains largely the same as Year 1 with a couple of minor exceptions. In Year 2 the technology line item is reduced to reflect the investment in technology from Year 1. A new line item, though related, is a modest allocation for PD and training in the use of technology. Note: Adjustments may be made based on the impact of interventions and student achievement.

Year 3 – 2017/18 (Full Implementation): The Year 3 budget remains largely the same as Year 2. Note: Adjustments may be made based on the impact of interventions and student achievement.

Years 4 & 5 - 2018/19 to 2019/20 (Sustainability): The changes in the budget for Years 4 & 5 represent an intentional, and strategic, scaling-back of resources and support. As detailed in **Table 9: Sustaining Major Components of the Plan** many elements of the plan remain in place, but funding streams are shifted or the level of support is scaled back. Staffing will be scaled back with the district and ISD taking on much more of the grant management and oversight work. During Years 4 & 5 (Sustainability) there will be a total of 1.5 FTEs added to the building between the SIG Coordinator, Data Coach, Family/Community Liaison, and Early Childhood Interventionist positions. Contracted service line items are scaled back and ISD-based support would return to being funded largely through RAG. Extended learning opportunities would continue to be offered through the district-based extended learning program, and supplemental curriculum and assessment materials, as well as technology, would be scaled back. Of course, every attempt will be made to maintain support and resources at the levels needed based on data-identified needs. Note: Adjustments may be made based on the impact of interventions and student achievement.

Reiteration of potential SIG/RAG Split: In order to best serve our schools and students, and because we are submitting a targeted application that augments existing R&R plans with the Early Learning Intervention Model, we are submitted a SIG IV application with a very streamlined budget but are asking MDE to consider continued (at a pro-rated level) RAG funding. This would also us to leverage RAG funds to (a) continue the highly impactful work which began during the 2014-2015 school year and (b) add the much needed support and coordination of early interventions at the Pre-K level which are currently not allowed under RAG rules and guidelines.

2014-2015 RAG Success and Why RAG should Continue in These Schools

- Implementation of comprehensive math interventions for all students.
    - Through the implementation of Rocket Math and Vanderbilt's University's K-Pals, LSD priority schools experience aggregate gains K-3 in foundational mathematic skills including math computation and math comprehension. Specifically in kindergarten classrooms, LSD priority schools saw an average of a 20% increase in oral counting, early numeracy, and math computation as measured by AIMSweb fall and spring benchmark assessment.
- Intervention Blocks in all schools
    - Each school implemented supplemental intervention time outside of core time to target specific data driven evidence-based interventions based on the individual needs of each students.
    - All certified staff assignments were prioritized to place the most skilled staff with the neediest students.
- Content Coaching
    - Teachers experienced both on-site and ISD driven professional coaching and development towards better instructional practices.
- Building Walk-Throughs
    - ISD personnel partnered with district personnel to conduct frequent walk-throughs to progress monitor and provide immediate feedback of RAG funded initiatives.

<u>Proposed SIG/RAG Funding for 2015-2016 and Proposed RAG Reduction</u>

- LSD and IISD administration will collaboratively prioritize SIG and RAG funding to ensure that efforts are sustainable and have a high impact within each the classroom.
    - In requesting a reduced amount of SIG funding in order to build a network of early intervention support between four priority schools, LSD and Ingham ISD will request MDE **to reduce the RAG for each school by 30%** (for these buildings) to partially off-set MDE's commitment of new SIG IV funding.
    - By utilizing both SIG and RAG funds, it is the goal of LSD and IISD to develop a sustainable and transferable Pre-K to 3rd grade model that can be reproduced throughout Lansing and all 12 Ingham County Districts.

c. Complete the preliminary building level budgets for all five years of the grant. (Attachment C.1)

<u>X</u> Completed and included as **Attachment C.1**.

Attachment A: Baseline Data Collection

_X_ Completed and uploaded into **MEGS+.**

SIG Data Requirements

The MDE is required to send this information to the United States Department of Education (USED) on an annual basis.

USED SIG Data Requirements

Provide the most current data for each school to be served with the School Improvement Grant. These data elements will be collected annually for School Improvement Grant recipients.

Data Group (*Office Use Only*)	Heading & Description	SY 2014-2015 Baseline Year 1
DG5	**Building Code**	04551
XXX	**School Name**	Willow Elementary
DG4	**District Code**	33020
XXX	**District Name**	Lansing School District
DG728	**School Improvement Status**	Priority
DG728	**Intervention Used** The type of intervention used by the school under the School Improvement Grant (turnaround, restart, evidence-based whole-school reform, early learning intervention, closure, or transformation).	ELRN - Early Learning
DG752	**Baseline Indicator Status** The baseline year is the school year immediately previous to the first year a school implemented one of the intervention models and received SIG funds.	YES
DG729	**School Year Minutes** *If decreased time please explain in DG745 Supplemental.*	67297.0
DG745	**Increased Learning Time (ILT)** Did the school provide for increased learning time from previous year?	NO
DG745	**ILT - Longer School Year** Did the school provide longer school year for increased learning time?	NO
DG745	**ILT - Longer School Day** Did the school provide longer school day for increased learning time?	NO
DG745	**ILT - Before or After School** Did the school provide before or after school for increased learning time?	NO
DG745	**ILT - Summer School** Did the school provide summer school for increased learning time?	NO
DG745	**ILT - Weekend School** Did the school provide weekend school for increased learning time?	NO

Data Group (*Office Use Only*)	Heading & Description	SY 2014-2015 Baseline Year 1
DG745	**ILT - Other** Did the school provide increased learning time other than longer school year, longer school day, before or after school, summer school, weekend school? *If yes, include information about the type of increased learning time in the explanation field in row 40.*	NO
DG745 Supplement	**Explanation** Explanation of other type of increased or decreased learning time. (maximum of 200 characters)	
Student Data		
DG731	**Student Attendance Rate** The count of school days during the regular school year (plus summer, if applicable) students attended school divided by the maximum number of days students could have attended school during the regular school year.	93.60%
XXX	Dropout Rate	24.81%
XXX	Number of Disciplinary Incidents	78
XXX	Number of Students Involved in Disciplinary Incidents	31
XXX	Number of Truant Students	17.20%
High Schools Only Data		
DG732	**Advanced Coursework** The number of students who complete advanced coursework, such as Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate classes, or advanced mathematics. Applies to grades 9-12 only.	NA
XXX	International Baccalaureate	NA
XXX	Early College/College Credit	NA
DG733	**Dual Enrollment** The number of high school students who complete at least one class in a postsecondary institution. Applies to grades 9-12 only.	NA
DG734	**Advanced Coursework & Dual Enrollment** The number of students who complete advance coursework and complete at least one class in a postsecondary institution. Applies to grades 9-12 only.	NA
XXX	High School Graduation Rate	NA
XXX	**College Enromment** Number of students enrolled in college from most recent graduating class.	NA
Teacher Data		

Data Group (*Office Use Only*)	Heading & Description	SY 2014-2015 Baseline Year 1	
DG735	**Teacher Attendance Rate** The number of FTE days teachers worked divided by the maximum number of FTE-teacher working days.	90.20%	

SIG Data Requirements

The MDE is required to send this information to the United States Department of Education (USED) on an annual basis.

USED SIG Data Requirements

Provide the most current data for each school to be served with the School Improvement Grant. These data elements will be collected annually for School Improvement Grant recipients.

Data Group (*Office Use Only*)	Heading & Description	SY 2014-2015 Baseline Year 1
DG5	**Building Code**	04551
XXX	**School Name**	Willow Elementary
DG4	**District Code**	33020
XXX	**District Name**	Lansing School District
DG728	**School Improvement Status**	Priority
DG728	**Intervention Used** The type of intervention used by the school under the School Improvement Grant (turnaround, restart, evidence-based whole-school reform, early learning intervention, closure, or transformation).	ELRN - Early Learning
DG752	**Baseline Indicator Status** The baseline year is the school year immediately previous to the first year a school implemented one of the intervention models and received SIG funds.	YES
DG729	**School Year Minutes** *If decreased time please explain in DG745 Supplemental.*	67297.0
DG745	**Increased Learning Time (ILT)** Did the school provide for increased learning time from previous year?	NO
DG745	**ILT - Longer School Year** Did the school provide longer school year for increased learning time?	NO
DG745	**ILT - Longer School Day** Did the school provide longer school day for increased learning time?	NO
DG745	**ILT - Before or After School** Did the school provide before or after school for increased learning time?	NO
DG745	**ILT - Summer School** Did the school provide summer school for increased learning time?	NO
DG745	**ILT - Weekend School** Did the school provide weekend school for increased learning time?	NO

Data Group (*Office Use Only*)	Heading & Description	SY 2014-2015 Baseline Year 1
DG745	**ILT - Other** Did the school provide increased learning time other than longer school year, longer school day, before or after school, summer school, weekend school? *If yes, include information about the type of increased learning time in the explanation field in row 40.*	NO
DG745 Supplement	**Explanation** Explanation of other type of increased or decreased learning time. (maximum of 200 characters)	
Student Data		
DG731	**Student Attendance Rate** The count of school days during the regular school year (plus summer, if applicable) students attended school divided by the maximum number of days students could have attended school during the regular school year.	93.60%
XXX	Dropout Rate	24.81%
XXX	Number of Disciplinary Incidents	78
XXX	Number of Students Involved in Disciplinary Incidents	31
XXX	Number of Truant Students	17.20%
High Schools Only Data		
DG732	**Advanced Coursework** The number of students who complete advanced coursework, such as Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate classes, or advanced mathematics. Applies to grades 9-12 only.	NA
XXX	International Baccalaureate	NA
XXX	Early College/College Credit	NA
DG733	**Dual Enrollment** The number of high school students who complete at least one class in a postsecondary institution. Applies to grades 9-12 only.	NA
DG734	**Advanced Coursework & Dual Enrollment** The number of students who complete advance coursework and complete at least one class in a postsecondary institution. Applies to grades 9-12 only.	NA
XXX	High School Graduation Rate	NA
XXX	**College Enromment** Number of students enrolled in college from most recent graduating class.	NA
Teacher Data		

Data Group (*Office Use Only*)	Heading & Description	SY 2014-2015 Baseline Year 1	
DG735	**Teacher Attendance Rate** The number of FTE days teachers worked divided by the maximum number of FTE-teacher working days.	90.20%	

Attachment B: Professional Development Calendar

Note: This calendar reflects a tentative set of topics and responsible parties associated with each of the weekly delayed start (120 minutes) PD opportunities.

Professional Development Calendar for 2015-2016		
Month & Week	Tentative PD Topic	Who is responsible?
September (W1)	MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs)	Principal; SIT; ISD
September (W2)	iCollaborate (PLCs)	District; SIT; Data Coach
September (W3)	Culturally Responsive PBIS; CHAMPS (PLCs)	District; C3 Team; ISD
September (W4)	MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs)	Principal; SIT; ISD
October (W1)	iCollaborate (PLCs)	District; SIT; Data Coach
October (W2)	Culturally Responsive PBIS; CHAMPS (PLCs)	District; C3 Team; ISD
October (W3)	MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs)	Principal; SIT; ISD
October (W4)	iCollaborate (PLCs)	District; SIT; Data Coach
November (W1)	Culturally Responsive PBIS; CHAMPS (PLCs)	District; C3 Team; ISD
November (W2)	MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs)	Principal; SIT; ISD
November (W3)	iCollaborate (PLCs)	District; SIT; Data Coach
November (W4)	Thanksgiving Break	
December (W1)	Culturally Responsive PBIS; CHAMPS (PLCs)	District; C3 Team; ISD
December (W2)	MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs)	Principal; SIT; ISD
December (W1)	Winter Break	
December (W2)	Winter Break	
January (W1)	Winter Break	
January (W2)	iCollaborate (PLCs)	District; SIT; Data Coach
January (W3)	Culturally Responsive PBIS; CHAMPS (PLCs)	District; C3 Team; ISD
January (W4)	MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs)	Principal; SIT; ISD
February (W1)	iCollaborate (PLCs)	District; SIT; Data Coach
February (W2)	Culturally Responsive PBIS; CHAMPS (PLCs)	District; C3 Team; ISD
February (W3)	MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs)	Principal; SIT; ISD
February (W4)	iCollaborate (PLCs)	District; SIT; Data Coach
March (W1)	Culturally Responsive PBIS; CHAMPS (PLCs)	District; C3 Team; ISD
March (W2)	MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs)	Principal; SIT; ISD
March (W3)	iCollaborate (PLCs)	District; SIT; Data Coach
March (W4)	Culturally Responsive PBIS; CHAMPS (PLCs)	District; C3 Team; ISD
April (W1)	Spring Break	
April (W2)	MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs)	Principal; SIT; ISD
April (W3)	iCollaborate (PLCs)	District; SIT; Data Coach
April (W4)	Culturally Responsive PBIS; CHAMPS (PLCs)	District; C3 Team; ISD
May (W1)	MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs)	Principal; SIT; ISD
May (W2)	iCollaborate (PLCs)	District; SIT; Data Coach
May (W3)	Culturally Responsive PBIS; CHAMPS (PLCs)	District; C3 Team; ISD
May (W4)	MTSS; Instructional Learning Cycles; Intervention Blocks (PLCs)	Principal; SIT; ISD
June (W1)	iCollaborate (PLCs)	District; SIT; Data Coach
June (W2)	Culturally Responsive PBIS; CHAMPS (PLCs)	District; C3 Team; ISD

: Preliminary School Level Budget

NOTE: Preliminary budgets are for planning and review purposes only. Initial approval of the grant application does not grant explicit approval to all preliminary budget items. Final approval of SIG budget items occurs in the Michigan Electronic Grants System Plus (MEGS+) and is subject to Title I rules of supplement vs. supplant, tests of allowability, and reasonable and necessary expenditures to support the approved reform model. Inclusion of an item in the preliminary budget does not guarantee it will be approved as a line item submitted in MEGS+.

LEAs may apply for School Improvement grants for each individual eligible school building within their jurisdiction. For the purposes of this grant, eligible school buildings are Title I eligible or Title I receiving Priority or Focus schools.
A separate budget and budget detail narrative is required for each building. Please use duplicate pages as necessary. The budget must cover the five-year period of the grant, with each year separate and distinct from the preceding year. Budgets that do not distinguish between the five years of the grant will be considered incomplete and will receive reduced scores accordingly.

There are two options allowed for the five-year grant period. These are detailed below:

Option 1:

- Year 1: Pre-implementation and planning not to exceed $750,000. These activities comprise the budget for year 1.
- Years 2-4: Full implementation not to exceed $1.5 million annually. Each year of implementation requires a separate budget.
- Year 5: Sustaining SIG funded reforms not to exceed $750,000. Sustainable activities comprise the year 5 budget.

Option 2:

- Years 1-3: Full implementation not to exceed $1.5 million annually. Each year of implementation requires a separate budget.
- Years 4 & 5: Sustaining SIG funded reforms not to exceed $750,000 annually. Sustainable activities comprise the year 4 and year 5 budgets. Each year of sustainability requires a separate budget.

The following general guidelines must be adhered to in creating the school budget:

- External service provider expenditures should not exceed 30% of the total annual building award.
- Personnel expenditures should not exceed 30% of the total annual building award.
- Technology expenditures should not exceed 20% of the total annual building award.
- Professional development expenditures should not exceed 20% of the total annual building award.

Use the supplied templates on the following page to complete the school level budget. A budget template for each five-year option is supplied; use the correct form as appropriate.

Attachment C.1: SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT PRELIMINARY BUDGET FORM

INSTRUCTIONS: The Budget Summary and the Budget Detail must be prepared by or with the cooperation of the Business Office using the School District Accounting Manual (Bulletin 1022). Please complete a School Improvement Grant Preliminary Budget for EACH building. Annual budgets are submitted in MEGS+ for final review and approval by MDE.

NOTE: Approval of the preliminary budget in the review process **does not guarantee** all preliminary budget items will be **approved** in the final budget in **MEGS+.**

LEGAL NAME OF DISTRICT APPLICANT:	**District Code:**
Lansing School District	33020
BUDGET SUMMARY FOR:	**Building Code:**
Willow	04551

OPTION 2: Full implementation in years 1-3, and sustaining reforms in years 4 & 5.

Year 1: Full Implementation (may not exceed $1,500,000)								
FUNCTION CODE	**FUNCTION TITLE**	**SALARIES**	**BENEFITS**	**PURCHASED SERVICES**	**SUPPLIES & MATERIALS**	**CAPITAL OUTLAY**	**OTHER EXPENDITURES**	**TOTAL EXPENDITURES**
111	**Elementary**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
112	**Middle/Junior High**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
113	**High School**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
118	**Pre-Kindergarten**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
119	**Summer School**	6000	4260	0	2000	0	0	12260

Year 1: Full Implementation (may not exceed $1,500,000)								
FUNCTION CODE	FUNCTION TITLE	SALARIES	BENEFITS	PURCHASED SERVICES	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	CAPITAL OUTLAY	OTHER EXPENDITURES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
211	Truancy/Absenteeism Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
212	Guidance Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
213	Health Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
216	Social Work Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
221	Improvement of Instruction	63000	49800	47400	8125	0	0	168325
225	Instruction Related Technology	0	0	0	20300	0	0	20300
226	Supervision and Direction of Instructional Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
227	Academic Student Assessment	0	0	0	5000	0	0	5000
233	Grant Writer/Grant Procurement	15250	12000	0	0	0	0	27250
241	Office of the Principal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
249	Other School Administration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
250	Support Services Business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
257	Internal Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
266	Security Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
271	Pupil Transportation Services	0	0	3000	0	0	0	3000
281	Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation	0	0	3000	0	0	0	3000
283	Staff/Personnel Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Year 1: Full Implementation (may not exceed $1,500,000)								
FUNCTION CODE	FUNCTION TITLE	SALARIES	BENEFITS	PURCHASED SERVICES	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	CAPITAL OUTLAY	OTHER EXPENDITURES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
331	Community Activities	61000	48000	0	0	0	0	109000
	SUBTOTAL	145250	114060	53400	35425	0	0	348135
	Indirect Costs 4.44% Restricted Rate	0	0	0	0	0	14800	14800
	TOTAL	145250	114060	53400	35425	0	14800	362935

Year 2: Full Implementation (may not exceed $1,500,000)								
FUNCTION CODE	FUNCTION TITLE	SALARIES	BENEFITS	PURCHASED SERVICES	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	CAPITAL OUTLAY	OTHER EXPENDITURES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
111	Elementary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
112	Middle/Junior High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
113	High School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
118	Pre-Kindergarten	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
119	Summer School	6000	4260	0	2000	0	0	12260
211	Truancy/Absenteeism Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
212	Guidance Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
213	Health Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
216	Social Work Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
221	Improvement of Instruction	63000	49800	47900	8125	0	0	168325

Year 2: Full Implementation (may not exceed $1,500,000)								
FUNCTION CODE	FUNCTION TITLE	SALARIES	BENEFITS	PURCHASED SERVICES	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	CAPITAL OUTLAY	OTHER EXPENDITURES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
225	Instruction Related Technology	0	0	0	6600	0	0	6600
226	Supervision and Direction of Instructional Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
227	Academic Student Assessment	0	0	0	5000	0	0	5000
233	Grant Writer/Grant Procurement	15250	12000	0	0	0	0	27250
241	Office of the Principal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
249	Other School Administration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
250	Support Services Business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
257	Internal Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
266	Security Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
271	Pupil Transportation Services	0	0	3000	0	0	0	3000
281	Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation	0	0	3000	0	0	0	3000
283	Staff/Personnel Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
331	Community Activities	61000	48000	0	0	0	0	109000
	SUBTOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	14239	14239
	Indirect Costs 4.44% Restricted Rate	145250	114060	53900	21725	0	14239	349174
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	14239	14239

Year 3: Full Implementation (may not exceed $1,500,000)								
FUNCTION CODE	FUNCTION TITLE	SALARIES	BENEFITS	PURCHASED SERVICES	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	CAPITAL OUTLAY	OTHER EXPENDITURES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
111	Elementary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
112	Middle/Junior High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
113	High School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
118	Pre-Kindergarten	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
119	Summer School	6000	4260	0	2000	0	0	12260
211	Truancy/Absenteeism Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
212	Guidance Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
213	Health Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
216	Social Work Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
221	Improvement of Instruction	63000	49800	47900	8125	0	0	168325
225	Instruction Related Technology	0	0	0	6600	0	0	6600
226	Supervision and Direction of Instructional Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
227	Academic Student Assessment	0	0	0	5000	0	0	5000
233	Grant Writer/Grant Procurement	15250	12000	0	0	0	0	27250
241	Office of the Principal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
249	Other School Administration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
250	Support Services Business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Year 3: Full Implementation (may not exceed $1,500,000)								
FUNCTION CODE	FUNCTION TITLE	SALARIES	BENEFITS	PURCHASED SERVICES	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	CAPITAL OUTLAY	OTHER EXPENDITURES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
257	Internal Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
266	Security Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
271	Pupil Transportation Services	0	0	3000	0	0	0	3000
281	Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation	0	0	3000	0	0	0	3000
283	Staff/Personnel Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
331	Community Activities	61000	48000	0	0	0	0	109000
	SUBTOTAL	145250	114060	53900	21725	0	0	334935
	Indirect Costs 4.44% Restricted Rate	0	0	0	0	0	14239	14239
	TOTAL	145250	114060	53900	21725	0	14239	349174

Year 4: Sustaining Reforms (may not exceed $750,000)								
FUNCTION CODE	FUNCTION TITLE	SALARIES	BENEFITS	PURCHASED SERVICES	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	CAPITAL OUTLAY	OTHER EXPENDITURES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
111	Elementary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
112	Middle/Junior High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
113	High School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
118	Pre-Kindergarten	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
119	Summer School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Year 4: Sustaining Reforms (may not exceed $750,000)								
FUNCTION CODE	FUNCTION TITLE	SALARIES	BENEFITS	PURCHASED SERVICES	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	CAPITAL OUTLAY	OTHER EXPENDITURES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
211	Truancy/Absenteeism Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
212	Guidance Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
213	Health Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
216	Social Work Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
221	Improvement of Instruction	32500	25800	18600	1500	0	0	78400
225	Instruction Related Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
226	Supervision and Direction of Instructional Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
227	Academic Student Assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
233	Grant Writer/Grant Procurement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
241	Office of the Principal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
249	Other School Administration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
250	Support Services Business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
257	Internal Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
266	Security Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
271	Pupil Transportation Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
281	Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
283	Staff/Personnel Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Year 4: Sustaining Reforms (may not exceed $750,000)								
FUNCTION CODE	FUNCTION TITLE	SALARIES	BENEFITS	PURCHASED SERVICES	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	CAPITAL OUTLAY	OTHER EXPENDITURES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
331	Community Activities	30500	24000	0	0	0	0	54500
	SUBTOTAL	63000	49800	18600	1500	0	0	132900
	Indirect Costs 4.44% Restricted Rate	0	0	0	0	0	5650	5650
	TOTAL	63000	49800	18600	1500	0	5650	138550

Year 5: Sustaining Reforms (may not exceed $750,000)								
FUNCTION CODE	FUNCTION TITLE	SALARIES	BENEFITS	PURCHASED SERVICES	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	CAPITAL OUTLAY	OTHER EXPENDITURES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
111	Elementary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
112	Middle/Junior High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
113	High School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
118	Pre-Kindergarten	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
119	Summer School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
211	Truancy/Absenteeism Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
212	Guidance Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
213	Health Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
216	Social Work Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
221	Improvement of Instruction	32500	25800	18600	1500	0	0	78400

Year 5: Sustaining Reforms (may not exceed $750,000)								
FUNCTION CODE	FUNCTION TITLE	SALARIES	BENEFITS	PURCHASED SERVICES	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	CAPITAL OUTLAY	OTHER EXPENDITURES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
225	Instruction Related Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
226	Supervision and Direction of Instructional Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
227	Academic Student Assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
233	Grant Writer/Grant Procurement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
241	Office of the Principal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
249	Other School Administration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
250	Support Services Business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
257	Internal Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
266	Security Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
271	Pupil Transportation Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
281	Planning, Research, Development, and Evaluation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
283	Staff/Personnel Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
331	Community Activities	30500	24000	0	0	0	0	54500
	SUBTOTAL	63000	49800	18600	1500	0	0	132900
	Indirect Costs 4.44% Restricted Rate	0	0	0	0	0	5650	5650
	TOTAL	63000	49800	18600	1500	0	5650	138550

Attachment D.1: SIG Coordinator

School Improvement Grant (SIG) Coordinator

Position Description

Qualifications Required:

1. Masters degree from an accredited college or university in education or an education-related field.
2. 5 to 7 years of successful teaching experience.
3. Prior experience leading school improvement planning, implementation, and progress monitoring.
4. Demonstrated knowledge of the state's accountability systems, categorical funding sources and regulations, and student achievement data.
5. Demonstrated knowledge of best practices and research related to Early Childhood Learning and Brain Research.
6. Demonstrated knowledge and understanding of research related to instructional strategies that support student achievement and engagement, especially for at-risk students.
7. Demonstrated ability to work with students, parents, school personnel, and community members to develop, and support the implementation of intervention strategies to increase student achievement and engagement.
8. Demonstrated ability to coordinate communication between district and school leaders, community members, and state and county partners to ensure timely implementation of school improvement initiatives.

Responsibilities:

1. Work with building principals, district transformation coordinator, and teacher leaders to support and oversee all aspects of SIG plan implementation and monitoring.
2. Work with the building principals to plan and coordinator program budgets in accordance with SIG and district guidelines.

3. Work with the Michigan Department of Education SIG Monitor to coordinate and complete SIG monitoring and compliance mandates and reports (e.g., leading and lagging, quarterly, and annual).
4. Ensure alignment between SIG and RR plans, as well as other district and building improvement efforts.
5. Support the development of tools and mechanisms to assess SIG implementation and impact.
6. Support categorical budget development and expenditures.
7. Work with the building principal, district transformation coordinator, and teacher leaders to develop and disseminate information on the School Improvement Grant.
8. Serve on any committees and councils concerned with the School Improvement Grant, as needed.
9. Communicate, coordinate, and support the work with external consultants on the implementation of SIG.
10. Facilitate parental involvement activities that meet SIG requirements with Family & Community Liaison.
11. Maintain a current and complete calendar of all SIG-related meetings.
12. Other SIG-related duties as assigned by the principal.

Attachment D.2: Data Coach

Data Coach

Contract Service

Qualifications Required:

1. Masters degree from an accredited college or university in education or an education-related field.
2. 5 to 7 years of successful teaching experience.
3. Prior experience leading school improvement planning, implementation, and progress monitoring.
4. Demonstrated knowledge of the state's accountability and student achievement data systems (i.e., mischooldata.org, etc.).
5. Demonstrated knowledge and understanding of research related to instructional strategies that support student achievement and engagement, especially for at-risk students.
6. Demonstrated ability to work with students, school personnel, and community members to develop, and support the implementation of data-driven strategies to increase student achievement and engagement.
7. Demonstrated ability to coordinate communication between district and school leaders, community members, and state and county partners to ensure timely implementation of data-driven improvement initiatives.

Responsibilities:

1. Work with building principal, district transformation coordinator, and teacher leaders planning and conducting staff development activities that focus on the use of data and assessments to enhance learning and collaborative instructional planning.
2. Coach small groups of teachers and/or instructional leaders in analyzing data and using data to differentiate instruction and make data-driven decisions.
3. Facilitate meetings of Professional Learning Communities with a focus on data-driven dialogues.
4. Support teachers in the use of state and local data.

5. Support the development of data-driven tools and mechanisms to assess SIG implementation and impact.
6. Work with the building principal, district transformation coordinator, and teacher leaders to develop and disseminate data-based information on the School Improvement Grant.
7. Serve on any committees and councils concerned with the School Improvement Grant, as needed.
8. Maintain a current and complete calendar of all SIG-related meetings relevant to the data coaching position.
9. Other data-related duties as assigned by the principal.

Attachment D.3: Family & Community Liaison

Family & Community Liaison

Position Description

Qualifications Required:

1. High school degree; bachelors preferred.
2. Preference will be given to applicants with 3 to 5 years of work or volunteer experience with children, families, and school systems.
3. Preference given to those with experience with Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS) and conflict resolution training.
4. Experience and knowledge of strategies to prevent absenteeism.
5. Evidence of successful experience in student/employee/parent relations.
6. Ability to communicate clearly and effectively, both orally and in writing.
7. Willingness to work a flexible schedule which includes some community and parent meetings and home visits.

Primary Responsibilities:

1. Assist in recruiting parents as volunteers within the school (e.g., classroom volunteers) for the purpose of increasing parent participation and student achievement.
2. Collaborate with school staff for the purpose of developing programs and classes to support non-English speaking parents and students.
3. Facilitate outreach to low income communities, community leaders and organizations for the purpose of developing resources and building partnerships with community members.
4. Organizes family meetings and educational classes for program participants. (e.g., parenting skills, volunteer training, child growth and development) for the purpose of providing family members parenting classes and/or family support needs.
5. Participate in workshops, meetings, community events, etc. for the purpose of receiving and/or presenting information.

6. Prepare a variety of written materials (e.g., newsletters, reports, logs, memos, handouts) for the purpose of documenting activities, providing written reference and/or conveying information.
7. Provide appropriate referrals and advocacy for families as needed and provides follow up to determine the outcome of services provided for the purpose of supporting families in working toward their goals.
8. Provide data for a variety of reports (e.g., program participation, activity) for the purpose of meeting program, district, state and federal requirements.
9. Assist in coordinating with community leaders and organizations (e.g. businesses, landlords, shelters, law enforcement, etc.) for the purpose of building resources and expanding program capabilities to assist families.
10. Confer with teachers, parents and/or appropriate community agency personnel for the purpose of assisting in evaluating student progress and/or implementing student objectives.
11. Participate in a variety of presentations, meetings, workshops and committees for the purpose of conveying and/or gathering information required to perform functions and remaining knowledgeable with current professional program regulations.
12. Refer students and their families to outside agencies (e.g. state agencies, medical professionals, counselors, foundations, charities, etc.) for the purpose of ensuring the need of students and families are met.
13. Respond to inquiries from a variety of internal and external sources (e.g. parents, students, teachers, staff, outside agencies, etc.) for the purpose of providing information and/or direction as may be required.

Attachment D.4: Early Childhood Interventionist

Early Childhood Interventionist

Position Description

Qualifications Required:

1. Valid Michigan Teaching Certificate.
2. Bachelor's degree with certification in elementary education.
3. 5 to 7 years of successful full-time teaching at the elementary level.
4. Demonstrated ability to work cooperatively with the peers, community members, students, building and district administration, and other staff members.
5. Deep knowledge of, and experience in, establishing data-driven educational environments.
6. Expertise in research-based highly effective instructional strategies that engage students and yield positive academic achievement.
7. Ability to work in multi-ethnic and multi-cultural learning environment.
8. Experience providing professional development and job-embedded teacher support on research-based instructional strategies.
9. Demonstrated effectiveness in time management, organizational skills, and prioritization of work.
10. Demonstrated initiative, flexibility, and ability to work independently.

Primary Responsibilities:

1. Promote enhanced literacy and math instruction and student learning by helping teachers develop more effective teaching practices that allow all students to reach high academic standards.
2. Model research-based best practices that address how students learn in core academic areas.
3. Collaborate with individual teachers through co-planning, co-teaching, and coaching.
4. Assist administrative and instructional staff in interpreting data and designing approaches to improve student achievement.
5. Promote teachers' delivery and understanding of the school curriculum through collaborative long-range and short-range planning and teacher coaching.

6. Facilitate teachers' use of research-based instructional strategies including differentiated instruction for diverse learners.
7. Work with Tier I and Tier II students, in one-on-one or small group settings, in core academic areas.
8. Facilitate professional learning communities and instructional learning cycles.
9. Complete, in a timely and accurate manner, all required records and reports.
10. Other duties as assigned by the principal.

Attachment E: Intervention Models

The following items are required elements of the model. Describe how each element will be met. Responses must be in the sequence of requirements as listed.
For additional details, please refer to Willow's MDE-approved Reform & Redesign Plan. The Turnaround Plan was approved in the January of 2015 and provides significant detail about how Willow (in collaboration with the district) is addressing ALL required components.

The early learning model must implement each of the following early learning strategies—

1. **Offer full-day kindergarten;** Willow already offers a full-day kindergarten experience (funded through a combination of Title I and general funds). This program will be expanded to include 12 days of extended learning in the summer.
2. **Establish or expand a high-quality preschool program**; Willow already offers a robust GSRP program (funded through a GSRP grant). This program will be expanded to include 12 days of extended learning in the summer.
3. **Provide educators, including preschool teachers, with time for joint planning across grades to facilitate effective teaching and learning and positive teacher-student interactions;** We will utilize nine hours of monthly teacher (preschool teachers included) collaboration time. Eight of these hours will occur during weekly (two hours each Wednesday morning) delayed starts and one additional hour for grade-level PLCs. This time will be used to expand high-quality instructional strategies, data-based collaboration, and develop skills among the instructional and non-instructional staff to meet the needs of our students. During these 9 hours the staff will utilize a closely monitored and facilitated PLC model that will support the implementation of our reform strategies.
4. **Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the early learning model;** Mr. Steve Lonzo was named principal in the Spring of 2015 and he meets all of the turnaround leader competencies.
5. **Implement the same rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation and support systems for teachers and principals, designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement, as required under the transformation model;** All teachers in the Lansing School District meet the definition of highly qualified. Teachers in the Lansing School District will continue to be evaluated using the Charlotte Danielson model of teacher effectiveness and 34% of their teacher evaluation will be based on student achievement (i.e., student growth) scores. While the teacher evaluation tools and processes are contractually "prohibited subjects", the Superintendent collaborated with the teacher's union and gathered their input on the evaluation instrument. The principal will be evaluated using an instrument collaboratively agreed upon with the administrators union and will adhere to the same robust student achievement standards outlined in the teacher evaluation tool. During the 2015-2016 school year, administrators will be evaluated using the School Advance (STAGES) rubric and which does include a robust student growth component. Thirty four percent of principal evaluation will also be based on student growth for the 2015-2016 school year. The Lansing School District is committed to maintaining a rigorous evaluation tool and process and as such will remain in compliance with all legislatively mandated evaluation requirements including requirements related to student growth as a significant factor.
6. **Use the teacher and principal evaluation and support system to identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so;** School leaders, teachers, and staff will be rewarded for increased student growth and implementing the instructional improvements with fidelity through the Board of Education and district recognition processes (i.e., district newsletter, etc.) District administrators, principals, and teachers are allowed to submit recommendations for formal recognition. Criteria for such

recognition will vary but could include increasing student achievement, and outstanding leadership related to improvement. Recognition occurs in an ongoing fashion, through district newsletters. Teachers are able to receive the district Elsie Maille Award ($10,000) for effective teaching and leadership skills. In addition, the district offers the Hinman Award ($2000) which provides teachers with funds to complete their graduate school work based on excellence in the classroom. Thus opportunities for recognition, resume-building, and leadership experience abound. Removal of teachers who have not yet increased student achievement is a 2-year process that has been established by state legislation. Teachers who are deemed ineffective are subject to the legal and/or contractual processes which direct the replacement procedures. However, prior to removal, they will be provided with opportunities for learning and growth through individual improvement plans (part of the formal evaluation process), involvement in PLCs, and collegial support aimed at implementing positive instructional changes.

7. **Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of students in the school, taking into consideration the results from the teacher and principal evaluation and support system, if applicable;** We will focus our recruitment and retention efforts on providing opportunities for career growth (an incentive) through identifying teacher mentors, chairpersons of district-wide committees, internships as school leaders, teacher-in-charge, etc. Criteria for these opportunities would be based on, but not limited to, the teacher or school leader with few absences, those with demonstrated ability to increase student achievement, participation in ongoing school improvement initiatives, and participation in extended learning and enrichment. The principal will continue to work (along with the district Human Resources Department) towards recruiting and retaining staff with specialized training in order to meet specific data-identified student needs.
8. **Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that (1) is research-based, developmentally appropriate, and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State early learning and development standards and State academic standards and (2) in the early grades, promotes the full range of academic content across domains of development, including math and science, language and literacy, socio-emotional skills, self-regulation, and executive functions;** Based on a comprehensive review of wide-ranging data (i.e., AIMSweb, DRA II, MEAP – from previous years, and ILC data) multiple target areas were for intensive support and intervention. **Table 1a** (Section B, Number 1a) details the specific target areas, subgroups, data sources, and implementation activities that will be the focus of interventions and supports provided through the Early Learning Intervention Model. The strategies, interventions and instructional programs are research-based, developmentally appropriate, and vertically aligned to MDE's early learning and content standards. Four components of the instructional program are detailed below:

   Tiered Support (Early Years): The staff will be trained on an evidence-based, three-tiered model of prevention and intervention (IIBlocks). The implementation of IIBlocks is right in line with Early Learning Intervention Model and ensures that students receive high quality instruction and interventions matched to their needs (Simmons et al., 2007; Sugai, 2008). In this model, teachers monitor progress frequently to make decisions about changes in instruction or goals and apply student response data to important educational decisions. The IIBlock structure allows staff to make instructional decisions in general, remedial, and special education tiers, creating a well-integrated system of instruction/intervention guided by student outcome data. The staff will be implementing screeners in the areas of math and ELA to determine student needs. Based on students' performance data and student work samples further training in appropriate interventions.

   iCollaborate: The iCollaborate initiative has become an important catalyst for improvement in our PK-3rd grade schools for the past 3 years. It is an initiative to improve instructional effectiveness

while building a culture of collaborative inquiry where educators feel safe to reflect on their practice, adopt a mindset of continuous improvement, and a willingness to use data as the impetus for discussion and exploration. As previously noted, classroom observations are conducted in each classroom by a trained data coach with the web-based EDU-SNAP observation instrument (Ritchie, Wiser, Mason, Holland, and Howes, 2010). This provides teachers with valuable, quantifiable information regarding how children spend their day. The information permits teachers to reflect critically on their instructional practices. Driven by this data, job-embedded support and is provided to teachers in the form of instructional/data coaching.

My Sidewalks: One evidence-based strategy we will implement is Pearson's *My Sidewalks*, an intervention designed to assist in the development of early literacy skills. *My Sidewalks* is an evidence-based reading intervention that helps students improve and sustain their levels of reading achievement through a series of scientifically proven strategies to help children experience faster and sustainable achievement rates (Simmons et al. 2007). *My Sidewalks* is designed for students who are unable to read and comprehend grade-level material, and can be used to compliment core reading. The *My Sidewalks* program builds the foundational reading skills of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension that are proven to increase student motivation and engagement. The *My Sidewalks* program will assist in aligning both the coordination and constancy of early literacy instruction across Pre-K, Kindergarten, and 1st Grade classrooms. The Lansing School District (LSD) has experience in supporting the implementation and maintenance of intensive interventions and will partner with the Ingham ISD (IISD) to provide job embedded PD to teachers and building principals in order to ensure the program is fully implemented with fidelity. LSD and IISD have partnered previously in the implementation of intensive math interventions in five elementary schools, during the 2014-2015 school year, that resulted in positive growth in math fluency in all grades as measured by AIMSweb.

Extended Year: In order to mitigate summer learning loss (i.e., the summer slide) we have documented using AIMsweb and DRA II data, using SIG IV funds, we will increase the school year by 12 days. Specifically, we will add three four-day weeks throughout the summer. This is an extended year model that we have found to be effective in our Pre-K to 3 buildings in the district. In this model we will provide 48 hours of additional support in core academic areas for our students. Rather than being set-up as an extension of the school year, during these weeks students are placed in multi-grade/age classrooms and benefit from the use of a project-based learning model. Project-based learning is a dynamic approach to teaching in which students explore real-world problems and challenges. With this type of active and engaged learning, students are inspired to obtain a deeper core content knowledge. A tentative list of projects for students to explore include: energy conservation, composting, physics in motion, web design, health and wellness, graphic novels, etc. All students will be invited to attend the extended year program which will take place in June and August.

9. **Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the educational and developmental needs of individual students; On**-going student data analysis will occur at weekly facilitated grade-level PLCs. In order to ensure continuous improvement, staff will review and refine existing student data to examine individual student progress and overall grade-level success. Staff will determine whether instructional interventions are being successful. This data will be used as a basis for guiding differentiated instruction and will be discussed and shared widely with stakeholders, at least monthly, at building-level PLC meetings and principal-led data conferences. Below is a list of assessments that are currently in use in the building.
10. **Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development such as coaching and mentoring (e.g., regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that**

reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to implement successfully school reform strategies. The enormous challenges that we face and needs of our students have led the district and school leaders to pursue significant changes to the way we approach the education of our students. These changes require a comprehensive and systemic approach to supporting meaningful professional learning. With our focus on implementing SIG in order to increase academic excellence and improve climate and culture we will utilize **nine hours** of monthly teacher collaboration time. Eight of these hours will occur during weekly (two hours each Wednesday morning) delayed starts and one additional hour for grade-level PLCs. This time will be used to expand high-quality instructional strategies, data-based collaboration, and develop skills among the instructional and non-instructional staff to meet the needs of our students. During these 9 hours the staff will utilize a closely monitored and facilitated PLC model that will support the implementation of our reform strategies.

The definition of a "high-quality preschool program" is based on the definition that is used in the Preschool Development Grants program. This defines a "high-quality preschool program" as an early learning program that includes structural elements that are evidence-based and nationally recognized as important for ensuring program quality, including at a minimum—

11. **High staff qualifications, including a teacher with a bachelor's degree in early childhood education or a bachelor's degree in any field with a State-approved alternate pathway, which may include coursework, clinical practice, and evidence of knowledge of content and pedagogy relating to early childhood, and teaching assistants with appropriate credentials;** We will maintain the rigorous standards detailed in the GSRP guidelines which state that, teachers must meet the GSRP qualifications upon hire. A teacher will be considered credentialed for the position with any of the following: A valid Michigan teaching certificate and an Early Childhood Education (ZA) or Early Childhood-General and Special Education (ZS) endorsement or A bachelor's degree in early childhood education or child development with a specialization in preschool teaching.
12. **High-quality professional development for all staff; See** #10 in this Attachment.
13. **A child-to-instructional staff ratio of no more than 10 to 1;** We will maintain the rigorous standards detailed in the GSRP guidelines which state that, a 1:8 adult/child ratio must be maintained at all times.
14. **A class size of no more than 20 with, at a minimum, one teacher with high staff qualifications as outlined in the final requirements;** We will maintain the rigorous standards detailed in the GSRP guidelines which state that, class size must be capped at 18 children with three consistent adults.
15. **A full-day program;** Willow already offers a robust full-day GSRP program (funded through a GSRP grant). This program will be expanded to include 12 days of extended learning in the summer.
16. **Inclusion of children with disabilities to ensure access to and full participation in all opportunities;** The LSD does offer children with disabilities access to full participation in GSRP programs.
17. **Developmentally appropriate, culturally and linguistically responsive instruction and evidence-based curricula, and learning environments that are aligned with the State early learning and development standards, for at least the year prior to kindergarten entry;** All GSRP programs in Lansing use the High Scope curriculum. This curriculum and instructional model is used widely in public Pre-K settings, it is culturally and linguistically responsive to the needs of diverse students and those with special needs. It is based on the fundamental premise that children are active learners who learn best from activities they plan,

carry out, and reflect on. Key developmental indicators are grouped into ten categories: creative representation, language and literacy, initiative and social relations, movement and music, classification, serrations, numbers, space, and time. A central element of the day is the "plan-do-review sequence" in which children make a plan, carry it out, and then reflect on the results. The daily routine includes times for small- and large-group experiences, time for outside play, and offers a document showing alignment with the ECSQ-PK.

18. **Individualized accommodations and supports so that all children can access and participate fully in learning activities;** As noted above, all GSRP programs in Lansing use the High Scope curriculum. This curriculum and instructional model is used widely in public Pre-K settings, it culturally and linguistically responsive to the needs of diverse students and those with special needs. It is based on the fundamental premise that children are active learners who learn best from activities they plan, carry out, and reflect on. Key developmental indicators are grouped into ten categories: creative representation, language and literacy, initiative and social relations, movement and music, classification, serrations, numbers, space, and time. A central element of the day is the "plan-do-review sequence" in which children make a plan, carry it out, and then reflect on the results. The daily routine includes times for small- and large-group experiences, time for outside play, and offers a document showing alignment with the ECSQ-PK. Modifications and accommodations are made on an "as needed" basis to ensure all children have access and full participation in learning activities.
19. **Instructional staff salaries that are comparable to the salaries of local kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) instructional staff;** Staff salaries are comparable to the salaries of kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) instructional staff.
20. **Program evaluation to ensure continuous improvement; The** GSRP evaluation requirements come from three sources: the Michigan Legislature in the law that establishes and funds GSRP, the Michigan State Board of Education in the criteria established for GSRP and Michigan Department of Education (MDE) reporting guidelines. GSRP utilizes information from screenings, ongoing observations, program quality evaluations, and insight from staff and parents to determine if the systems in place are working, whether there is an efficient use of resources and how the program can best respond to the needs of enrolled children. The focus of a systematic approach to local data collection and data use is to provide continuous improvement feedback to staff and enrolled families. The GSRP is required by legislation to provide for active and continuous participation of parents of enrolled children. Parents partner in child-development goals as active decision-makers. Parents discuss data with their children's teachers and understand what the data means for their children, both inside and outside of the classroom. Upon enrollment, parents must be informed that information about their child and family is collected, reported, and analyzed to learn about the effectiveness of GSRP. Confidentiality must be maintained. A sample announcement to parents on program evaluation can be found in the resources for this section. Each Intermediate School District (ISD) must have a written evaluation plan that covers the implementation of all required program components.
21. **On-site or accessible comprehensive services for children and community partnerships that promote families' access to services that support their children's learning and development; Children** who are successful in school have many healthy interconnections between family, school, and community. Parent involvement in the learning process strengthens learning at home and is directly linked back to positive child outcomes at school. Providing on-site or accessible comprehensive services will be a primary responsibility of the Family & Community Liaison. Please see **Attachment D.3** for a comprehensive job description.
22. **Evidence-based health and safety standards.** All GSRP sites in the Lansing School District meet all health and safety standards.

Attachment F: SIG IV 5-Year Timeline (Option #2 – 3 Years of Full Implementation and 2-Years of Sustainability)

SIG IV 5-Year Timeline							
Action Step	**Person Responsible**	**Year 1**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**	**Year 5**	**Success metric**
Principal with HR and DTC establish job descriptions and postings for SIG-funded positions	Principal & DTC & HR	Within 2 week of notice of grant award	As needed	As needed	As needed	As needed	All positions filled within 60 days of grant notification
Align grant timelines with grant budget approval dates	Principal & DTC & SIG Coordinator	Within 2 weeks of notice of grant award	On-Going	On-Going	On-Going	On-Going	Grant timeline posted and communicated
* Develop contract service agreements & ESP Contract	DTC & Associate Superintendent & Building Principal	No later than 30 days after award notification	Annually evaluate & renewal as needed	Annually evaluate & renewal as needed	Annually evaluate & renewal as needed	Annually evaluate & renewal as needed	Interventions and support will be operationalized 45 days after notification
* Finalize PD calendar and coordinate cross-building training	Building Principal & SIG Coordinator	No later than 30 days after award notification	Annually develop PD calendar - May	Annually develop PD calendar - May	Annually develop PD calendar - May	Annually develop PD calendar - May	Shared PD Calendar
School-wide SIG orientation (new staff & families)	Building Principal & SIG Coordinator	Within 2 week of notice of grant award	Annually as needed	Annually as needed	Annually as needed	Annually as needed	Presentation; Flyers; and Informational Materials
Purchase SIG technology	Building Principal; DASI; Finance; SIG Coordinator	Purchases submitted by school and posted on MEGS+ 90 days after notification	October 1 annually	October 1 annually	October 1 annually	October 1 annually	80% of grant funded technology purchased by end of first semester annually - School SIG Inventory records
* Implement Tier I, II and III academic support interventions	Building Principal; Teachers; DTC; ISD	No later than 30 days after award notification	Annually evaluate & adjust as needed	Annually evaluate & adjust as needed	Annually evaluate & adjust as needed	Annually evaluate & adjust as needed	All students will receive Tier I, II or III academic support based on performance data
Implement parent and community engagement strategies – Parent U	Building Principal & Family Liaison	No later than 30 days after FCL is hired	September 15 annually	September 15 annually	September 15 annually	September 15 annually	85 % of parents will be actively engaged in no fewer than 2 school activities

SIG IV 5-Year Timeline (continued)							
Action Step	**Person Responsible**	**Year 1**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**	**Year 5**	**Success metric**
SIG Staff Evaluation	Building Principal	Annual evaluation reports submitted spring	Annual evaluation reports submitted spring	Annual evaluation reports submitted spring	Annual evaluation reports submitted spring	Annual evaluation reports submitted spring	HR records show all staff evaluations completed
ESP Program review & Evaluation	DTC & Building Principal & DASI	Quarterly with adjustments as needed	Quarterly with adjustments as needed	Quarterly with adjustments as needed	Quarterly with adjustments as needed	Quarterly with adjustments as needed	Written feedback for ESP and adjustments made within 30 days
Annual SIG Program Review & Evaluation	DTC & Building Principal & DASI	Annually evaluate & adjust as needed - May	Annually evaluate & adjust as needed – May	Annually evaluate & adjust as needed – May	Annually evaluate & adjust as needed – May	Annually evaluate & adjust as needed – May	Written feedback from DASI and adjustments
Weekly SIG grant update to Superintendent's ET	DTC	On-Going	On-Going	On-Going	On-Going	On-Going	Written reports and verbal updates to Superintendent as requested
Quarterly SIG grant update to BoE	Building Principal & SIG Coordinator	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Written Quarterly Reports delivered to BOE and MDE
Monthly grant so spend down report for SIG director and SIG coordinators	Building Principal; DASI; Finance; SIG Coordinator	First of the month	First of the month	First of the month	First of the month	First of the month	Timely reporting of grant fiscal status
Annual benchmark & leading indicators reports	Building Principal & SIG Coordinator	Annually as determined by MDE	Annually as determined by MDE	Annually as determined by MDE	Annually as determined by MDE	Annually as determined by MDE	Submission of data reports to MDE on time 95%+
Align annual SIP, Title I, Title IIa reports and budgets to SIG plans	Building Principal; DASI; SIG Coordinator	Annually as determined by MDE	Annually as determined by MDE	Annually as determined by MDE	Annually as determined by MDE	Annually as determined by MDE	Submission of data reports to MDE on time 95%+
* Denotes activities, practices, structures, and procedures that are already in place due to previous priority school identification.							

Attachment G: Annual Goals

Note: Because this school is Pre-K to 3rd Grade we have no standardized measures of progress for writing, social studies, and science. However, has you see below, we have included additional data points related to local assessments and measures associated with the Early Learning Intervention Model.

Willow Elementary						
MDE Summative Assessments	Current Proficiency Rate 2014-15	Goal for 2015-2016	Goal for 2016-2017	Goal for 2017-2018	Goal for 2018-19	Goal for 2019-20
Reading/ELA	71.1%	77%	81%	85%	≥85%	≥85%
Mathematics	29%	48%	67%	85%	≥85%	≥85%
Writing/ELA	N/A	N/A	N/A	85%	≥85%	≥85%
Social Studies	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Willow Elementary			
Local Formative Assessments	Fall Benchmark	Winter Benchmark	Spring Benchmark
AIMSweb	≥60+%	≥85% or ↑ from Fall	≥85% or ↑ from Winter
DRA II	≥60+%	≥85% or ↑ from Fall	≥85% or ↑ from Winter

Attachment H: ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: *Please review the assurances and certification statements that are listed below. Signatures on the application cover sheet indicate the applicant entity has read, understand, and agrees to the assurances and certifications herein.*

SPECIFIC PROGRAM ASSURANCES

The following provisions are understood by the recipients of the grants should it be awarded:

1. The LEA will use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in priority and focus school, which the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements.
2. The LEA will establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or priority and focus school, that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
3. The LEA will report to the MDE the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements, including baseline data for the year prior to SIG implementation.
4. The LEA will ensure that each priority and focus school that it commits to serve receives all of the State and local funds it would receive in the absence of the school improvement funds and that those resources are aligned with the interventions.
5. The grant award is approved and is not assignable to a third party without specific approval.
   Funds shall be expended in conformity with the budget. Line item changes and other deviations from the budget as attached to this grant agreement must have prior approval from the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation unit of the Michigan Department of Education.
6. The Michigan Department of Education is not liable for any costs incurred by the grantee prior to the issuance of the grant award.
7. Payments made under the provision of this grant are subject to audit by the grantor.
8. If the recipient implements a restart model in an eligible school, it must include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements.
9. The recipient must monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality.
10. The recipient must monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and that it will provide technical assistance to schools on how they can sustain

progress in the absence of SIG funding.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING FOR GRANTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

No federal, appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of a federal agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any federal grant or cooperative agreement. If any funds other than federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member Of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form – LL*Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying*, in accordance with its instructions. The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the awards documents for all sub awards at all tiers (including sub grants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all sub recipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, INELIGIBILITY, AND VOLUNTARY EXCLUSION – LOWER TIER COVERED TRANSACTIONS

The prospective lower tier participant certifies, by submission of this proposal, that neither it nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participating in this transaction by any Federal department or agency. Where the prospective lower tier participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal. **OG-4929**

ASSURANCE WITH P.L. 111-117 OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION OMNIBUS APROPRIATION ACT OF 2010

When issuing statements, press releases, requests for proposals, solicitations, and other documents describing this project, the recipient shall state clearly: 1) the dollar amount of federal funds for the project, 2) the percentage of the total cost of the project that will be financed with federal funds, and 3) the percentage and dollar amount of the total cost of the project that will be financed by nongovernmental sources.

ASSURANCE CONCERNING MATERIALS DEVELOPED WITH FUNDS AWARDED UNDER THIS GRANT

The grantee assures that the following statement will be included on any publication or project materials developed with funds awarded under this program, including reports, films, brochures, and flyers: “These materials were developed under a grant awarded by the Michigan Department of Education.”

CERTIFICATION REGARDING NONDISCRIMINATION UNDER FEDERALLY AND STATE ASSISTED PROGRAMS

The applicant hereby agrees that it will comply with all federal and Michigan laws and regulations prohibiting discrimination and, in accordance therewith, no person, on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, sex, marital status or handicap, shall be discriminated against, excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or otherwise be subjected to discrimination in any program or activity for which it is responsible or for which it receives financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education or the Michigan Department of Education.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA EQUAL ACCESS ACT, 20 U.S.C.
7905, 34 CFR PART 108.

A State or sub grantee that is a covered entity as defined in Sec. 108.3 of this title shall comply with the nondiscrimination requirements of the Boy Scouts of America Equal Access Act, 20 U.S.C.
7905, 34 CFR part 108.

PARTICIPATION OF NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

The applicant assures that private nonprofit schools have been invited to participate in planning and implementing the activities of this application.

ASSURANCE REGARDING ACCESS TO RECORDS AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

The applicant hereby assures that it will provide the pass-through entity, i.e., the Michigan Department of Education, and auditors with access to the records and financial statements as necessary for the pass-through entity to comply with Section 400 (d) (4) of the U.S. Department of Education Compliance Supplement for A-133.

ASSURANCE REGARDING COMPLIANCE WITH GRANT PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

The grantee agrees to comply with all applicable requirements of all State statutes, Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, policies and award conditions governing this program. The grantee understands and agrees that if it materially fails to comply with the terms and conditions of the grant award, the Michigan Department of Education may withhold funds otherwise due to the grantee from this grant program, any other federal grant programs or the State School Aid Act of 1979 as amended, until the grantee comes into compliance or the matter has been adjudicated and the amount disallowed has been recaptured (forfeited). The Department may withhold up to 100% of any payment based on a monitoring finding, audit finding or pending final report.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING TITLE II OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (A.D.A.), P.L. 101-336, STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provides comprehensive civil rights protections for individuals with disabilities. Title II of the ADA covers programs, activities, and services of public entities. Title II requires that, “No qualified individual with a disability shall, by reason

of such disability be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by such entity." In accordance with Title II ADA provisions, the applicant has conducted a review of its employment and program/service delivery processes and has developed solutions to correcting barriers identified in the review.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING TITLE III OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (A.D.A.), P.L. 101-336, PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS AND COMMERCIAL FACILITIES

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provides comprehensive civil rights protections for individuals with disabilities. Title III of the ADA covers public accommodations (private entities that affect commerce, such as museums, libraries, private schools and day care centers) and only addresses existing facilities and readily achievable barrier removal. In accordance with Title III provisions, the applicant has taken the necessary action to ensure that individuals with a disability are provided full and equal access to the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations offered by the applicant. In addition, a Title III entity, upon receiving a grant from the Michigan Department of Education, is required to meet the higher standards (i.e., program accessibility standards) as set forth in Title III of the ADA for the program or service for which they receive a grant.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING GUN-FREE SCHOOLS - Federal Programs (Section 4141, Part A, Title IV, NCLB)

The applicant assures that it has in effect a policy requiring the expulsion from school for a period of not less than one year of any student who is determined to have brought a weapon to school under the jurisdiction of the agency except such policy may allow the chief administering officer of the agency to modify such expulsion requirements for student on a case-by-case basis. (The term "weapon" means a firearm as such term is defined in Section 92` of Title 18, United States Code.)

The district has adopted, or is in the process of adopting, a policy requiring referral to the criminal or juvenile justice system of any student who brings a firearm or weapon to a school served by the agency.

AUDIT REQUIREMENTS

All grant recipients who spend $500,000 or more in federal funds from one or more sources are required to have an audit performed in compliance with the Single Audit Act (effective July 1, 2003).

Further, the applicant hereby assures that it will direct its auditors to provide the Michigan Department of Education access to their audit work papers upon the request of the Michigan Department of Education.

ASSURANCE AGAINST TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS

The applicant assures that it adopts the requirements in the code of Federal Regulations at

2CFR 175 as a condition for this grant. You as a sub recipient under this award and your employees may not—

I. Engage in severe forms of trafficking in persons during the period of time that the award is in effect,
II. Procure a commercial sex act during the period of time that the award is in effect; or
III. Use forced labor in the performance of the award or sub awards under the award,
IV. Under this condition, the Federal awarding agency may terminate this grant without penalty for any violation of these prohibitions by the grantee, its employees or its sub recipients.

ASSURANCE REGARDING THE PROHIBITION OF TEXT MESSAGING AND EMAILING WHILE DRIVING DURING OFFICIAL FEDERAL GRANT BUSINESS

The applicant assures that it prohibits text messaging and emailing while driving during official grant business. Federal grant recipients, sub recipients and their grant personnel are prohibited from text messaging while driving a government owned vehicle, or while driving their own privately owned vehicle during official grant business, or from using government supplied electronic equipment to text message or email when driving.

Recipients must comply with these conditions under Executive Order 13513, "Federal Leadership on Reducing Text Messaging While Driving," October 1, 2009.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING UNIVERSAL IDENTIFIER REQUIREMENTS

The applicant or grant recipient certifies it will meet the requirement for supplying a Data Universal Numbering systems (DUNS) number. As a condition of a sub recipient of a federal grant award, you must supply a DUNS number to the MDE. No entity may receive a federal sub award without a DUNS number. The MDE will not make a sub award to an entity unless that entity has provided its DUNS number.

ASSURANCE REGARDING REPORTING SUBAWARD DATA FOR SUBRECIPIENTS

The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) is designed to increase transparency and improve the public's access to Federal government information. To this end, FFATA requires that sub award data be reported for all new Federal grants funded at $25,000 or more with an award date on or after October 1, 2010.

<u>IN ADDITION:</u>

This project/program will not supplant nor duplicate an existing School Improvement Plan. In the case of priority schools already implementing a state approve reform/redesign plan, the grant will be used to supplement, expand, or otherwise substantially increase the efforts and work of the selected reform model. Grant funds shall not be used for a reform model that has not been approved by the Michigan Department of Education.