

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 E, Annual Goals, as appropriate. **(maximum length 1 page)**

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 Executive Director of School Improvement (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 E**). 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 2015-16 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/PSAT & SAT	M-Step
AIMSweb	AIMSweb
WIDA	WIDA
READ 180 - Lexile Scores	Scholastic Reading & Math Inventory
Synergy	Synergy
School Report Cards	School Report Cards
ACT EXPLORE & PLAN	DIBELS Next / 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	Edusnap & 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. **(maximum length 1 page)**

NOTE: The district and school may choose not to work with an ESP; however, the SIG still requires a description of how the district will hold ESPs accountable should they ever have one in place. A response consisting simply of "N/A" or one indicating the district or school does not plan to work with ESPs and does not describe an accountability or monitoring plan will receive a score of zero.

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 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 E**). ESPs working with SIG-funded schools and the Executive of Director of School Improvement (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 dialogue 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 IV schools are working with Ingham Intermediate School District (IISD) as their primary ESP. The selection of IISD as ESP allowed for the continuity of practice needed to achieve the goals and strategies identified in our SIG IV 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. IISD 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 Budget:

- a. Complete a five year budget overview for all eligible schools and applying for the SIG. Include annual district costs. **(Attachment F.1; a template has been provide for your reference)**
 - i. Annual district level costs should not exceed 5% of the overall LEA allocation.
 - ii. Building level costs or positions should not be duplicated at the district level. For example, if the SIG coordinator is a building level position, associated costs come out of the building budget. In this scenario, these costs may not come from the district budget, nor could the district employ additional SIG coordinators at the district level.
 - iii. District level oversight and associated costs must reflect the actual amount of time spent on those duties.
 1. This may include restructuring duties and time of current district/central office staff.
 2. This may include hiring new staff to perform SIG-specific duties. However, the district must have a plan for how this work will be sustained after the grant period ends.
 3. This may include contracting with a third party.
 - iv. District level duties may include, but are not limited to:
 1. Financial oversight
 2. Support for school buildings receiving the grant
 3. Monitoring schools and other entities for compliance with grant requirements
 4. Monitor progress on annual goals and implementation of the grant and selected intervention model.
- b. 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? **(maximum length 2 pages)**

6A: See attachment F.1.

6B: 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

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 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 E**). ESPs working with SIG-funded schools and the Executive Director of School Improvement (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 and SIG IV schools are working with 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 and SIG IV applications. 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. IISD 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:

Henry H. North Elementary School is the only Lansing school applying for SIG V. Henry H. North Elementary is currently in priority status, and great care was taken to ensure a high degree of alignment between the components described in this application and the existing Turnaround plan components. The writing team thoroughly reviewed the existing Turnaround plan to ensure alignment and develop a thoughtful set of additional elements that would compliment the existing plan. Plans are aligned for optimal coherence and driven by data and evidence-based practices. Henry H. North Elementary School (and the district), aligns Title I, Title II, Title III and Section 31a funds and other resources (including federal, state, and local grants) to both the school and district-level improvement 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 F.1: 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 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+.**

Annual awards per building are capped at the following amounts:

- Planning (Option 1, Year 1): **\$500,000**
- Implementation (Option 1, years 2-4 or Option 2, years 1-3): **\$750,000**
- Sustaining reforms (Option 1 year 5 or Option 2 years 4 & 5): **\$500,000**

Any district level costs are charged against the school level budget. District level costs are considered in the overall totals for schools applying for the grant.

Here is an example:

- The district has two eligible schools. Each school initially plans to request \$750,000 for year one.
- The maximum the district can receive in year 1 is \$1,500,000.
- \$75,000 will be used for district level costs; the school requests must be reduced by that amount so as not to exceed the \$1,500,000 maximum.
- Overall district proposed budget for year 1:
 - District costs (\$75,000) + school A (\$712,500) + school B (\$712,500) = \$1,500,000

Complete the budget overview on the next page using the template provided.

LEA Five Year BUDGET OVERVIEW						
Budget Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	5 Year Total
Henry H. North Elementary School	\$478,423	\$717,635	\$717,635	\$717,635	\$438,140	\$3,069,468
LEA Costs (Indirect 4.51%)	\$21,577	\$32,365	\$32,365	\$32,365	\$19,760	\$138,432
Total Budget	\$500,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$457,900	\$3,207,900

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 applying for **Budget Option 1** for year 1 for pre-implementation and planning, years 2-4 of full implementation and and year 5 of sustaining reforms.

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 4.51% Restricted Rate	0	0	0	0	0	\$21,577	\$21,577
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	\$21,577	\$21,577

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 4.51% Restricted Rate	0	0	0	0	0	\$32,365	\$32,365
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	\$32,365	\$32,365

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 4.51% Restricted Rate	0	0	0	0	0	\$32,365	\$32,365
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	\$32,365	\$32,365

YEAR 4 - 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 4.51% Restricted Rate	0	0	0	0	0	\$32,365	\$32,365
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	\$32,365	\$32,365

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 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 4.51% Restricted Rate	0	0	0	0	0	\$19,760	\$19,760
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	\$19,760	\$19,760