

Michigan Technical Assistance Work Plan for 2010–11

September 2010

Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center

.....
at LEARNING POINT ASSOCIATES

1120 East Diehl Road, Suite 200
Naperville, IL 60563-1486
800-356-2735 • 630-649-6500
www.learningpt.org

This work was originally produced in whole or in part by the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center with funds from the U.S. Department of Education under cooperative agreement number S283B050012. The content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department of Education, nor does mention or visual representation of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the federal government.

Great Lakes East is one of the 16 regional comprehensive centers funded by the U.S. Department of Education, and its work is administered by Learning Point Associates.

Contents

	Page
Prior Technical Assistance in Michigan: Years 1–5.....	1
Overview of Context and Coherence.....	1
Summary of Year 5 Goals and Evidence of Capacity Building.....	4
Proposed Technical Assistance in Michigan: Year 6.....	11
Overview of Planned Work.....	11
Summary of Proposed Goals.....	12
Proposed SEA Technical Assistance Goals.....	15
Teacher Quality.....	15
Goal 1: State Individual Professional Development Plans.....	15
Goal 2: State Teacher Preparation System Revision.....	16
Goal 3: Professional Development System and Policy Revision.....	17
High School.....	20
Goal 1: High School Redesign.....	20
Statewide System of Support.....	24
Goal 1: Michigan’s Statewide System of Support.....	24
Goal 2: Response to Intervention.....	26
Goal 3: English Language Learners.....	27
References.....	31
Appendix: Research and Practice Literature That Supports Great Lakes East Work.....	32

Prior Technical Assistance in Michigan: Years 1–5

Overview of Context and Coherence

During Years 1–5, the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center at Learning Point Associates provided assistance to the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) as MDE built and put in place systems, structures, processes, networks, and partnerships in support of district and school improvement. The work of Great Lakes East focused on MDE’s effort to build the department’s capacity and the capacity of its key partners, including the intermediate school districts (ISDs) and their professional association (the Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators [MAISA]), to provide technical assistance and other support to local education agencies (LEAs).

An integral theme within Great Lakes East’s scope of work has been fostering structures to promote MDE cross-office communication, coordination, and leveraging efforts to build coherence, reduce fragmentation, and improve efficiency in an era of diminishing resources and reduced staffing. One of the most important lessons learned during the previous years is the need to focus on alignment of policies, practices, and procedures at all levels of leadership and across structural silos. During Year 5, through a process of continuous inquiry, Great Lakes East was able to gain deeper insights into the kinds of political, practical, and conceptual leadership that will help engage people across all levels of Michigan’s educational system.

Great Lakes East’s work with MDE focused on three key areas during Years 1–5: teacher quality, high school, and statewide system of support.

Teacher Quality

In collaboration with MDE, Great Lakes East built capacity among MDE staff members and key stakeholders to raise the quality of Michigan’s teaching force. Years 1–5 focused on developing and implementing a statewide system of support for professional learning based on the state Professional Learning Strategic Plan. Through the collaborative efforts, Great Lakes East and MDE worked with key stakeholders to refine a comprehensive individual professional development plan process, create critical tools, and gather relevant resources for Michigan pretenure teachers. During the 2009–10 school year, the team field-tested the individual professional development plan process with a select set of new teachers and their mentors in a variety of schools representing the state’s ethnic, economic, and geographic diversity.

In Year 5, as part of the implementation of the state Professional Learning Strategic Plan, a team from Great Lakes East, MDE, and key partners examined all teacher preparation standards documents to discover gaps and overlaps and used that work to help inform MDE in drafting a comprehensive “Framework for Excellence in Teacher Preparation” and a “Teacher Preparation, Certification, and Professional Learning Continuum.” Also, as part of the implementation of the strategic plan, Great Lakes East assisted in the initial conceptualizing of a three-tier licensure system for teachers that will be incorporated into the Continuum.

At the request of MDE's deputy superintendent, MDE and Great Lakes East formed a new cross-office team focused on professional development. The team began working to understand the current research on professional development, revise MDE's professional development policy, and explore ways to ensure that all appropriate MDE requests for proposals reflect principles of effective professional development. All this work will continue in Year 6.

High School

Beginning with the graduating class of 2011, all high school students are required to meet the standards of the new Michigan Merit Curriculum in order to earn a high school diploma. In Year 5, Great Lakes East continued to build MDE's capacity to help districts and schools as their students strive to meet the new requirement and increase achievement. Through the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation (formerly the Office of School Improvement), Great Lakes East worked with MDE to build coherence in the high school work and strengthen collaboration between MDE offices, ISDs, and key stakeholders. Effort was placed on leveraging the various high school activities and initiatives across MDE and drafting a "Michigan Framework for Reimagining High Schools" to provide schools and districts across the state with guidance for high school redesign. After the superintendent of public instruction issued a dropout challenge to all schools and districts in Michigan, Great Lakes East worked collaboratively with MDE and its partners to support this initiative. In addition, an MDE cross-office team on alternative high schools was convened to meet with an alternative education focus group that represented schools and districts across the state to identify and address key issues and concerns of alternative educators around the state.

Statewide System of Support

To support Michigan's statewide system of support, Great Lakes East began working with MDE several years ago in order to address No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act responsibilities and help MDE provide an effective system of support for districts and schools in the improvement process, especially those in corrective action.

During Year 5, Great Lakes East continued working with the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation (formerly the Office of School Improvement) to refine and strengthen Michigan's statewide system of support. Great Lakes East reviewed data and provided formative feedback about the implementation of the expanded components of Michigan's statewide system of support and assisted the state to increase alignment and coherence of the existing components of Michigan's system. The original statewide system of support provided intensive interventions for schools in corrective action in Year 3 or above. Three new components were added to the statewide system of support for schools in corrective action in Year 1 and Year 2. These expansions to the statewide system of support include the following:

- **Evidence-Based Interventions.** School leadership teams were trained to select evidence-based interventions to increase student achievement.
- **Instructional Coaches.** Instructional coaches were hired and trained to work with teachers in high-priority schools to build the capacity of teachers to implement with fidelity evidence-based strategies in the areas of English language arts and mathematics.

- **Data Coaches.** Data coaches helped schools build a culture of using quality data suitable for decision making. Data coaches worked closely with school leadership teams to understand the data and to align school improvement plans to address identified needs.

To assist the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation in this redesign, Great Lakes East worked collaboratively with the Center on Innovation & Improvement (CII). They guided MDE through a self-assessment process to identify strengths and weaknesses of the current system to begin the process of redesign. Great Lakes East and CII identified and studied current research on statewide systems of support and other states' designs and processes for improving the current Michigan system.

To address the needs of Michigan's student subgroups, especially its English language learners (ELLs), Great Lakes East provided support to MDE in developing and refining an ELL five-year strategic plan, which defines priority state issues, needs, and action plans. With guidance from the five-year plan, work began to build a strong infrastructure of support for Michigan's ELL students and their teachers. In Year 5, Great Lakes East worked with MDE to update and extend the strategic plan for an additional three years. To further enhance this initiative, Great Lakes East continued to codesign MDE's statewide ELL Advisory Committee's quarterly meetings and facilitate the Committee's work in support of strategic plan implementation. Also, the work continued through MDE's cross-office ELL core team composed of MDE office directors and staff from throughout the department and facilitated by Great Lakes East. Great Lakes East assisted state ELL leaders in the development of professional development plans based on the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model that meet the needs of each of their respective regions. This additional support strategically expanded technical assistance for the statewide ELL strategic plan.

During Year 5, Great Lakes East also began working with MDE on response to intervention (RTI). MDE was eager to provide support and guidance to districts and hoped to encourage all districts to look closely at RTI as a core piece of the school improvement puzzle. With assistance from Great Lakes East, MDE formed a cross-office team consisting of staff members from the Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services, the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation, ISDs, higher education, Great Lakes East (and its partner RMC Research Corporation), and the National Center on Response to Intervention (NCRTI). The team's purpose was to develop a statewide framework and guidance resources for RTI implementation. As they drafted the framework and guidance resources, the team worked to align the Michigan Continuous School Improvement Process with the emerging RTI system.

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009

In Year 5, Great Lakes East continued to align its efforts in Michigan to ARRA's assurance areas. Although the work touches on all four assurance areas, the bulk of support that Great Lakes East is providing to MDE is in the assurance areas focused on effective teachers and support to struggling schools. Addressing teacher quality, Great Lakes East has been assisting MDE in the following regard:

- Developing a three-tier licensure process

- Revamping teacher preparation program approval guidelines
- Drafting guidelines for the state's to-be-established alternative preparation programs
- Creating an individual professional development plan process for teachers
- Revising MDE's professional development policy
- Integrating principles of effective professional development into all MDE initiatives, including the agency's requests for proposals

Great Lakes East also is supporting struggling schools by assisting MDE and its partners as they redesign Michigan's statewide system of support. Great Lakes East's contributions to this effort include the following activities:

- Striving for coordination and coherence across the numerous components
- Sharing examples, models, and learnings from other states
- Developing an operational manual and action plan for program redesign
- Cofacilitating and designing core team meetings
- Creating and implementing a comprehensive electronic data, record keeping, and artifact storage site (SharePoint) for MDE and its partners
- Generating formative feedback for a key MDE partner and helping them take action based on the data

Great Lakes East has supported MDE as it worked through the process of submitting their Round 1 Race to the Top application by hosting the participation of key MDE staff in a regional ARRA forum on November 19, 2009, cohosted by Great Lakes East, the Great Lakes West Comprehensive Center, REL Midwest at Learning Point Associates, as well as the North Central Comprehensive Center and REL Central. Representatives from the U.S. Department of Education made presentations and responded to questions from state education agency (SEA) members representing 10 Midwestern states. The forum focused on building coherence across ARRA funds and enabled staff to clarify some questions they had regarding ARRA funding. Great Lakes East facilitated Michigan's team and assisted the team in creating a structure for organizing their Race to the Top proposal effort. The leaders of the internal MDE ARRA team also have participated in the periodic ARRA Web conferences hosted by Great Lakes East and Great Lakes West.

Summary of Year 5 Goals and Evidence of Capacity Building

The technical assistance goals codeveloped with MDE strongly align to NCLB as well as ARRA priority areas, as described below under each Year 5 goal (see Tables 1–7). The overarching goal of MDE's work with Great Lakes East during the past five years has been to improve the performance of all Michigan students, with a particular focus on lower performing student subgroups and to strengthen cross-office collaboration within MDE.

Teacher Quality (Year 5)

Table 1. Teacher Quality Goal 1: State Individual Professional Development Plans

Goal Name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Individual Professional Development Plans
Goal Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase teacher quality by identifying and implementing a process for educators to use for individual professional development plans that support the state’s school improvement process. <i>(Continues into Year 6.)</i>
Great Lakes East and MDE Collaborative Work and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building	<p>MDE built and sustained systemic support for district and school improvement efforts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designed professional development in support of individual professional development plan implementation by field-testing 54 teachers, mentors, and principals. <p>MDE improved the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designed and conducted the field test; surveyed and interviewed participants throughout the field test for formative feedback on the plan’s template and implementation for further revision and improvement. • Revised individual professional development plan process and materials for field testing based on participants’ feedback. • Incorporated additional tools and guidance materials as part of the individual professional development plan.

Table 2. Teacher Quality Goal 2: State Teacher Preparation System Revision

Goal Name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Teacher Preparation System Revision
Goal Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To improve coordination and alignment of teacher preparation to the current teacher workforce and provide available research to inform teacher preparation and teacher preparation policy based on recommendations of the Teacher Preparation Redesign Task Force. <i>(Continues into Year 6.)</i>
Great Lakes East and MDE Collaborative Work and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building	<p>MDE developed solutions to address needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed and examined all types of teacher standards for gaps and overlaps. • Created a draft “Framework for Excellence in Teacher Preparation” and a “Teacher Preparation, Certification, and Professional Learning Continuum.” • Aligned all key standards documents related to teacher preparation. • Helped MDE strengthen the final report of English language arts standards review.

High School (Year 5)

Table 3. High School Goal 1: High School Redesign

Goal Name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High School Redesign
Goal Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To build the capacity of MDE and key stakeholders in the state to support all students in order to meet the state’s rigorous high school graduation standards (Michigan Merit Curriculum), with particular attention to the academic achievement of student subgroups. <i>(Continues into Year 6 with</i>

	<i>additional focus on alternative high schools.)</i>
Great Lakes East and MDE Collaborative Work and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building	<p>MDE accurately assessed the improvement needs of its districts and schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planned and facilitated a meeting with stakeholders to gather input on principles for a “Michigan Framework for Reimagining High Schools.” • Disseminated research and literature to the high school strategic planning committee to assist with development of principles for high school redesign. • Facilitated meetings to collect and review proficiency data in high-poverty high schools to accurately assess improvement needs and to identify schools that are “beating the odds” through continuous improvement. <p>MDE developed solutions to address needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formed and facilitated a collaborative Great Lakes East and MDE planning team to develop high school core team agendas and rotating facilitation plan to increase regular collaboration and communication between MDE offices and ISDs. • Facilitated the high school core team meetings to increase coherence of MDE’s high school work and create a system of collaboration with MDE. • Planned and facilitated quarterly high school core team (strategic planning committee) meetings to draft principles for “Michigan Framework for Reimagining High Schools,” to support the work of the Emerging Practices website committee, and plan for a statewide dropout prevention conference. • Worked with MDE and early/middle colleges to build support for early/middle college high school programs focused on students at risk of dropping out. • Facilitated weekly meetings with the dropout prevention planning team to build MDE capacity to develop support for schools and districts participating in MDE’s Dropout Challenge. • Disseminated research and literature on dropout prevention and support for struggling students to MDE Dropout Prevention committee to review and post on MDE Graduation Town website. • Facilitated meetings and coplanned Dropout Prevention Summit for schools, districts, ISDs, and community partners held in August 2010. <p>MDE built and sustained systemic support for district and school improvement efforts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worked collaboratively with MDE/Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP) team to develop and provide resources to Graduation Town website to disseminate information on dropout prevention and to provide a vehicle for communication and collaboration for schools and districts. • Created a dropout prevention site on the MDE website to disseminate dropout prevention support for schools and districts.

Table 4. High School Goal 4: Alternative High Schools

Goal Name	• Alternative High Schools
Goal Description	• To improve statewide capacity to accurately assess the improvement needs of the state’s alternative schools and programs and to develop solutions to

	address those needs to increase student achievement with a focus on subgroups not making adequate yearly progress (AYP). <i>(This goal will be integrated into the High School Redesign goal in Year 6.)</i>
Great Lakes East and MDE Collaborative Work and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building	<p>MDE accurately assessed the improvement needs of its districts and schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convened and facilitated monthly alternative education focus group meetings to assess the needs of districts and alternative high schools with meeting Michigan’s rigorous high school graduation requirements, to assess barriers to student achievement in alternative high schools, and to identify MDE supports available for alternative education high schools. • Identified professional development and technical assistance needs of districts and alternative high schools. • Identified state policies and requirements that affect the success of students in alternative high schools. <p>MDE developed solutions to address needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cofacilitated alternative education monthly meetings to increase collaboration and communication between MDE offices regarding districts and alternative high schools and to share MDE supports available for these high schools. • Coplanned and provided technical assistance to develop professional development activities for districts and alternative high schools. • Provided support and resources to MDE including research about alternative education models around the country to assist districts and alternative high schools as they work to increase student achievement. • Cofacilitated meetings between MDE and alternative education focus group to gather input from schools and districts to develop new policy on adequate yearly progress (AYP) and alternative high schools. • Coplanned professional development activities in October and June to build capacity of alternative educators to support struggling students. • Provided recommendations for addressing AYP concerns of alternative high schools to the Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability. <p>MDE built and sustained systemic support for district and school improvement efforts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported development of a “Michigan Framework of Excellence for Alternative Education in Michigan.” <p>MDE improved the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MDE developed a new policy regarding AYP and alternative high schools to be implemented in the 2010–11 school year.

Statewide System of Support (SSOS) (Year 5)

Table 5. SSOS Goal 1: Michigan’s Statewide System of Support

Goal Name	• Michigan’s Statewide System of Support
Goal Description	• To address MDE’s NCLB responsibilities to provide an effective system of support for districts and schools in the improvement process, especially those

	in corrective action. (<i>Continues into Year 6.</i>)
<p>Great Lakes East and MDE Collaborative Work and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building</p>	<p>MDE accurately assessed the improvement needs of its districts and schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducted an SSOS rubric and self-assessment to identify strengths and weaknesses in the current statewide system of support. • Provided formative feedback to identify issues and concerns impacting coherence of components of the current statewide system of support and to identify issues with integration of statewide system of support expansion. <p>MDE developed solutions to address needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed the SSOS Self-Assessment report to MDE that identified strengths and weaknesses in the current SSOS. • Supported and cofacilitated monthly SSOS core team meetings to analyze new data (on high-priority high schools) and guide the team’s work to increase alignment, coherence, and understanding of Michigan’s statewide system of support. • Collaborated with the Center on Innovation & Improvement to facilitate cross-state dialogues with eight other states to inform continuous improvement of the statewide system of support through participation in the Pacesetter Academy. • Provided technical assistance and disseminated information to ensure that all components of the statewide system of support are aligned and coherent, based on the current research by the Center on Innovation & Improvement. • Cofacilitated MDE Emerging Practices committee meetings to begin development of an Emerging Practices website, which shares promising and research-based practices of high-poverty, high-achieving “model” high schools in Michigan. • Facilitated MDE Emerging Practices committee meetings to integrate Emerging Practices website plans with MDE Teaching for Learning website plans to coordinate services. • Disseminated research on characteristics of high-achieving, high-poverty schools and on statewide system of support in other states. • Facilitated meetings to select high-poverty schools to study that are demonstrating progress toward high achievement in Michigan. • Provided guidance to MDE on creating a selection process for schools to be featured on the Emerging Practices website. • Disseminated information to organize the process of developing protocols for case studies of high-poverty, high-achieving schools. • Facilitated meetings to review protocols to use for case studies of high-poverty schools showing progress in Michigan. <p>MDE built and sustained systemic support for district and school improvement efforts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed a SharePoint site to increase communication and transparency between SSOS components. • Increased capacity for MDE and key stakeholders to refine and improve their statewide system of support through participation in the year-long Pacesetter Academy. • Leveraged ISD resources to create a network of support for improving secondary instructional improvement through SSOS Collaboration team

	<p>meetings.</p> <p>MDE improved the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitated meetings with MDE and the Center on Innovation & Improvement to share current research on statewide system of support. Provided information to SSOS team on instructional coaching models.
--	--

Table 6. SSOS Goal 2: Response to Intervention

Goal Name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response to Intervention
Goal Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To help MDE develop an RTI initiative that will identify priority state issues, needs, and action plans to build a strong infrastructure of support for implementation of RTI in Michigan. (<i>Continues into Year 6.</i>)
Great Lakes East and MDE Collaborative Work and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building	<p>MDE developed solutions to address needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determined state supports needed for LEAs in order to effectively implement RTI and identified issues and needs related to RTI and its implementation. Codeveloped a plan of action to build MDE’s capacity to support RTI implementation. <p>MDE built and sustained systemic support for district and school improvement efforts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased capacity in MDE and the ISDs to develop and implement processes to support school district efforts to implement RTI by creating frameworks and other guidance documents and tools. <p>MDE improved the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created a draft “RTI Critical Features Framework” that includes RTI essential elements, definition, principles, and examples. Integrated RTI and MDE’s Continuous School Improvement Process. Designed and conducted a statewide RTI conference for school, district, and ISD leaders.

Table 7. SSOS Goal 3: English Language Learners

Goal Name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English Language Learners
Goal Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To implement an ELL program strategic plan that will identify priority state issues, needs, and action plans. This five-year plan will build a strong infrastructure of support for all Michigan ELLs and their teachers. (<i>Continues into Year 6.</i>)
Great Lakes East and MDE Collaborative Work and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building	<p>MDE developed solutions to address needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assisted MDE to create and refine communications tools for the ELL educators (district leaders and teachers). Facilitated MDE and its statewide ELL advisory committee to revise, update, and implement the state’s ELL strategic plan. <p>MDE built and sustained systemic support for district and school improvement efforts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designed and facilitated MDE’s ELL Advisory Committee’s quarterly meetings.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increased capacity in MDE and key ELL program stakeholders to develop and sustain a system that supports and implements effective ELL strategies.• Developed state ELL leaders' capacity to provide high-quality professional development to ELLs.• Assisted state ELL leaders in the development of professional development plans based on the SIOP model that meet the needs of each of their respective regions.• Formalized a cross-office ELL core team to coordinate, align, leverage, and grow MDE's ELL work.
--	---

Proposed Technical Assistance in Michigan: Year 6

Overview of Planned Work

The Great Lakes East technical assistance plan for Year 6 will focus on completing and institutionalizing the structures, plans, tools, systems, and processes needed by MDE to fully support school improvement at the district, school, and classroom levels for all students. Focus will continue to be on strengthening cross-office teams to increase communication, efficiency, and coherence across the department and maximize leveraging opportunities.

During Year 6, Great Lakes East will continue to work with MDE to ensure coherence in the high school work and increase collaboration between MDE offices, ISDs, and key stakeholders. The goal is to ensure that everyone is working together toward increasing and supporting academic achievement of all students, especially student subgroups. Through the cross-office high school team, effort will continue on leveraging the various high school activities and initiatives across MDE as well as completing the development of the “Michigan Framework for Reimagining High Schools” and disseminating the framework across the state. In addition, Great Lakes East will provide technical assistance to MDE to develop and disseminate strategies and interventions to address the achievement gaps and to increase the academic achievement of high school students across the state, with an emphasis on struggling learners. The alternative education goal from Year 5 will be integrated into the high school redesign goal to ensure that all high school redesign efforts will be aligned and coherent. Great Lakes East will provide technical assistance to coordinate the development of a five-year strategic plan for high school improvement and continue to support the Superintendent’s office and key partners with dropout prevention.

Great Lakes East will continue to work with the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation to redesign and improve the statewide system of support. Effort will be placed on ensuring that all the components are aligned and coherent to create and integrate into the overall picture a statewide system of support for districts with schools in corrective action.

The ELL student population will continue to receive special attention. Great Lakes East is working with MDE to improve statewide capacity to address the needs of Michigan’s ELL students through expanding the work of the MDE cross-office ELL core team. Great Lakes East will continue the implementation of the refined and expanded ELL strategic plan. The plan will focus on developing a uniform statewide approach to high-quality ELL program development information and on supporting the further development of ELL preservice and inservice programs.

The role of response to intervention (RTI) in assisting districts and the integration into the state’s technical assistance process and system of support also will be explored, and a state plan for supporting RTI, including finalizing an RTI framework and guidance documents, will be implemented. Great Lakes East will facilitate an MDE cross-office RTI team to lead the implementation of the plan.

In addition, through its work with the Office of Professional Preparation Services in Year 6, Great Lakes East will support Michigan’s effort to promote practices for improving overall teacher quality. It will work with MDE to strengthen the state’s professional development infrastructure and focus on other strategies within the state Professional Learning Strategic Plan. Year 6 work will include the support needed to scale up the individual professional development plan across the state, as well as completion of the “Michigan Framework for Excellence in Teacher Preparation” and the “Teacher Preparation, Certification, and Professional Learning Continuum.” The overarching goal is to effectively address MDE’s responsibilities for ensuring that all students have highly effective teachers.

As a new technical assistance goal in Year 6, under the direction of MDE Deputy Superintendent and Chief Academic Officer Sally Vaughn, Ph.D., the work of the professional development cross-office team will engage key stakeholders, including professional associations and teachers unions, in refining MDE’s professional development policy and creating a coherent professional development system in the state.

At the request of MDE, Great Lakes East also will be providing assistance to MDE and its Literacy Stakeholder Group to create a statewide literacy plan. The overall goal of the plan is to create a coordinated, comprehensive state infrastructure to increase high literacy achievement for all Michigan students. The plan will guide and inform MDE’s literacy-related activities and initiatives in support of local districts and will be completed by December 2010.

Summary of Proposed Goals

The overarching goal for Year 6 will continue to be to improve performance of all of the state’s students with a particular focus on lower performing student subgroups and to keep fostering cross-office collaboration within MDE. Table 8 details Michigan technical assistance goals for Year 6.

Table 8. Michigan Technical Assistance Goals: Year 6

Teacher Quality	High School	Statewide System of Support
<p>Goal 1. State Individual Professional Development Plans—To increase teacher quality by identifying and implementing a process for educators to use for individual professional development plans that support the state’s school improvement process. <i>(Continued from Year 1.)</i></p>	<p>Goal 1. High School Redesign—To build the capacity of MDE and key stakeholders in the state to support all students in order to meet the state’s rigorous high school graduation standards (Michigan Merit Curriculum), with particular attention to the academic achievement of student subgroups. <i>(Continued from Year 3.)</i></p>	<p>Goal 1. Michigan’s Statewide System of Support—To address MDE’s NCLB responsibilities and to provide an effective system of support for districts and schools in the improvement process, especially those in corrective action. <i>(Continued from Year 3.)</i></p>
<p>Goal 2. State Teacher Preparation System Revision—To improve</p>		<p>Goal 2. Response to Intervention—To help MDE develop an RTI initiative that</p>

Teacher Quality	High School	Statewide System of Support
<p>coordination and alignment of teacher preparation to the current teacher workforce and provide available research to inform teacher preparation and teacher preparation policy based on recommendations of the Teacher Preparation Redesign Task Force. <i>(Continued from Year 4.)</i></p>		<p>will identify priority state issues, needs, and action plans to build a strong infrastructure of support for implementation of RTI in Michigan. <i>(Continued from Year 5.)</i></p>
<p>Goal 3: Professional Development System and Policy Revision—To refine policy to support a coherent and consistent system for high-quality professional learning at the state and district levels and develop guidelines to support implementation of the professional development policy. <i>(New for Year 6.)</i></p>		<p>Goal 3. English Language Learners—To implement an ELL program strategic plan that will identify priority state issues, needs, and action plans. This five-year plan will build a strong infrastructure of support for all Michigan ELLs and their teachers. <i>(Continued from Year 2.)</i></p>
Relationship to NCLB		
Teacher Quality	High Schools	Statewide System of Support
<p>Recognizing that a highly qualified teacher is the key to raising student achievement, this effort builds MDE’s capacity to:</p> <p>(1) Connect teacher professional learning needs with the improvement needs of schools and districts. Great Lakes East is assisting MDE to develop the tools and systems for the individual professional development plan process for all state educators.</p> <p>(2) Implement the recommendations of the Teacher Preparation Redesign Task Force in order to ensure that new teachers are highly qualified.</p> <p>(3) Provide policy support to ensure that all teachers have access to research based professional development.</p>	<p>This goal addresses NCLB responsibilities to raise student achievement of all student subgroups in the context of Michigan’s high school reform initiative.</p>	<p>NCLB requires that SEAs and LEAs provide schools identified for improvement with extensive support and technical assistance in designing and implementing a plan to improve student achievement, including the student subgroups such as ELLs.</p>

Teacher Quality	High School	Statewide System of Support
Connection to the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act		
<p>The proposed goals under the area of teacher quality will provide MDE assistance in building an infrastructure of support for teacher learning and effectiveness as well as strengthen teacher preparation to ensure a highly qualified and effective teacher in every classroom.</p>	<p>The proposed goals under the area of high schools will provide MDE assistance in helping all students meet rigorous graduation requirements (based on high quality standards and assessments) and be prepared for postsecondary education.</p>	<p>The proposed goals under the area of statewide system of support will provide MDE assistance in reimagining and strengthening its statewide system of support for struggling schools and districts.</p>

Proposed SEA Technical Assistance Goals

Teacher Quality

Goal 1: State Individual Professional Development Plans

To increase teacher quality by identifying and implementing a process for educators to use for individual professional development plans that support the state’s school improvement process.

Scope of Services. With a focus on implementation of Michigan’s Professional Learning Strategic Plan, Great Lakes East will continue to conduct and cofacilitate regular face-to-face meetings and teleconferences with MDE’s Professional Learning team. The team engages a diverse stakeholder group, including representatives from unions, professional associations, ISDs, and LEAs, in guiding the development of a plan for rollout of the individual professional development plan, an essential component of the state Professional Learning Strategic Plan. Linkages will be made between the individual professional development plan and Michigan’s School Improvement Framework.

Based on the field test conducted during Year 5, the team will analyze feedback, collected and interpreted by the American Institutes for Research (AIR), in collaboration with the stakeholder group. Based on these data, final revisions will be made to all components of the individual professional development plan and a final electronic version will be created. The team then will draft a plan to be used by the Office of Professional Preparation to introduce the individual professional development plan to districts statewide. As part of the statewide rollout, Great Lakes East will conduct ongoing literature reviews to identify effective professional learning strategies to support effective teacher use of individual professional development plans and will design professional development for teachers, mentors, and principals to support the statewide rollout.

Key Team Members. The key team members are Gary Appel (Michigan state manager), Claudette Rasmussen (Great Lakes East), and Amy Colton (lead, Great Lakes East consultant); Sally Vaughn (Office of the Superintendent), Flora Jenkins, Donna Hamilton, Karen Hairston, Catherine Smith, and Bonnie Rockafellow (Office of Professional Preparation); and Darren Woodruff (AIR).

Elements and Outcomes. Table 9 describes the core elements of capacity building and their anticipated outcomes and evidence for Goal 1: State Individual Professional Development Plans.

Table 9. Elements of Capacity Building and Outcomes for Teacher Quality Goal 1: State Individual Professional Development Plans

Core Elements of Capacity Building	Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building (Start and End Dates Provided in Parentheses)
MDE accurately assesses the improvement needs of its districts and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalize an individual professional development plan process that guides teachers to choose their professional goals after examining student learning goals in their school improvement plan and assessing the needs

Core Elements of Capacity Building	Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building (Start and End Dates Provided in Parentheses)
schools.	of their current students. (October 2010–November 2010)
MDE develops solutions to address needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refine the field-tested individual professional development plan process in place for use by mentors and beginning teachers and available for use by all Michigan teachers. (October 2010–November 2010)
MDE builds and sustains systemic support for district and school improvement efforts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase capacity for MDE and key stakeholders to develop and sustain a system that supports and implements effective professional learning. (October 2010–September 2011) • Finalize an articulated, technology-based individual professional development plan process that connects with other MDE electronic resources and can be more easily scaled up throughout the system. (October 2010–November 2010) • Implement the individual professional development plans with beginning teachers statewide with local support from their mentors, grade/department-level teams, and principals as well as the ongoing training support of the state’s ISDs. (November 2010–May 2011)
MDE improves the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an observation tool for teacher performance assessment to support the individual professional development plans based on MDE’s professional standards for Michigan teachers. (October 2010–December 2010) • Roll out statewide an individual professional development plan process that guides teachers to choose professional learning experiences that address Michigan standards, including content standards and professional development standards identified in the state’s Professional Learning Strategic Plan. (November 2010–September 2011)

Goal 2: State Teacher Preparation System Revision

To improve coordination and alignment of teacher preparation to the current teacher workforce and provide available research to inform teacher preparation and teacher preparation policy based on recommendations of the Teacher Preparation Redesign Task Force.

Scope of Services. A team from Great Lakes East, MDE, and key partners will finalize the design of a “Framework for Excellence in Teacher Preparation” by further analyzing the review data from examining standards documents (e.g., standards for teacher preparation institutions, Professional Standards for Michigan Teachers, standards for every subject area of teacher preparation, Certification Standards for Elementary Teachers). The team will work with MDE to revise the framework based on input from the State Board of Education’s Post Secondary Commission on Teaching and will submit it to the State Board of Education for approval. In conjunction with the framework, Great Lakes East will continue to provide assistance to MDE in refining the “Teacher Preparation, Certification, and Professional Learning Continuum.” The continuum will describe the system of requirements for teacher candidates, preparation institutions, and employing school districts along the continuum of a teacher’s career from preservice through induction and into the ongoing professional development of a teacher. The

framework and continuum reflect both recent Michigan legislation and Race to the Top priorities.

Key Team Members. The key team members are Gary Appel (Michigan state manager); Jane Coggshall (National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality); and Flora Jenkins and Catherine Smith (Office of Professional Preparation).

Elements and Outcomes. Table 10 describes the core elements of capacity building and their anticipated outcomes and evidence for Goal 2: State Teacher Preparation System Revision.

Table 10. Elements of Capacity Building and Outcomes for Teacher Quality Goal 2: State Teacher Preparation System Revision

Core Elements of Capacity Building	Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building (Start and End Dates Provided in Parentheses)
MDE accurately assesses the improvement needs of its districts and schools.	[This cell is intentionally blank.]
MDE develops solutions to address needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize a “Framework for Excellence in Teacher Preparation” in partnership with the State Board’s Professional Standards Commission for Teaching. (October 2010–November 2010) • Finalize a “Teacher Preparation, Certification, and Professional Learning Continuum” that will include a three-tiered teacher licensure system. (October 2010–February 2011)
MDE builds and sustains systemic support for district and school improvement efforts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attain State Board of Education approval for “Framework for Excellence in Teacher Preparation.” (November 2010–December 2010)
MDE improves the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement MDE’s oversight of the teacher preparation system based on the framework and continuum. (January 2011–September 2011)

Goal 3: Professional Development System and Policy Revision

To refine policy to support a coherent and consistent system for high quality professional learning at the state and district levels and develop guidelines to support implementation of the professional development policy.

Scope of Services. MDE’s professional development cross-office team consisting of office directors and one or two staff members from the respective offices will work to increase teacher quality. The team aims to develop a cross-department understanding of professional learning and to design a system that supports and leverages the use of effective professional learning. It also seeks to align and implement MDE policies, partnerships, and structures to support effective professional development. As part of the immediate scope of work, Great Lakes East will assist MDE to revise current policy on professional development to reflect the new National Staff Development Council standards and draft a rubric that MDE could use when evaluating grant

applications. Drafting a general professional development guide for the field also will be included. The group will develop guidelines to support implementation of the revised professional development policy. These tools will be shared with the team and an expanded stakeholder group in the fall of 2010 and then presented to the State Board of Education and later to the field. The revised professional development policy will be adopted by the State Board of Education in early 2011.

Key Team Members. The key team members are Gary Appel (Michigan state manager); Claudette Rasmussen (Great Lakes East); Amy Colton (lead, Great Lakes East consultant); and Sally Vaughn (Office of the Superintendent).

Elements and Outcomes. Table 11 describes the core elements of capacity building and their anticipated outcomes and evidence for Goal 3: Professional Development System and Policy Revision.

**Table 11. Elements of Capacity Building and Outcomes for
Teacher Quality Goal 3: Professional Development System and Policy Revision**

Core Elements of Capacity Building	Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building (Start and End Dates Provided in Parentheses)
MDE accurately assesses the improvement needs of its districts and schools.	[This cell is intentionally blank.]
MDE develops solutions to address needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and facilitate a cross-office functional team to build understanding of research-based professional development, revise MDE professional development policies, and ensure that all MDE requests for proposals reflect principles of effective professional development. (October 2010–September 2011) • Revise MDE’s current policy on professional development and draft an update to reflect the new National Staff Development Council (NSDC) standards. (September 2010–December 2010) • Ensure that high-quality professional development is embedded in all MDE requests for proposals, including a rubric that MDE can use when evaluating grant applications. (October 2010–March 2011) • Develop professional development guidelines in collaboration with key stakeholder groups. (November 2010–September 2011) • Implement an approved Michigan State Board of Education professional development policy that reflects the new NSDC definition. (December 2010–September 2011)
MDE builds and sustains systemic support for district and school improvement efforts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that educators have a broad-based understanding and commitment to the state’s vision of high-quality professional learning. (October 2010–September 2011) • Draft a rubric that MDE could use when evaluating grant applications as well as a general guide for the field when offering professional development. (October 2010–July 2010)

Core Elements of Capacity Building	Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building (Start and End Dates Provided in Parentheses)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support MDE in ensuring that educators have a broad-based understanding and commitment to the state’s vision of high-quality professional learning. (December 2010–September 2011) • MDE and key stakeholder groups have increased capacity to develop and sustain a system that supports and implements effective professional learning. (December 2010–March 2011)
MDE improves the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MDE has increased capacity to develop a professional development monitoring and evaluation plan. (January 2011–September 2011)

High School

Goal 1: High School Redesign

To build the capacity of MDE and key stakeholders in the state to support all students in order to meet the state’s rigorous high school graduation standards (Michigan Merit Curriculum), with particular attention to the academic achievement of student subgroups.

Scope of Services. Great Lakes East and MDE will continue to facilitate the high school core team and work closely with MDE’s newly formed high school unit in order to support state efforts to increase the coherence of the technical assistance work to raise academic achievement in Michigan’s high schools and to ensure that students come to high school prepared to meet high academic standards and are college and career ready upon graduation. MDE has requested technical assistance to develop a five-year strategic plan for high school improvement. Great Lakes East and the National High School Center will work facilitate this work. Other collaborators in this work include Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Midwest, and MDE’s offices of Education Improvement and Innovation, Special Education and Early Intervention Services, Professional Preparation, and Career and Technical Education. The team also has additional representation from ISDs and professional associations, including the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, MAISA, and Michigan School Counselors. In Year 6, Great Lakes East will work with MDE’s high school unit to coordinate the high school redesign work across the department and with ISDs, LEAs, IHEs, and professional organizations. Systems to build capacity across agencies will be refined in order to share information, skills, and services.

Great Lakes East will continue providing technical assistance to MDE as it supports the state’s LEAs—especially those with large populations of student subgroups and those that are in corrective action for failure to meet the adequate yearly progress (AYP) measure—to ensure that all students in the state meet graduation requirements. Continuing through Year 6, Great Lakes East will assist MDE in developing and disseminating a “Michigan Framework for Reimagining High Schools” to provide guidance for high school redesign in order to increase academic achievement, and to build the capacity of districts and schools to ensure that all students are college and career ready.

Technical assistance will be provided to the core team and MDE High School Unit to develop and provide opportunities to share research-based best practices as well as to gather information from ISDs, districts, and schools regarding challenges they face and the support they need to meet the requirements of the Michigan Merit Curriculum and to implement the “Michigan Framework for Reimagining High Schools.” In addition, a high school core team subcommittee will review data to identify schools and collect information on promising and emerging practices across the state to support the statewide system of support Emerging Practices committee. Great Lakes East also will provide assistance to the MDE team working on the High School Dropout Challenge.

The alternative education goal, which continued through Year 5, will be integrated into the overall high school redesign work for Year 6 in order to ensure that improvement efforts prepare *all* students to meet the rigorous Michigan Merit Curriculum requirements and be college and

career ready upon graduation. Great Lakes East will continue technical assistance to help MDE build statewide capacity to accurately assess the improvement needs of the state’s alternative high schools and programs and to develop solutions to address those needs to increase student achievement with a focus on subgroups not making AYP. Great Lakes East and MDE team members will meet with an Alternative Education Focus Group that consists of MDE staff and LEA representatives from across the state. Barriers to increased student achievement in alternative high schools and programs will be identified, and the team will work with stakeholders to develop solutions to address those needs. The team will continue to work with MDE, stakeholders, and policymakers to identify state policies that may create barriers for alternative education student success and to craft proposals to reduce policy impediments. In addition, Great Lakes East will work with MDE to identify and disseminate information and supports needed to increase student achievement in alternative high schools. Great Lakes East will work with its subcontractors, RELs, the Center on Instruction, and the National High School Center to provide research about best instructional practices to use with struggling learners as well as research about alternative education models from across the country. The team will work to develop a statewide system of professional development for alternative educators designed to promote increased student achievement.

Key Team Members. The key team members are Linda Forward, Sam Sinicropi, Dan LaDue, Ruth Isaia, Sue Codere, Barb Fardell, and Mark Coscarella (Office of Education Improvement and Innovation); Leisa Gallagher and Fran Loose (Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services); Patty Cantu (Office of Career and Technical Education); Krista Ried (Office of Professional Preparation); Jan Ellis (Superintendent’s Office); Deb Clemmons (State School Reform and Redesign Office); Carl Wozniak (Northern Michigan University); Toni Glasscoe (Lansing Community College); Kristine Gullen (Oakland Schools); Diane McMillan (Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals); Jay Miller (Michigan School Counselors); Charlotte Koger and Myra Munroe (MAISA); Bersheril Bailey (Great Lakes East lead); and Gary Appel (Michigan state manager, Great Lakes East).

Elements and Outcomes. Table 12 describes the core elements of capacity building and their anticipated outcomes and evidence for Goal 1: High School Redesign.

Table 12. Elements of Capacity Building and Outcomes for High School Goal 1: High School Redesign

Core Elements of Capacity Building	Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building (Start and End Dates Provided in Parentheses)
MDE accurately assesses the improvement needs of its districts and schools.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan and conduct surveys to gather information from ISDs, districts, and schools regarding challenges they face and the support they need to meet the requirements of the Michigan Merit Curriculum and to implement the “Michigan Framework for Reimagining High Schools.” (October 2010–June 2011) • Conduct regular core team meetings to discuss needs of districts and schools and how MDE and key stakeholders can address the needs. (October 2010–June 2011) • Facilitate cross-office meetings to review achievement data of

Core Elements of Capacity Building	Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building (Start and End Dates Provided in Parentheses)
	<p>Michigan’s high schools. (October 2010–June 2011)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a five-year strategic plan for high school improvement. (November 2010–August 2011) • Convene monthly alternative education focus group meetings to assess the needs of districts and alternative high schools with meeting Michigan’s rigorous high school graduation requirements. (October 2010–June 2011) • Identify professional development and technical assistance needs of districts and alternative high schools. (October 2010–March 2011) • Identify state policies and requirements that affect the success of students in alternative high schools. (October 2010–March 2011)
MDE develops solutions to address needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement a subcommittee to develop a plan to disseminate “Michigan Framework for Reimagining High Schools” to MDE offices, ISDs, LEAs, and professional organizations to support all students in meeting Michigan’s high school graduation requirements. (October 2010–January 2011) • Plan and convene webinars and/or meetings to share research-based best practices and “Michigan Framework for Reimagining High Schools” to increase student achievement in high schools. (October 2010–May 2011) • Co-manage an online tool (Graduation Town) created to disseminate research-based information and to increase communication with key stakeholders. (October 2010–June 2011) • Disseminate information from content centers and RELs to increase knowledge base on research-based practices of high-poverty, high-achieving high schools. (October 2010–September 2011) • Cofacilitate meetings to develop collaborative support for implementing dropout prevention strategies that include ISDs, LEAs, IHEs, and professional organizations. (October 2010–March 2011) • Work with appropriate offices within MDE to discuss policies and requirements that affect alternative high schools. (October 2010–June 2011)
MDE builds and sustains systemic support for district and school improvement efforts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leverage ISD resources to create a network of support for improving secondary instructional improvement. (January 2011–September 2011) • Institute processes to support MDE cross-office collaboration as well as collaboration among MDE, ISDs, and professional organizations. (January 2010–September 2011) • Facilitate meetings to build MDE capacity to develop support for schools and districts participating in MDE’s Dropout Challenge. (October 2010–June 2011) • Cofacilitate monthly alternative education focus group meetings to increase collaboration and communication between MDE offices regarding districts and alternative high schools. (October 2010–June 2011) • Continue to work with subcontractors, RELs, Center on Instruction, and the National High School Center to provide research on best practices to

Core Elements of Capacity Building	Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building (Start and End Dates Provided in Parentheses)
	<p>use with struggling learners. (October 2010 –June 2011)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide support and resources to MDE to assist districts and alternative high schools as they work to increase student achievement. (October 2010–June 2011) • Provide technical assistance and develop ongoing professional development for districts and alternative high schools. (October 2010–June 2011) • Provide research about alternative education models around the country. (October 2010–June 2011)
<p>MDE improves the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create processes and tools and put them in place to support teacher learning. (October 2010 2010–June 2011) • Provide “Michigan Framework for Reimagining High Schools” to schools and districts across the state. (November 2010–June 2011) • Examine policies that affect the success of alternative education and determine if any policy changes are needed. (October 2010–June 2011) • Develop and implement new policy regarding AYP and alternative high schools. (October 2010 – June 2011)

Statewide System of Support

Goal 1: Michigan’s Statewide System of Support

To address MDE’s NCLB responsibilities to provide an effective system of support for districts and schools in the improvement process, especially those in corrective action.

Scope of Services. During the past several years, MDE and ISDs have spearheaded assistance strategies to help districts and schools that do not make AYP. Since Year 3 of its technical assistance, Great Lakes East has been working with MDE in exploring the impact of these strategies. During Year 6, Great Lakes East will continue to collaborate with MDE in strengthening and building MDE’s capacity to provide effective services as part of its statewide system of support. Some of the strategies will include building systems, structures, processes, networks, and partnerships in support of schools in corrective action. Specifically, Great Lakes East will support MDE’s Office of Education Improvement and Innovation in designing an aligned and coherent process to strengthen and improve Michigan’s statewide system of support.

Great Lakes East will continue to cofacilitate meetings and teleconferences with a statewide system of support team consisting of representatives from the various components of the system. With assistance from the Center on Innovation & Improvement, current research on statewide systems of support and other states’ designs and processes for improving their statewide systems of support will be identified and studied as part of Michigan’s participation in the Pacesetter Academy.

Key Team Members. The key team members are Gary Appel (lead, Michigan state manager), Bersheril Bailey, and Jennifer Reed (Great Lakes East); Linda Forward, Mark Coscarella, Bill Witt, and Diane Joslin-Gould (Office of Education Improvement and Innovation); Charlotte Koger (MAISA); Linda McDonald (RMC Research Corporation); and Sam Redding (Center on Innovation & Improvement).

Elements and Outcomes. Table 13 describes the core elements of capacity building and their anticipated outcomes and evidence for Goal 1: Michigan’s Statewide System of Support.

Table 13. Elements of Capacity Building and Outcomes for SSOS Goal 1: Michigan’s Statewide System of Support

Core Elements of Capacity Building	Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building (Start and End Dates Provided in Parentheses)
MDE accurately assesses the improvement needs of its districts and schools.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support and cofacilitate monthly meetings of a core team of Great Lakes East, MDE, and key stakeholders to analyze new data (on high-priority high schools) and guide the team’s work to increase understanding of Michigan’s statewide system of support and the landscape within which it operates. (October 2010–June 2011) • Identify issues and concerns impacting coherence of current components of the current statewide system of support and identify issues with the system redesign. (October 2010–June 2011)
MDE develops solutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide technical assistance to ensure that all components of the statewide system of support are aligned and coherent, based on the

Core Elements of Capacity Building	Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building (Start and End Dates Provided in Parentheses)
to address needs.	<p>current research by the Center on Innovation & Improvement. (October 2010–September 2011)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of Michigan’s participation in the Pacesetter Academy, collaborate on cross-state dialogues to inform continuous improvement of the statewide system of support. (October 2010–May 2011) • Use ongoing MDE-contracted evaluation data to develop statewide system of support improvements. (October 2010–June 2011) • Disseminate research on characteristics of high-achieving, high-poverty schools and on statewide system of support in other states. (October 2010–June 2011) • Share the information from Emerging Practices site visits of schools and districts in corrective action to help inform MDE’s work. (November 2010–May 2011) • Codevelop an SSOS Operations Manual document to provide all components of the system of support for schools in corrective action. (October 2010–January 2011)
MDE builds and sustains systemic support for district and school improvement efforts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide technical assistance to increase knowledge of MDE staff to assist instructional coaches in building their competence to work with teachers in high priority schools. (October 2010–June 2011) • Provide technical assistance to develop tools and processes for statewide system of support redesign, including defining and strengthening the role of districts in the statewide system of support. (October 2010–June 2011) • Help MDE design solutions to implement proposed improvements. (January 2011–September 2011) • Facilitate meetings to select high-poverty high schools to study that are demonstrating progress toward high achievement in Michigan. (October 2010–December 2010) • Disseminate information to organize the process of developing protocols for case studies of high-poverty, high-achieving schools. (October 2010–January 2011) • Facilitate meetings to develop protocols to use for case studies in Michigan. (October 2010–January 2011) • Model processes for conducting case studies in high-priority schools that are “beating the odds.” (October 2010–November 2010) • Collect information on promising and emerging practices in schools across the state. (October 2010–March 2011) • Develop a plan to share successful strategies used in model high schools around the state. (October 2010–December 2010) • Facilitate meetings to integrate MDE Teaching for Learning and “Emerging Practices” website to share promising and research-based practices of high-poverty, high-achieving high schools in Michigan. (October 2010–June 2011) • Launch test “Emerging Practices” website. (January 2011–May 2011) • Present beta website to professional organizations and ISDs. (May 2011) • Provide guidance to MDE on creating a selection process for schools to

Core Elements of Capacity Building	Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building (Start and End Dates Provided in Parentheses)
	be featured on the “Emerging Practices” website. (October 2010–January 2011)
MDE improves the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability.	[This cell is intentionally blank.]

Goal 2: Response to Intervention (RTI)

To help MDE develop an RTI initiative that will identify priority state issues, needs, and action plans to build a strong infrastructure of support for implementation of RTI in Michigan.

Scope of Services. Great Lakes East will continue to support MDE and its partners in the design and implementation of a statewide RTI initiative in Michigan’s schools. Throughout Year 6, Great Lakes East will assist MDE in convening the RTI core team and designing and facilitating monthly face-to-face core team meetings. The team will work to refine and finalize the Michigan RTI Critical Features Framework that includes RTI essential elements, definition, principles, and examples. The team also will build an RTI website that will organize guidance materials, tools, and other resources to support RTI implementation by LEAs. In addition, Great Lakes East will assist the RTI core team to review and determine how RTI practices might be more fully integrated into current state initiatives, especially the state’s School Improvement Process and the tools provided by MDE to LEAs in support of school improvement.

Key Team Members. The key team members are Gary Appel (lead, Michigan state manager) and Bersheril Bailey (Great Lakes East); Karen Sanders (RMC Research Corporation); Darren Woodruff (AIR); Jan Oord (Office of Education Improvement and Innovation); Lindy Buch (Office of Early Childhood Education and Family Services); and Beth Steenwyck (Michigan’s Integrated Improvement Initiatives [MI3]).

Elements and Outcomes. Table 14 describes the core elements of capacity building and their anticipated outcomes and evidence for Goal 2: Response to Intervention.

Table 14. Elements of Capacity Building and Outcomes for SSOS Goal 2: Response to Intervention

Core Elements of Capacity Building	Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building (Start and End Dates Provided in Parentheses)
MDE accurately assesses the improvement needs of its districts and schools.	[This cell is intentionally blank.]
MDE develops solutions to address needs.	[This cell is intentionally blank.]

Core Elements of Capacity Building	Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building (Start and End Dates Provided in Parentheses)
MDE builds and sustains systemic support for district and school improvement efforts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement a plan of action to support LEA adoption of RTI. (November 2010–August 2011) • Coplan and conduct a statewide RTI conference in fall 2010. (October 2010–November 2010) • Finalize and disseminate RTI Critical Features Framework throughout the state. (October 2010–September 2011) • Identify exemplary Michigan high school RTI models. (October 2010–December 2010) • Increase capacity in MDE and the ISDs to develop and implement processes to support school district efforts to implement RTI. (October 2010–September 2011)
MDE improves the tools and systems it employs for district and school improvement and accountability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide tools and systems that assist LEAs in implementing RTI, including an RTI resources website. (October 2010–September 2011) • Conduct regional RTI professional development for district and ISD leaders. (January 2011–June 2011)

Goal 3: English Language Learners

To implement an ELL program strategic plan that will identify priority state issues, needs, and action plans. This five-year plan will build a strong infrastructure of support for all Michigan ELLs and their teachers.

Scope of Services. In Michigan, 7.8 percent of total K–12 students are ELL (Editorial Projects in Education, 2009), with the highest concentrations in urban centers and areas with large migrant and refugee communities. Only about half of ELLs scored proficient or above in state mathematics and reading assessments in 2007, lagging significantly behind their non-ELL peers (Editorial Projects in Education, 2009).

Based on the five-year ELL strategic plan finalized and adopted during Year 3 and updated and extended in Year 5, implementation of a strong infrastructure of support for all Michigan ELL students and their teachers will continue to take place during Year 6. Great Lakes East will continue to work with the cross-office ELL core team and the statewide ELL Advisory Committee to provide technical assistance as the updated ELL strategic plan is put into action. Technical assistance will focus on program administration, assessment and standards integration, and preservice and inservice ELL professional development. At least four ELL Advisory Committee follow-up meetings will be conducted to guide the implementation of the ELL strategic plan in Year 6.

After being vacant for over three years, the ELL consultant position at MDE was filled in late August 2010 by Shereen Tabrizi, a long-time member of the statewide ELL Advisory Committee. Great Lakes East will be working intensively with her to both support her leadership and to build MDE ELL capacity.

MDE is developing an enhanced technical assistance structure to create effective, quality programs that support ELL academic growth in English language proficiency and academic content. Great Lakes East will codesign and cofacilitate meetings and provide targeted support to assist MDE in addressing implementation and refinement of the state's ELL programs. It also will assist MDE in the development of a statewide structure that clarifies and synthesizes MDE's position on how local districts respond to the needs of ELLs based on current state and federal legislation.

MDE's ELL core team, formed in Year 4 and made up of directors and staff from all offices of MDE, will continue to meet six times a year. Great Lakes East will codesign and cofacilitate the team's meetings to address the integration of ELL needs and resources throughout MDE, focusing on leveraging and expanding cross-departmental initiatives and coordination. In an effort to expand statewide ELL capacity, support will be provided to develop MDE's capacity to better serve ELL students in mainstream classes.

In addition, one goal for Year 6 is to institutionalize regional ELL professional development teams to provide Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) trainers and technical assistance across the state in order to improve the achievement of ELLs. The ISD system will provide the primary structure for the teams. ISDs will provide the professional development sites for regional trainings and provide recruitment and ongoing SIOP training for regional schools' mainstream staff. In order to accomplish this goal, MDE will partner with Great Lakes East to do the following:

- Develop state ELL leaders' capacity (primarily located in ISDs) to provide high-quality and systematic SIOP professional development to teachers of ELLs.
- Assist state ELL leaders (from ISDs) in the development of professional development plans that meet the particular needs of each of their regions.
- Provide technical assistance to state ELL leaders and SIOP regional trainers, and integrate follow-up support to teachers working with ELLs in their regions.
- Assist MDE in the development of a long-term plan for SIOP implementation and sustainability.

Further, Great Lakes East and MDE will continue to refine a statewide ELL preservice and inservice plan that is consistent with the state Professional Learning Strategic Plan. Great Lakes East will help identify best practices to enhance ELLs' acquisition of English language skills and academic achievement in the content areas through effective teaching and learning. Great Lakes East plans to identify and model research-based teaching and learning strategies that work best to meet the needs of the state's ELL population. To help build the state infrastructure in professional development, Great Lakes East will assist MDE in refining and building the role of the ISDs and professional associations to support field-based teacher learning.

Key Team Members. Mike Radke and Shereen Tabrizi (Office of Field Services); Linda Forward (Office of Education Improvement and Innovation); Lindy Buch (Office of Early Childhood); Patty Cantu and Chris Reiff (Office of Career and Technical Education); Bonnie Rockafellow and Tom Bell (Office of Professional Preparation); Sheryl Diamond (Office of

Special Education and Early Intervention Services); Aric Kuester (Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability); Gary Appel and Asta Svedkauskaite (Great Lakes East); and Dennis Terdy (lead, Center for Applied Linguistics).

Elements and Outcomes. Table 15 describes the core elements of capacity building and their anticipated outcomes and evidence for Goal 3: English Language Learners.

**Table 15. Elements of Capacity Building and Outcomes for
SSOS Goal 3: English Language Learners**

Core Elements of Capacity Building	Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building (Start and End Dates Provided in Parentheses)
MDE accurately assesses the improvement needs of its districts and schools.	[This cell is intentionally blank.]
MDE develops solutions to address needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue ongoing implementation of the updated and refined strategic plan. (October 2010–September 2011) • Assist MDE Title III capacity building with the statewide development of district-level common standardized exit/entrance criteria and formative assessments. (October 2010–February 2011) • Identify and promote additional ELL instructional best practices related to program development models, model implementation, and instructional practices using ELPA data and other criteria for "well developed/executed" ELL programs in the state. (October 2010–September 2011) • Research strategies to provide improved support to “low incidence” ELL districts statewide. (October 2010–December 2010)
MDE builds and sustains systemic support for district and school improvement efforts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase capacity in MDE and key ELL program stakeholders to develop and sustain a system that supports and implements effective ELL program development statewide. (October 2010–September 2011) • Expand an MDE cross-office ELL core team to leverage, align, and expand ELL initiatives across all MDE offices. (October 2010–September 2011) • Implement a standardized and coordinated ELL regional professional development program that addresses teacher inservice needs and aligns with the state Professional Learning Strategic Plan. (October 2010–September 2011) • ISDs expand professional development as part of the ELL strategic plan. (October 2010–September 2011) • Develop a long-term plan for support and sustainability of the regional professional development teams. (October 2010–June 2011) • A high-quality uniform and systematic statewide technical assistance and support system for all ELL programs in Michigan is in place. (June 2011–September 2011)
MDE improves the tools and systems it employs for district and school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tools developed by MDE and disseminated to schools and districts to support raising ELL achievement. (October 2010–September 2011)

Core Elements of Capacity Building	Anticipated Outcomes and Evidence of MDE Capacity Building (Start and End Dates Provided in Parentheses)
improvement and accountability.	

References

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002). Retrieved September 15, 2010, from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/107-110.pdf>

Appendix:

Research and Practice Literature That Supports Great Lakes East Work

All citations below refer to the research- or practice-based literature that supports Great Lakes East's work with the Michigan Department of Education. The underlying or primary sources of the cited literature are available within the bibliography or reference sections within the documents. In all instances, the primary intent of Great Lakes East was to locate research-based literature; however, at times research literature was unavailable or non-existent. In those instances, practice-based literature was utilized.

Teacher Quality

Goal 1: State Individual Professional Development Plans

The following key resources directly supported the work of the Great Lakes East and MDE team in designing the IPDP process, tools, and other supporting materials. The somewhat overweighted reliance on practice-based literature is due to the very limited body of research on IPDPs.

National Staff Development Council. (2001). *Standards for staff development* (Rev. ed.) [Website]. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from <http://www.nsd.org/standards/index.cfm>

Steiner, L. (2004). *Designing effective professional development experiences: What do we know?* Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from http://www.tqsource.org/issueforums/plantoAction/resources/4_PDResearchPolicyAction/DesigningEffectivePD.pdf

Yoon, K. S., Duncan T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Education Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/REL_2007033.pdf

Goal 2: State Teacher Preparation System Redesign

Supporting the enhancement of the coherence of Michigan's teacher preparation system by working with key stakeholders to develop the Framework for Excellence Teacher Preparation has been driven by the normative and empirical literature on teacher preparation best practices as well as what is known about high quality teacher accreditation and state approval systems. The need for a realignment of Michigan's preparation system was based also in part on the growing recognition in the field of the need to focus on clinical preparation of teachers as well as new legislation that opens more pathways to certification in Michigan.

- Alter, J., & Coggshall, J.G. (2009). *Teaching as a clinical practice profession: Implications for teacher preparation and state policy*. New York, NY: New York Comprehensive Center and the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved September 23, 2010, from <http://www.tqsource.org/publications/clinicalPractice.pdf>
- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (2010). *Teacher preparation: Who needs it? The clinical component*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. (2008). *Report of the accreditation task force: Building agreement on an accreditation system for educator preparation*. Washington, DC: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED501705). Retrieved September 15, 2010, from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED501705.pdf>
- Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2009). Teacher preparation and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 31(4), 416–440.
- Dwyer, C. A., Millet, C. M., & Payne, D. G. (2006). *A culture of evidence: Postsecondary assessment and learning outcomes*. Princeton, NJ: ETS. Retrieved on August 31, 2010, from http://www.ets.org/Media/Resources_For/Policy_Makers/pdf/cultureofevidence.pdf
- Galluzzo, G. (1999). *Aligning standards to improve teacher preparation and practice*. Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED438261). Retrieved September 15, 2010, from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED438261.pdf>
- Garvin, P. (Ed.). (2003). *Developing knowledgeable teachers: A framework for standards-based teacher education supported by institutional collaboration. The STEP reports*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED473783). Retrieved September 15, 2010, from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED473783.pdf>
- Grossman, P., & McDonald, M. (2008). Back to the future: Directions for research in teaching and teacher education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(1), 184–205.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2008). *Professional standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation institutions*. Washington, DC: Author.

Goal 3: Professional Development System and Policy Revision

The knowledge base used to inform this work draws from two broad areas: high quality professional learning and effective development and implementation of policy to support a professional development system. Experimental, quasi-experimental, and descriptive studies of professional learning can be found in the Darling Hammond et.al. and Steiner publications cited below. “Industry” standards and a definition of high quality professional learning can be found in the work of the leading professional organization, the National Staff Development Council, as listed below. Publications by other leading educational professional organizations, task forces

and comprehensive centers on policy development and implementation at the state and local levels are cited below. In addition, the actual legislative and state board of education policies of several states were used to inform and guide the policy revision work.

American Federation of Teachers, National Education Association, National Staff Development Council, & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Advancing high quality professional learning through collective bargaining and state policy: An initial review and recommendations to support student learning*. National Staff Development Council. Retrieved September 24, 2010, from www.nsd.org/news/advancinghighqualityprofessionallearning.pdf

Croft, A., Cogshall, J. G., Dolan, M., Powers, E. & Killion, J. (2010). *Job-embedded professional development: What it is, who is responsible, and how to get it done well*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved September 24, 2010, from <http://www.tqsource.org/publications/JEPD%20Issue%20Brief.pdf>

Darling-Hammond, L., Chung Wei, R., & Adamson, F. (2010). *Professional development in the United States: Trends and challenges—Phase II of a three-phase study*. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council. Retrieved September 20, 2010, from <http://www.learningforward.org/news/NSDCstudy2010.pdf>

Darling-Hammond, L., Chung Wei, R., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad*. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council. Retrieved September 20, 2010, from <http://www.learningforward.org/news/NSDCstudy2009.pdf>

Darling-Hammond, L., Chung Wei R., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). State of the profession: Study measures status of professional development. *JSD 30(2)*, 42–50. Retrieved September 20, 2010, from <http://www.learningforward.org/news/getDocument.cfm?articleID=1844>

Killion, J., & Davin, L. (2009). When policy joins practice: Task force examines how states and unions address professional development. *JSD 30(2)*. Retrieved September 20, 2010, from <http://www.learningforward.org/news/articleDetails.cfm?articleID=1832>

National Staff Development Council. (2001). *Standards for staff development*. Oxford, OH: Author.

National Staff Development Council. (2009). New definition of professional development. Author. Retrieved September 24, 2010, from <http://www.learningforward.org/standfor/definition.cfm>

Smith, B. (2003). Public policy and public participation: Engaging citizens and community in the development of public policy. Retrieved September 24, 2010, from http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/canada/regions/pdf/pub_policy_partic_e.pdf

Steiner, L. (2004). *Designing effective professional development experiences: What do we know?* Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates. Retrieved September 24, 2010, from www.tqsource.org/issueforums/plantoAction/.../DesigningEffectivePD.pdf

High School

Goal 1: High School Redesign

Multiple resources directly informed the work of Great Lakes East and MDE. Great Lakes East utilized a combination of resources from the comprehensive center network and leading national organizations recognized for their work and disseminated research and literature to support MDE's work. These resources provided the foundation for the high school core team's discussions and decisions and key contextual information in support of the team's work. There was a somewhat overweighted reliance on practice-based literature, but this focus was appropriate given the purpose of the project. The research was used in the following ways:

- Development of the seven principles included in the "Michigan Framework for Reimagining High Schools."
- Resources provided to schools and districts on MDE's Dropout Challenge website (www.michigan.gov/dropoutchallenge).
- Resources provided to schools and districts on the Graduation Town website (www.graduationtown.org).
- Schools and districts were provided with research to use to identify strategies and interventions to revise school improvement plans at the Dropout Prevention Summit.
- Schools and districts were provided with research to support struggling learners at the Alternative Education Summer Institute.

Brewster, C., & Fager, J. (2000). *Increasing student engagement and motivation: From time-on-task to homework*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from http://educationnorthwest.org/webfm_send/452

Brooks, R. B. (1999). Creating a positive school climate: Strategies for fostering self-esteem, motivation, and resilience. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *Educating minds and hearts: Social emotional learning and the passage into adolescence*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement. (2006). *Research brief: Practices that support data use in urban high schools*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from http://www.centerforcsri.org/files/Center_RB_Sept06.pdf

- Dolejs, C. (2006). *Report on key practices and policies of consistently higher performing high schools*. Washington, DC: National High School Center. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from http://www.betterhighschools.org/docs/ReportOfKeyPracticesandPolicies_10-31-06.pdf
- Garcia-Reid, P., Reid, R., & Peterson, N. A. (2005). School engagement among Latino youth in an urban middle school context: Valuing the role of social support. *Education and Urban Society*, 37(3), 257–275. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from [http://www.schoolsuccessprofile.org/publications/Garcia-Reid%20et%20al%20\(2005\)%20School%20Engagement%20Among%20Latino%20Youth%20EUS.pdf](http://www.schoolsuccessprofile.org/publications/Garcia-Reid%20et%20al%20(2005)%20School%20Engagement%20Among%20Latino%20Youth%20EUS.pdf)
- Goodwin, B. (2000). *Raising the achievement of low-performing students*. Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from http://www.mcrel.org/PDF/PolicyBriefs/5993PI_PBRaisingAchievement.pdf
- Guskey, T. (2003). Analyzing lists of the characteristics of effective professional development to promote visionary leadership. *NASSP Bulletin*, 87(637), 4–18.
- Henderson, A., & Mapp, K. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family and community connections on student achievement*. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from <http://www.sedl.org/connections/resources/evidence.pdf>
- Herlihy, C. M., & Quint, J. (2005). *Emerging evidence on improving high school student achievement and graduation rates: The effects of four popular improvement programs*. Washington, DC: National High School Center. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from http://www.betterhighschools.org/docs/NHSC_EmergingEvidenceBrief_111606Final.pdf
- Hootstein, E. W. (1994). Motivating students to learn. *The Clearinghouse*, 67(4), 213–217.
- Huebner, T. A., & Calisi-Corbett, G. (2005). *Rethinking high school: Five profiles of innovative models for student success*. San Francisco: WestEd. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from http://www.wested.org/online_pubs/gates.profiles.pdf
- Kennelly, L., & Monrad, M. (2007). *Approaches to dropout prevention: Heeding early warning signs with appropriate interventions*. Washington, DC: National High School Center. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from http://www.betterhighschools.org/docs/NHSC_ApproachesToDropoutPrevention.pdf
- Kennelly, L., & Monrad, M. (Eds.). (2007). *Easing the transition to high school: Research and best practices designed to support high school learning*. Washington, DC: National High School Center. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from http://www.betterhighschools.org/docs/NHSC_TransitionsReport.pdf

Note: This report is a compilation of the following four separate documents:

- Herlihy, C. (2007). *State and district-level support for successful transitions into high school* (Policy Brief). Washington, DC: National High School Center.
- Herlihy, C. (2007). *Toward ensuring a smooth transition into high school* (Issue Brief). Washington, DC: National High School Center.
- Smith, T. J. (2007). *Managing the transition to ninth grade in a comprehensive urban high school* (Snapshot). Washington, DC: National High School Center.
- Williams, E., & Richman, S. (2007). *The first year of high school: A quick stats fact sheet*. Washington, DC: National High School Center.

Kreider, H., Caspe, M., Kennedy, S., & Weiss, H. (2007). Family involvement in middle and high school students' education. *Family Involvement Makes a Difference*, 1(3), 1–12. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from http://www.hfrp.org/content/download/1340/48835/file/fi_adolescent.pdf

Krueger, C. (2006). *The progress of P-16 collaboration in the states*. Denver: Education Commission of the States. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from <http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/68/71/6871.pdf>

Lachat, M. A., & Smith, S. (2005). Practices that support data use in urban high schools. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 10(3), 333–349.

Meece, J., & McColskey, W. (1997). *Improving student motivation: A guide for teachers and school improvement teams*. Tallahassee, FL: Southeastern Regional Vision for Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED410197). Retrieved September 15, 2010, from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED410197.pdf>

Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning. (2003). *Sustaining school improvement: Data-driven decision making*. Aurora, CO: Author. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from http://www.mcrel.org/pdf/leadershiporganizationdevelopment/5031tg_datafolio.pdf

National Association of Secondary School Principals. (2004). *Breaking Ranks II: Strategies for Leading High School Reform*. Reston, VA: Author.

Oakes, J., & Saunders, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Beyond tracking: Multiple pathways to college, career and civic participation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

O'Day, J., & Bitter, C. (2003). *Evaluation study of the immediate intervention/underperforming schools program and the high achieving/improving schools program of the public schools accountability act of 1999*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from http://www.air.org/files/PSAA_Evaluation_Final_Report.pdf

Vermont Department of Education. (2002). *High schools on the move: Renewing Vermont's commitment to quality secondary education*. Montpelier, VT: Author. Retrieved

September 15, 2010, from
<http://www.education.vermont.gov/new/pdfdoc/pubs/hsom/hsom.pdf>

The Wallace Foundation (2009). *Research findings to support effective educational policymaking: Evidence and action steps for state, district and local policymakers*. New York: Author. Retrieved September 15, 2009, from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/Documents/Research-Findings-Action-Items-to-Support-Effective-Educational-Policymaking.pdf>

Yair, G. (2000). Reforming motivation: How the structure of instruction affects students' learning experiences. *British Educational Journal*, 26(2), 191–210.

Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/REL_2007033.pdf

The following additional key resources from the research and practice literature supported the work of alternative high schools at monthly focus group meetings and at the Alternative Education Summer Institute:

- *Exemplary Practices in Alternative Education: Indicators of Quality Programming*, National Alternative Education Association

IES Practice Guides:

- *Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making*
- *Helping Students Navigate the Pathway to College: What High Schools Can Do*
- *Dropout Prevention*
- *Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Strategies*
- *Organizing Instruction to Improve Student Learning*

Statewide System of Support

Goal 1: Michigan's Statewide System of Support

The resources listed below directly informed Great Lakes East's work with MDE's statewide system of support planning team and partner organizations. These resources have been used in the ongoing building and implementation of the state's system of support and were most often referenced in meeting preparations and face-to-face discussions. The resources were integral in helping the planning team continue development and refinement of the statewide system of support. As indicated by the sources of these materials, Great Lakes East utilized a combination of resources from the comprehensive center network, especially from the Center on Innovation &

Improvement, and from leading national organizations recognized for their work on statewide systems of support. Publication dates range from 2006 to 2009, in recognition of the SEA's need for the most current resources available on designing and improving its system.

Calkins, A., Guenther, W., Belfiore, G., & Lash, D. (2007). *The turnaround challenge: Why America's best opportunity to dramatically improve student achievement lies in our worst-performing schools*. Boston: Mass Insight Education and Research Institute. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from http://www.massinsight.org/resourcefiles/TheTurnaroundChallenge_2007.pdf

Elmore, R. (2006). *School reform from the inside out: Policy, practice, and performance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Press.

Elmore, R. (2007). Professional networks and school improvement: The medical rounds model. *School Administrator*, 64(4). Retrieved September 15, 2010, from <http://www.aasa.org/SchoolAdministratorArticle.aspx?id=6812>

Fullan, M. (2005). *Leadership and sustainability: System thinkers in action*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Kerins, T., Perlman, C., & Redding, S. (2009). *Coherence in statewide systems of support*. Lincoln, IL: Center on Innovation & Improvement

Lusi, S. (1997). *The role of state departments of education in complex school reform*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Mazzeo, C., & Berman, I. (2003). *Reaching new heights: Turning around low-performing schools—A guide for governors*. Washington, DC: National Governors Association Center for Best Practices. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from <http://www.nga.org/cda/files/0803reaching.pdf>

Redding, S., & Walberg, H. (Eds.). (2007). *Handbook on statewide systems of support*. Lincoln, IL: Center on Innovation & Improvement.

Reville, P., Coggins, C. T., Candon, J., McDermott, K., Churchill, A., & Long, B. (2005). *Reaching capacity: A blueprint for the state role in improving low performing schools and districts*. Boston: Rennie Center for Education Research and Policy at MassINC.

Goal 2: Response to Intervention

The Michigan RTI initiative is directly informed by the literature demonstrating the effectiveness of integrating assessment and intervention within a multi-level prevention system to maximize student achievement and to reduce behavior problems. The literature supports schools identifying students at risk for poor learning outcomes, monitoring student progress, providing evidence-based interventions, and adjusting the intensity and nature of those interventions depending on a

student's responsiveness. Sources include the National Center on Response to Intervention and the Center on Instruction.

Elliott, J., & Morrison, D. (2008). *Response to intervention: Blueprints for implementation* (District Level). Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from <http://www.nasde.org/Portals/0/district.pdf>

Mohammed, S. S., Roberts, G., Murray, C. S., & Vaughn, S. (2009). *Conversations with practitioners: Current practice in statewide RTI implementation. Recommendations and frequently asked questions*. Portsmouth, NH: Center on Instruction. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from <http://www.centeroninstruction.org/files/Conversations%20with%20Practitioners%20Cor.pdf>

National Center on Response to Intervention (2010). *Essential components of RTI—A closer look at response to intervention*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from http://www.rti4success.org/images/stories/pdfs/rtiessentialcomponents_042710.pdf

Tackett, K. K. (December 4, 2007). *Snapshots from five schools implementing RTI: Practices and perspectives* [PowerPoint presentation]. Portsmouth, NH: Center on Instruction. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from http://www.centeroninstruction.org/files/RTI%20webinar_FINAL_12-17-07%20%5BRead-Only%5D.pdf

Goal 3: English Language Learners

The following research findings related to the education of ELLs have been identified in the literature and will inform the development of Year 6 technical assistance plan for Michigan:

ELLs profit from instruction that is modified to meet their language needs. According to National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth, teachers need to modify their instruction to take into account ELLs' language needs (August & Shanahan, 2006). Promising instructional modifications that facilitate ELLs' language, literacy, and content learning include, among others, making lessons comprehensible by using visuals and graphic organizers; highlighting, teaching and reviewing key vocabulary; and providing opportunities for students to extensively interact with teachers and peers (August & Shanahan, 2006; Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2006; Goldenberg, 2008; Institute of Education Sciences, 2007; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). In order to meet ELLs' needs, sheltered instruction, an approach that integrates content and language instruction, has gained popularity across the United States. The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model is a scientifically validated model of sheltered instruction (Echevarria, Short, & Powers, 2006) that has made instructional modifications for ELLs clear and explicit for teachers (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2008; Goldenberg, 2008). Research studies indicate that when teachers implement the SIOP model to a high degree, they provide consistent, high-quality instruction to ELLs that

results in gains in student academic literacy (Echevarria, Short, & Powers, 2006; Short, Fidelman, & Louguit, 2009).

Teachers of ELLs have limited preparation and expertise to provide effective instruction to ELLs. A major challenge to educating ELLs is the limited number of teachers who are prepared to teach these students the social language, academic literacy, and content knowledge they need to succeed academically. In Michigan, there are 119 ELLs in Title III language-instruction programs for every ELL certified teacher (Editorial Projects in Education, 2009). Across the nation, the teacher preparation infrastructure has been outpaced by demand for ELL instructional expertise. For instance, as of 2001, only one sixth of higher education institutions included ELL-focused content in their requirements for mainstream teachers (Menken & Antunez, 2001). In addition, teachers continue to have limited access to inservice professional development opportunities to better teach these students (Consentino & Chu Clewell, 2007; Menken & Antunez, 2001; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). Nationally, in 2003, only 31 percent of teachers had participated in eight hours or more of professional development on how to teach ELLs during the previous three years. This figure was only 1.7 percent in Michigan. (Wei, Darling-Hammond, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009).

School systems need to improve their capacity to support high-quality instruction for ELLs. It is clear that there exists a strong need for developing the professional and institutional capacity of school systems, at the district and state levels, to address the needs of ELLs. However, limited research has been conducted in this area. Recent evidence indicates that districts that are improving ELLs' outcomes are characterized by a shared vision for change, leadership and advocacy on the behalf of ELLs, and empowerment of ELL district leaders. (Horwitz et al., 2009). In addition, successful districts use a number of promising practices, including providing long-term professional development that is rigorous, relevant, and hands-on to all teachers of ELLs and school administrators (Horwitz et al., 2009; Pardini, 2006).

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cosentino, C., & Chu Clewell, B. (2007). *Putting English language learners on the educational map: The No Child Left Behind Act implemented*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from: http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/311468_ell.pdf?RSSFeed=UI_Education.xml

Echevarria, J., Short, D., & Powers, K. (2006). School reform and standards-based education: An instructional model for English language learners. *Journal of Educational Research*, 99(4), 195–210. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from <http://wikiedresearch.wdfiles.com/local--files/bilingual-education/SIOP.pdf>

Echevarria, J., M. Vogt, and D. J. Short. 2008. *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Editorial Projects in Education. (2009). *Michigan—State highlights 2009* [Special supplement to

Quality Counts 2009: Portrait of a population: How English language learners are putting schools to the test]. Bethesda, MD: Author.

- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2006) *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of the empirical evidence research*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English language learners: What the research does—and does not—say. *American Educator*, 32(2), 8–22. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from <http://www.aft.org/pdfs/americaneducator/summer2008/goldenberg.pdf>
- Horwitz, A., Uro, G., Price-Baugh, R., Simon, C., Uzzell, R., Lewis, S., & Casserly, M. (2009). *Succeeding with English language learners: Lessons learned from the Great City Schools*. Washington, DC: Council of the Great City Schools. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from http://www.cgcs.org/publications/ELL_Report09.pdf
- Institute of Education Sciences (IES). (2007). *Effective literacy and English language instruction for English language learners in the elementary grades*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/20074011.pdf>
- Menken, K., & Atunoz, B. (2001). *An overview of the preparation and certification of teachers working with limited English proficient (LEP) students*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse of Bilingual Education. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED455231.pdf>
- Pardini, P. (2006). In one voice: teachers work side-by-side in the classroom, teaching language through content. *Journal of Staff Development*, 27(4) 20–25.
- Short, D. J., Fidelman, C., & Louguit, M. (2009). *The effects of SIOP model instruction on the academic language development of English language learners*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Short, D. J., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners*. New York: Carnegie Corporation. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from <http://www.all4ed.org/files/DoubleWork.pdf>
- Wei, R. C., Darling-Hammond, L., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad*. Dallas: National Staff Development Council. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from <http://www.nsd.org/news/NSDCstudy2009.pdf>