Lansing School District

REAP: <u>R</u>ewarding <u>E</u>ducator <u>A</u>chievement and <u>P</u>erformance

<u>**PROJECT NARRATIVE:**</u>
TABLE OF CONTENTS

_____

ABSOLUTE PRIORITY 1: <u>**Human Capital Management System.**</u> Lansing School District (LSD: Applicant / Fiscal Agent) proposes ***REAP**: **R**ewarding **E**ducator **A**chievement & **P**erformance*, a *Teacher and School Leader Incentive Program* grant that uses educator performance results to inform key school- and district-level human capital decisions, including: preparation, recruitment, hiring, placement, retention, dismissal, compensation (including performance–based compensation), professional development, tenure, and promotion, particularly as they affect educators working in High-Need Schools served by the project. ***REAP** will serve all LSD schools* – <u>26 of 27 Lansing schools have Free and Reduced Lunch rates exceeding 50% of enrollment and meet the *TSL* criteria of High-Need School</u>; LSD stakeholders include:

Schools	Students	Teachers	Principals	Assistant Principals	Administrators	HCMS Personnel
27	11,463	823	27	12	7	10

Details are outlined in the *Project Design* section, beginning on page 14. See *TSL Application Programmatic and Statutory Requirements Checklist* for page numbers for Absolute Priority 1 components.

ABSOLUTE PRIORITY 4: <u>**Evaluation and Support Systems for Teachers and School Leaders.**</u> Lansing School District will enhance its Evaluation and Support Systems for teachers and school leaders in High-Need Schools by improving two **TIERS**: 1) Comprehensive Human Capital Management System (HCMS); and 2) Educator Quality Supports. The LSD HCMS is providing ongoing, differentiated, targeted, and personalized support and feedback for improvement that includes professional learning opportunities designed to increase educator effectiveness. (see *Project Design* section / *Requirements Checklist* in Appendix for details).

COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY 1: <u>**Equitable Access to Effective Educators. (1) Gaps in Student Access to Effective Educators in High-Need Schools.**</u> There are significant gaps in LSD schools, including: (a) ethnicity of teachers vs. students; (b) the effectiveness of educators in highest performing vs. lowest performing schools; and (c) the effectiveness of educators in low-poverty schools vs. high-poverty schools. Each of these gaps impacts the quality of teaching and learning in Lansing schools, particularly high-need schools, and reduces equitable access to effective educators for <u>ALL</u> students.

(a) Ethnic Composition: % Teachers vs. % Students (2015-2016)						
Ethnicities	**White**	**Black**	**Hispanic**	**Multi**	**Asian**	**Native**
Teachers	82.8%	10.7%	4%	0%	2.1%	.4%
Students	26.3%	39.3%	19.2%	8.5%	6%	.74%
Difference	+56.5%	-28.6%	-15.2%	-8.5%	-3.9%	-.34%

Source: *Michigan Department of Education, 2015-2016*

Across the district, there is a marked disparity between the percentage of White teachers (83%) teaching in a district with 74% non-White student enrollment. LSD acknowledges the 56.5% point gap and will formulate and implement a plan to recruit greater numbers of effective minority (non-white) educators.

(b) Educator Effectiveness: Highest Performing Schools vs. Lowest Performing Schools (2015-16)						
School (Grades)	**% Proficient**	**% Proficient**	**Highly**	**Effective**	**Minimally**	**Ineffective**
Highest Performing LSD Elementary, Middle and High School						
Averill ES (K – 4)	53.6%	73.2%	67%	14%	14%	5%
Mt. Hope (4 – 6)	56.9%	46.8%	45%	55%	0%	0%
Eastern HS (7 – 12)	50.9%	39.4%	35%	58%	6%	1%
Lowest Performing LSD Elementary, Middle and High School						
Cavanaugh ES (K – 3)	35.4%	35.4%	65%	13%	6%	6%
Attwood ES (4 – 6)	36.3%	19.0%	47%	53%	0%	0%
Sexton HS (7 – 12)	37.1%	20.6%	15%	50%	13%	22%

Source: *Michigan Department of Education, 2015-2016*

Lansing School District is impacted by achievement gaps that distinguish highest performing from lowest performing schools. Exacerbating achievement gaps is the unequal distribution of *Highly Effective* educators in schools (per results of annual educator ratings). In the three lowest performing schools (Cavanaugh, Attwood and Sexton – state-designated Priority schools) students learn from an average of 42.3% *Highly Effective* teachers; in the three highest performing schools (Averill, Mt. Hope and Eastern) students learn from an average of 49% *Highly Effective* teachers. Furthermore, in Sexton High School – lowest performing Lansing high school with a 71.2% graduation rate – 35% of educators are rated *Minimally Effective* or *Ineffective* compared 7% *Minimally Effective* or *Ineffective* teachers in highest performing Eastern High.

(c) Educator Effectiveness: Lowest Poverty Schools vs. Highest Poverty Schools (2016-17)					
School (Grades)	**% F/R Lunch**	**Highly Effective**	**Effective**	**Minimally Effective**	**Ineffective**
Lowest Poverty LSD Elementary, Middle and High Schools					
Post Oak ES (K – 4)	44.57%	82%	8%	0%	0%
Mt. Hope (4 – 6)	56.68%	45%	55%	0%	0%
Everett HS (7 – 12)	57.97%	65%	31%	1%	3%
Highest Poverty LSD Elementary, Middle and High Schools					
Fairview ES (K – 4)	85.92%	92%	8%	0%	0%

Pleasant View (4 – 6)	76.83%	32%	59%	6%	3%
Eastern HS (7 – 12)	64.51%	35%	58%	6%	1%

Source: *Michigan Department of Education, 2015-2016*

The average Free / Reduced Lunch rate across Lansing School District is 67.28% – 26 of 27 LSD schools have a Free / Reduced Lunch rate that exceeds 50% of enrollment. Despite the high district poverty rate, Lansing schools are impacted by enrollment gaps that distinguish highest poverty schools from lowest poverty schools. Students attending the three lowest poverty schools (Post Oak, Mt. Hope, Everett – 53.1% average F/R Lunch rate) are taught by 64.0% *Highly Effective* teachers while students attending the three highest poverty schools (Fairview, Pleasant View, Eastern – 75.6% average F/R Lunch rate) are taught by only 53.0% *Highly Effective* teachers. Analysis of teacher evaluation data indicates high poverty students have reduced access to effective teachers. *REAP* will close equity gaps across schools, grade levels and poverty.

 (2) Factors Determining Gaps. Several factors contribute to equity gaps in Lansing district schools:

- Unequal distribution of poverty in high needs schools. Lack of resources negatively impacts the ability of a school to attract and retain high-quality educators, the ability to furnish classrooms with technology / laboratories / research-validated curricula and utilize cutting edge assessment tools. Unequal distribution of quality teaching and learning resources, particularly human capital resources, impedes equal access to effective educators and effective schools. **As indicated in the charts above, highest poverty schools are taught by far fewer *Highly Effective* teachers.**

- Unequal distribution of language skills in high needs schools. LSD educates significant numbers of ELL students and international refugee students / families impacted by communication challenges. Language and cultural barriers can lead to isolation from the school community and minimal participation in education decisions. Housing patterns across district neighborhoods determine enrollment in schools and lead to inconsistent distribution of ELL and refugee students in schools.

- High educator turnover rates in high needs schools. Highest-need LSD schools have exceedingly high annual turnover rates making it difficult to sustain staff support, implement education reform and maintain positive, inclusive school climates. LSD Priority / Focus Schools (lowest 10% of all MI schools) experience a 23% turnover rate compared to district average of 11% in higher performing schools.

- Unequal distribution of beginning teachers in high needs schools. In response to high educator turnover rates in high-need schools, a disproportionately high number of new educators (0 - 3 years experience) serve highest-needs students, which can negatively impact instructional effectiveness. On average across

state-designated Priority / Focus Schools (lowest 10% of all MI schools), 44.7% of classroom teachers have fewer than 3 years of teaching experience compared to the district average of 28.4% new teachers.

- Higher rates of violence and behavioral issues in high needs schools. Poverty, communication skills and cultural conflict increase incidences of bias / violence in LSD schools; behavioral issues impact schools at different rates in response to unequal distribution of demographic groups in schools leading to differences in school climate and quality of teaching and learning.

Implementation of *REAP* will help Lansing School District close equity gaps, increase access and improve student achievement, especially in lowest performing Lansing schools.

(3) Strategies to Close Gaps Aligned to State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators.

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) *Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Teachers* highlights the following state gaps, aligned to national education research:

- High turnover and low retention result in inexperienced teachers at high-needs schools.

- As many as 1/3 of teachers leave after their first 3 years of teaching; 50% leave after 5 years.

- Challenges with retaining high quality teachers in high-needs schools include: teacher supply, distribution and recruitment, support for new teachers and school environment.

- Teachers remain in schools with a positive work context longer, regardless of school demographics.

- Teachers remain in schools when school leaders: (1) ensure proper school operation; (2) provide instructional leadership; (3) promote inclusive decision-making; (4) provide high levels of collegial support / respect / trust / collaboration; (5) set professional goals and purposes and (6) maintain school culture with consistent student discipline standards and meaningful parent engagement.

To support equitable access to effective educators, MDE adopted a two-pronged approach with seven strategies: (1) Build a statewide infrastructure to develop and support ongoing identification and evaluation of strategies targeted to specific gaps in access to excellent educators; and (2) Pilot promising new strategies to improve retention of excellent educators in high-poverty and high-minority schools.

Lansing School District has aligned its strategies to MDE strategies as follows:

Michigan Department of Education Strategy	Lansing School District Strategy
1.1 Establish and maintain EEAG (Excellent Educator Advisory Group);	1.1 LSD will utilize Teacher and Principal Forums to focus discussion closing equity gaps and cultural proficiency;

1.2 Operationalize MDE Office of Educator Talent & Policy Coordination; 1.3 Conduct robust data analysis to inform EEAG.	1.2 LSD will focus efforts to improve HCMS on talent recruitment and development and workforce diversity; 1.3 LSD will use data to make informed decisions.
2.1 Implement Michigan Teacher Corps; 2.2 Support Kent County's School Leader & Master Teacher Initiative; 2.3 Execute Call to Action/Media Campaign; 2.4 Increase awareness / support research on Teacher Loan Forgiveness Program.	2.1 LSD will employ strategies to assist new teachers including Induction Support, New Teacher Mentoring and Growth Plans to build skills; 2.2 LSD will create opportunities that support educator advancement through Career Lattice and Leader Internship; 2.3 LSD will engage community partners / parents.

Lansing School District will be more deliberate in recruiting, hiring, training and incentivizing highly effective teachers and principals to serve in highest-needs Lansing schools and schools impacted by equity gaps.

COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY 2: **Attracting, Supporting, Retaining Diverse, Effective Workforce. (1) Commitment to Creating / Maintaining Diverse Workforce**. Lansing School District is committed to inspire excellence in teaching and learning by creating and maintaining a workforce of increasing diversity where students are able to learn from adult role models who look like them and share common experiences, as well as highly effective educators who may not look like students, but bring the diversity of many backgrounds / experiences - valued in a community where 75 different languages are spoken. While there is much work to do, LSD understands the value in learning from each other and is proud of its community role in teaching future generations of all ages and ethnicities to become respectful, tolerant, productive citizens (see *Management Plan*/*GEPA 427* for Equal Access assurance).

(2) Plan for Attracting, Supporting, Retaining Diverse Educators. Meaningful diversity in the educator workforce revolves around three action steps: **Attracting Diverse Educators –** Lansing School District will recruit well-trained educators from top teaching colleges, including regionally located Michigan State University and the University of Michigan, to ensure new teachers come to Lansing with the best academic preparation available. In addition, LSD HCMS professionals will expand their search for effective minority candidates to *Historically Black Colleges and Universities* across the country. The district will consider alternative certification programs and partnerships with colleges and universities to help identify and cultivate their own candidates into customized recruiting programs that will determine over time the combination of strategies that best prepare educators to raise student achievement. LSD district administrators, school leadership & HCMS personnel will complete professional development offered by HCMS experts (Battelle for Kids and the American Association of School Personnel Administrators, see *Project Design* Tier 2) to

increase district implementation of HCMS strategies proven to increase recruitment, hiring and retention of highly qualified minority educators. **Supporting Diverse Educators –** LSD will implement an enhanced HCMS, guided by use of *Teacher* and *Principal Frameworks*, that yields annual educator effectiveness ratings, influences distribution of performance-based compensation and triggers the development of Educator Quality Supports designed to increase the number of teachers and principals who attain *Highly Effective* and *Effective* performance ratings. Annually, all educators will be assigned to a Professional Growth Track based on effectiveness ratings. All educators will have equal access to supports based on priorities identified in individual Professional Growth Plans (see *Project Design* Tier 2). Diverse educators will be given opportunities to grow their talents by participating in professional development, striving for Master or Mentor Teacher status, earning National Board Certification and participating in Aspiring Leaders Internships. A Career Lattice will utilize, in partnership with Michigan State University, a micro-credentialing assessment process to identify highest performing educators with the skills to succeed in leadership roles. Professional Learning Communities will complete online cultural proficiency learning modules offered by *REAP* partners – Battelle for Kids and School Improvement Network (see *Project Design* Tier 2) – to create culturally accepting school environments for both students and professionals. Implementation of *REAP* will create a Professional Equity Awareness Team responsible for periodic survey and assessment of educator perceptions related to professional equity in Lansing schools and identification of training, policies and strategies that reduce equity gaps and support diversity, if identified by educators. **Retaining Diverse Educators –** The LSD HCMS will reward excellence and support continuous educator improvement. *Highly Effective* and *Effective* teachers will be recognized for their efforts through performance-based compensation and multiple advancement opportunities – rewards will increase retention of high quality educators in high-need schools. *Highly Effective* teachers willing to teach in Priority and Focus schools for three or more consecutive years will receive Priority and Focus School Retention Bonuses to reward outstanding educators for serving highest need students. Professional Growth Plans will offer individualized guidance to educators in every phase of their careers, cultivating the talents of those who demonstrate the skills and the temperament to serve in the district's most challenging schools.

(a) EVIDENCE OF SUPPORT.

(1) Comprehensive Effort to Improve Teaching / Learning / Support Standards. Lansing School District serves students and families living and learning in struggling Lansing, Michigan. While Lansing serves as the

capitol of Michigan and is the state epicenter for government and policy, local communities struggle to break free from longstanding cycles of limited economic, social and education opportunities. Following the shuttering of numerous automotive industry manufacturing plants, the city of Lansing has struggled through economic and social stagnation. The prolonged local downturn increases the pressure on Lansing School District to provide hope and opportunity for students as they look to the future. To provide students and families with the high-quality education experiences they deserve and demand, LSD has embarked upon an ambitious district reform and renewal project that promises to yield improved academic and social outcomes. Under the leadership of Dr. Yvonne Caamal Canul – the 2015 Michigan Superintendent of the Year – Lansing School District is implementing a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning in low performing, impoverished schools. Efforts to promote positive school reform, turnaround and student achievement include:

- Promise Pathways: In 2016, Lansing voters passed a bond to improve the aging infrastructure of schools and align academics to learning pathways linked to postsecondary fields of study / careers. Promise Pathways align to magnet school themes and will sustain K – 12 academic pathways.

- Magnet Schools: LSD has created, with the help of grant funds, 12 magnet schools to address court-ordered desegregation mandates, reduce minority group isolation, increase diversity of learning options for students and families and improve academic outcomes, grades K – 12.

☐ Project Prevent Social / Emotional Supports: Lansing was one of 20 applicants awarded a *Project Prevent* grant to implement strategies that reduce violent behaviors and improve climate in Lansing schools.

☐ Arts Enrichment: Implementation of multiple United States Department of Education arts grants (both *Professional Development for Arts Educators* and *Arts Education Model Development and Dissemination* grants) allowed LSD to integrate arts programs across curricular subjects and grades.

☐ Michigan Standards Alignment / Training: LSD completes annual Michigan standards training in partnership with Ingham ISD to ensure all educators fully understand rigorous instructional parameters and student achievement expectations for all subjects.

☐ Instructional Improvement: Teachers in LSD schools have completed professional development offered by The Buck Institute to promote use of project-based learning instructional strategies, supported by evidence of effectiveness, and increase academic rigor in classrooms.

- Piloted Teacher Evaluation System: Lansing piloted its educator (teacher and principal) evaluation system utilizing Michigan-validated effectiveness rubrics in 2014-15. LSD is ready to apply lessons learned, using *TSL* funds to expand performance stipends and quality supports.

- Piloted Performance-Based Incentives: In an effort to increase teacher and principal attendance in lowest-performing schools, LSD linked results of the piloted educator evaluation system to performance-based stipends for teachers and principals who met district-wide attendance goals. Administrators, teachers and unions recognized the need to increase educator attendance and supported the pilot effort.

REAP – including a comprehensive HCMS linked to educator effectiveness data and Educator Quality Supports – is a key component of the comprehensive LSD reform agenda. Implementation of complementary efforts will expand the reach of *TSL* funds and increase the efficiency of limited resources. Combined, multiple efforts promise to yield positive and lasting results that increase equity and achievement in high-need schools.

(2) Collaboration of Appropriate Partners. *REAP* was designed to leverage available district resources and connect with education partners – local / regional / national organizations – to improve teaching and learning for all educators - from beginners to veterans - in LSD schools. *REAP* partners will provide critical expertise and resources as LSD expands its capacity to better meet stakeholder needs:

Primary *REAP* Partners and Responsibilities (see Tier 2 for additional support providers)	
Michigan Department of Education	• Inform LSD of updates in state law and changes to rubrics, domains, scoring, protocols. • Deliver student assessment results to be used in calculating educator effectiveness. • Provide expertise on issues of equity and convene Michigan Equity Committee.
Ingham ISD	• Provide training to educators in effectiveness rubrics and observation tools. • Provide external effectiveness evaluators to increase inter-rater reliability and reduce bias.
Michigan State University	• Provide *Launch into Teaching* modules for beginning / probationary teachers. • Support *REAP* efforts with ongoing coaching and on-campus seminars. • Provide external effectiveness evaluators to increase inter-rater reliability and reduce bias. • Provide training to Master Teachers and Mentor Teachers through online modules.
Marzano Center	• Offer training and support to implement the Marzano Model with fidelity.
Battelle for Kids	• Provide HCMS operational training for district administrators and HCMS personnel. • Offer value-added student assessment data training for educators and school leaders. • Provide access to educator improvement modules through LSD district licensure.
TNTP	• Conduct virtual observations / analyze results compared to LSD results to reduce bias.

N.Y.C. Leadership Academy	• Provide Principal Coach training in *Facilitative, Competency Based Coaching Model*.
	• Provide *School Leadership Team* training to support improved educational leadership.

(3) Building on Efforts Using Existing Funding Supported by Community, State, Federal Resources.

Lansing School District is committed to district-wide improvement that leads to positive social and academic outcomes for high-need students. During the past five years, LSD has implemented multiple complementary projects targeting improvement across district priorities: (1) Magnet Schools expand academic choice for students and families; (2) Project Prevent strengthens supports for marginalized students and implements strategies to reduce school violence; (3) Carol M. White Physical Education Program grant activities increase student / family / community wellness; (4) Elementary Counseling grant funds enhance mental health supports for young learners and align district-wide policies to positive school climate objectives; and (4) Promise Pathways align academic programs to postsecondary education and career standards to increase relevancy and rigor of learning in Lansing schools. After prolonged and continuing investment in student-centric initiatives, LSD is expanding reform to focus attention and resources on the improvement of instruction and school leadership aligned to newly adopted state of Michigan policies pertaining to teacher and principal quality:

- **LSD Human Capital Management System:** Since the 2014-15 school year, LSD has implemented an educator evaluation system to inform a Human Capital Management System designed to increase equitable access to highly effective teachers across all schools for all students. Ongoing reform of the LSD Human Capital Management System will increase the use of objective data to inform all aspects of human capital management, including hiring, dismissal, placement, promotion and compensation. Early LSD efforts reflect changing Michigan policy that mandates the implementation of state-adopted, research-validated educator evaluation tools – linked to strong student growth measures – to determine educator effectiveness. Alignment of the HCMS with Michigan policies ensures district compliance with state efforts, but more importantly, provides a framework for district leaders to promote school improvement through enhanced educator quality. The reimagined LSD approach has transformed the Human Resources department, driven by tenure and a step system, into a HCMS that uses data to inform decision-making and connect students to highly effective educators.

- **LSD Educator Evaluation System:** Beginning with the 2014-15 school year, Lansing School District – in compliance with Michigan Council for Educator Effectiveness (MCEE) guidance and MDE regulations – adopted the state-approved Danielson Teacher Effectiveness Evaluation Model and the state-approved ADvance Principal Effectiveness Evaluation Model. After multiple years implementing the Danielson and

ADvance models and after gaining valuable experience implementing objective educator effectiveness evaluation systems linked to student growth measures, LSD is revising its approach to implement the Marzano Model for both teacher and principal effectiveness evaluation for the 2017-18 school year. The new approach increases HCMS consistency and holds all educators to the same standards of performance. Through implementation of *REAP*, LSD will build on existing strategies and facilitate individualized educator improvement by linking Professional Growth Plans to credible, reliable educator evaluation system data gathered through Marzano Model tools.

- **LSD Performance-Based Compensation:** Upon completion of its first cycle of educator evaluations utilizing state-approved tools, LSD – with support from administrators, teachers and union leadership – piloted a performance-based compensation strategy reflecting a collaboratively designed incentive formula. Using data gathered from educator evaluation tools, the LSD distributed stipends to educators that met a combination of attendance / professional performance indicators in lowest-performing schools. LSD administrators selected attendance as a key indicator in response to unacceptably high levels of educator absences. While this process provided the district with a meaningful way to encourage improved educator performance, the availability of resources prevented LSD from implementing a more robust PBCS driven by effectiveness ratings that measure both educator metrics and student growth indicators. Successful distribution of performance-based stipends demonstrated that an objective system can reward educators who achieve performance standards with fairness and equity to promote outcomes.

REAP will provide the necessary resources to expand meaningful, early efforts and help Lansing School District meet state mandates that link Human Capital Management Systems to educator effectiveness, educator support systems, performance-based compensation and state equity plans.

(b) NEED FOR PROJECT.

(1) Addressing needs of at risk students. Lansing, Michigan and Lansing School District struggle to overcome challenges that impact the quality of education programs serving high-need schools, low performing students and underserved communities. Multiple barriers impede the success of students and school programs and degrade district efforts to promote ongoing improvement of education options, including: (1) At-Risk Communities; (2) Low-Performing Schools; (3) District Capacity; and (4) Gaps and Weaknesses in Education Programs. **(1) At-Risk Communities:** Lansing School District serves students living and learning in vulnerable communities impacted by significant risk factors that promote negative social / academic outcomes:

Social Risk Indicators*	Lansing	Michigan	Nation (National Rank)
Free / Reduced Lunch Rate	67.28%	46.1%	48.1%
Per Capita Income	$19,430	$26,143	$28,555
% Children Living in Poverty	41.3%	23.7%	21.9%
% High School Diploma or Higher	76.8%	89.3%	86.3%
% Bachelors Degree or Higher	25.1%	26.4%	29.3%

*Sources: U.S. Census; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics; MDE Count Data, 2016.

Poverty: Poverty and community risk indicators demonstrate widespread hardship for Lansing families. The district is impacted by social gaps that further divide local communities into "haves" and "have nots." Combined with a long history of racial inequity and segregation (**LSD remains in court-ordered desegregation since 1978**), the growing economic disparity that compartmentalizes segments of the Lansing community perpetuates cycles of unequal access to education opportunities between demographic / racial subgroups (over the last 20 years, "White Flight" has reapportioned LSD student enrollment from 58% white, 42% non-white – in alignment with community racial profile – to 26% white and 74% non-white in 2016). As district enrollment trends have changed, so too have academic performance outcomes. *TSL* programming will provide resources to improve teaching and learning. **(2) Low-Performing Schools:** Analysis of academic performance data indicates that students attending Lansing schools consistently fail to meet state standards in core academic subjects, fall short of national averages on standardized tests, attend schools that fail to meet performance / growth targets and are in state-designated Priority status. **High-Need / Priority Schools:** Lansing School District includes 27 PreK – 12 schools (LSD also operates multiple Alternative Education programs / facilities); 26 of 27 schools are High-Need schools per *TSL* standards with free / reduced lunch eligibility rates exceeding 50% of enrollment (see *Appendix* for Free / Reduced Lunch verification). Michigan Department of Education utilizes an accountability system that codes schools based on performance indicators and growth benchmarks (color-coded system and school performance scores ranging from 0 to 132). LSD is a designated RED district (LSD Score: 80 of 132 points [equivalent to "F" grade on previous School Report Card scale]) and includes six (6) Priority Schools (bottom 5% of Michigan schools) and one (1) Focus School (bottom 10% of Michigan schools). **Priority and Focus schools account for 25.9% of all Lansing School District schools (7 of 27 schools) and educate 22.0% of LSD students**.

Lansing School District	% Students BELOW BASIC 2014-2015			
District-wide Grade Level Scores	ELA	Math	Science	Social Studies

Elementary School Score – Grade 3	71.5%	66.7%	N/A	N/A
Elementary School Score – Grade 5	76.7%	90.7%	(Gr 4) 97.2%	94.2%
Middle School Score – Grade 8	86.9%	95.8%	(Gr 7) 94.9%	92.8%
High School Score – Grade 11	66.1%	90.8%	90.8%	79.9%
	2011-12	**2012-13**	**2013-14**	**2014-15**
Average LSD Graduation Rate	58.50%	64.23%	66.81%	61.65%

Source: Michigan School Report Cards, M-STEP Exam, 2014-2015 (most recent public data).

☐ Lansing School District has a bilingual population of 2,395 students (22% of student population) who speak a total of more than 54 native languages; many are refugees and immigrants.

☐ LSD special education students total more than 21% of district-wide student enrollment.

☐ More than 90% of middle and high school students fail to meet state math standards.

Poor academic performance in proposed schools is exacerbated by significant achievement gaps that distinguish racial / socio-economic subgroups. The chart below compares black and white student performance on state assessments. The large achievement gap is a critical academic shortcoming LSD seeks to rectify through improved educator quality and expanded access to high quality programs.

	% Students Below Basic			
District Grade Level Scores	**ELA - Black**	**ELA - White**	**Math - Black**	**Math - White**
Elementary School – Grade 5	85.3%	69.0%	96.6%	83.8%
Middle School – Grade 8	93.1%	74.7%	97.4%	89.6%
High School – Grade 10	76.9%	54.5%	95.1%	87.3%

Source: Michigan School Report Cards, 2014-2015.

Resources are needed to improve educator effectiveness, promote equal access to high quality teaching and learning and raise student achievement in failing Lansing schools.

(3) District Capacity: Lansing School District pursues opportunities to expand local capacity to offer innovative programs that support student achievement – recent *Magnet Schools*, *Project Prevent*, *Elementary Counseling, Promise Pathways* and other district / state / federal projects have expanded access to services. These efforts are critical but cannot function in isolation – LSD lacks resources to support expanded student services simultaneously with rigorous educator accountability and improvement initiatives. Reinforcing the need to invest in educator quality, the State of Michigan enacted two laws (2011 Teacher Quality and Tenure Reform Act; 2015 Educator Evaluation Act) mandating new strategies that link educator effectiveness and

human capital management decisions to student growth outcomes. To comply with new state regulations and increase educator accountability for student achievement, Lansing launched its Human Capital Management System driven by educator effectiveness data linked to a pilot effort to disburse performance-based compensation (see *Evidence of Support* section). While these efforts have proven impactful and promise to push forward positive reform efforts, LSD lacks the financial resources to fully implement district-wide performance-based compensation and support educators with diverse, evidence-based professional development that raises educator performance. *TSL* funds will expand local capacity and support five years of HCMS reform while the district designs a sustainability plan to carry forward effectiveness-based HMCS strategies, performance-based compensation and quality educator supports beyond the grant period.

(2) Identified Gaps Including Nature and Magnitude. In response to significant challenges and barriers impacting the success and future potential of students, Lansing School District convened a planning Task Force – comprised of district administrators, HCMS professionals, finance officers, curriculum specialists, principals, teachers, non-instructional professionals and union leaders – to assess district needs and propose solutions that fill gaps and strengthen weaknesses in LSD programs. *REAP: Rewarding Educator Achievement and Performance* – the result of collaborative planning, research, design and compromise – will help LSD improve educator quality in high-needs schools, enhance learning opportunities for low performing students, fill gaps in current education programs and strengthen teaching and learning weaknesses that impede student success. The following chart identifies current needs and gaps, and proposed *REAP* strategies:

Lansing School District Gap	*REAP* Improvement Strategy
Need 1: Lansing lacks resources to consistently implement effectiveness-based HCMS across all schools.	
Gap 1: District-wide implementation of effectiveness-based Human Capital Management and Performance-Based Compensation Systems limited by resources.	*REAP* will improve and expand the LSD Human Capital Management System and Performance-Based Compensation System (Tier 1) and enhance educator effectiveness in high-need schools (Tier 2) to promote equity across all schools.
Need 2: Lansing lacks expertise to objectively evaluate educator effectiveness across all schools.	
Gap 2: Implementation of Marzano Model to assess educator effectiveness is vulnerable to rater bias and lack of fidelity to tool.	*REAP* will provide educators with training from Marzano to increase fidelity of tool; coaching and "shadow evaluations" will increase inter-rater reliability / reduce bias (Tier of Support #1).
Need 3: Lansing lacks a process to connect educators with supports that increase effectiveness.	

Gap 3: Lansing does not utilize a system of support that aligns professional development to individual strengths and weaknesses.	*REAP* will utilize Professional Growth Plans linked to effectiveness ratings to connect educators to professional development designed to improve practice (Tier of Support #2).
Need 4: Lansing lacks strategies and resources to meet Michigan Department of Education equity plans.	
Gap 4: Lansing HCMS strategies do not adequately address equity gaps that impair equal student access to high quality learning.	*REAP* will provide professional development to administrators and HCMS personnel to equitably distribute *Highly Effective* and *Effective* educators across ALL schools; incentives will encourage teachers to serve Priority / Focus schools.

Lansing School District faces significant challenges. Policies and systems do not support a school district prepared to overcome the challenges of educating high-needs youth impacted by chronic failure, poverty, low education attainment and underprepared educators. *TSL* funding will provide resources to implement positive reforms that build local capacity to raise educator and student achievement.

(c) QUALITY OF THE PROJECT DESIGN.

(1) Project Demonstrates Rationale. *REAP: Rewarding Educator Achievement and Performance* is the result of collaborative planning aligned to state reform initiatives, state equity plans and the district need to implement systems that support improved teaching and learning in all schools, particularly high-needs schools. The *REAP* planning Task Force completed extensive research and review of human capital management systems, performance-based compensation strategies, educator evaluation protocols and educator improvement plans. The Task Force was deliberate in its selection of school improvement strategies supported by Evidence of Effectiveness studies that meet United States Department of Education *What Works Clearinghouse* standards. By utilizing programs supported by Evidence of Effectiveness, the Task Force is confident that *REAP* will yield positive outcomes for students during the grant period and beyond. Components of *REAP* supported by evidence of effectiveness include (see *Appendix* - Literature Cited):

Program	*REAP*: Evidence of Effectiveness
Human Capital Management System with PBCS	• **Evidence of Effectiveness:** Pay-for-performance bonuses generated slightly higher student reading achievement, and gains in math were similar in magnitude. Researchers confirmed that positive impact of pay-for-performance on student achievement was reflected in positive impacts on educator effectiveness, as measured by the effectiveness ratings that educators received from their districts (Chiang, et al, 2015).

Teacher Supports	• **Evidence of Effectiveness:** After controlling for initial ability (as measured by test scores) and other student characteristics, teacher effects are statistically important in explaining ninth-grade math test score achievement (Aaronson, Barrow & Sander, 2007).
Principal Supports	• **Evidence of Effectiveness:** Leadership is second to teaching (among school-related factors) in its impact on student learning and the impact of leadership is greatest in schools where student learning needs are most acute (Leithwood, et al, 2004).
Educator Induction	• **Evidence of Effectiveness:** Results of a randomized control study conclude teacher induction and new teacher support increases the test scores of average students by 4 percentile points in reading and 8 percentile points in math (Glazerman, et al, 2010).
Educator Retention	• **Evidence of Effectiveness:** Analytical, random study of a Boston Teacher Residency retention incentive program in high-need schools indicates attrition stabilizes after three years of service and incentive recipients more likely to remain in school five or more years (Silva, et al, 2014).
Marzano Educator Evaluation Model	• **Validated Model:** Michigan Department of Education approved educator evaluation system. • **Evidence of Promise:** A statewide study, *What Works in Oklahoma Schools*, demonstrates a correlation of improved academic performance in both reading and math to teacher effectiveness evaluation using the Marzano Model (Marzano Research Laboratory, 2011).

Based on research of effective practices related to the implementation of HCMS, PBCS, educator evaluation and educator improvement plans, the Task Force developed a *REAP* Logic Model grounding the project in a strong theory of support and rationale. The validated logic model framework – developed by the Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Northeast & Islands and WestEd and aligned to the FORECAST evaluation strategy (see *Program Design*) – grounds *REAP* in strong theory (see *Appendix* for full Logic Model):

REAP Summary Logic Model				
To improve student achievement by increasing access to effective educators in high-needs schools.				
INPUTS >>	**OBJECTIVES >>**	**ACTIVITIES >>**	**OUTPUTS >>**	**OUTCOMES**

• *TSLIF* Funding	• **Objective 1:** Reduce equity gaps through HCMS.	• **Tier 1:** Comprehensive Human Capital Management System	• Effectiveness-based HCMS	• Increase # *Highly Effective/Effective* educators in high-need schools.
• Existing Partner Resources	• **Objective 2:** Assess educator effectiveness using validated tools.	• **Tier 2:** Educator Quality Supports	• Annual Educator Performance Ratings	• Equal access in HCMS.
• Existing LSD Resources	• **Objective 3:** Improve educator effectiveness through learning / support.		• Professional Growth Plans for all educators.	• Increased ELA and Math proficiency / reduced gaps.
• Coordinating programs	• **Objective 4:** Increase student attainment of state academic standards.			• Improve graduation rates.

Grant managers, Advisory Board (see *Management Plan*) and evaluators will utilize the Logic Model to ensure

alignment of activities with the project goal, objectives and timeline, ensuring equitable delivery of the Tiers.

- **Prioritization of Services:** *REAP* will serve all Lansing schools – 26 of 27 schools have Free and Reduced

  Lunch rates exceeding 50% of enrollment and meet the *TSL* criteria of High-Need School. The one school

  falling short of the 50% threshold has a 44.57% Free / Reduced Lunch rate; LSD will serve all schools to

  ensure consistency of efforts across the district and because all schools have multi-year trends of increasing

poverty – the one LSD school falling short of the 50% threshold will likely see future increases in poverty that

place it over the 50% rate during the grant period (see *Appendix* for Verification). To ensure services target

highest needs students and schools, the Task Force identified a **Tiers of Intensity** strategy to identify schools

most in need of improvement. The Tiers of Intensity rationale will guide implementation of *REAP*:

Tier of Intensity	*REAP* Level of Focus Classification
Tier 1: Highly Intense	• LSD schools receiving "F" and "D" letter grade labels and "Priority or Focus School" status indicating classification in lowest performing 10% of schools in state.
Tier 2: Moderately Intense	• LSD schools receiving "C" letter grade indicating classification impacted by declining student performance or failure to meet state benchmarks in subgroup component scores.
Level 3: Intense	• LSD schools receiving "B" and "A" letter grade labels indicating classification of schools meeting or exceeding state academic performance benchmarks / standards.

LSD designed a project based on Evidence of Effectiveness and peer-reviewed research. A Logic Model

grounds the project in strong theory and deliberate prioritization of services using a Tiers of Intensity strategy

provides a clear rationale for ensuring *REAP* benefits highest-need schools and closes equity gaps.

(2) Appropriate Design Addressing Needs. After an extensive needs assessment, the *REAP* Task Force designed a comprehensive effort to initiate, strengthen and sustain strategies supporting improvement in high-needs schools. Implementation of *REAP* will help LSD meet and exceed the following goal and objectives:

GOAL: To improve student achievement by increasing access to effective educators in high-needs schools.
Objective 1: Reduce equity gaps through effectiveness-based Human Capital Management Systems.
Objective 2: Assess educator effectiveness using validated tools to ensure objectivity.
Objective 3: Improve educator effectiveness through individualized learning and support.
Objective 4: Increase student attainment of state academic performance standards.

Evaluation of the goal and objectives will include assessment of required GPRA performance indicators and project-specific measures (see *Project Design* sub-criteria 3 for measures / evaluation details). The *REAP* project design is composed of two interconnected **TIERS OF SUPPORT**: 1) Comprehensive Human Capital Management System and 2) Educator Quality Supports.

TIER OF SUPPORT 1: Comprehensive Human Capital Management System. Lansing School District has embarked on an initiative to reimagine its Human Resources Department into a data-driven Human Capital Management System linked to effectiveness data. *REAP* will expand current efforts to reform the LSD HCMS and will provide district / school administrators with the tools to support improvement in high-need schools. Supports include: (1) Effectiveness-based Human Capital Management; (2) Educator Effectiveness Model; (3) High Quality Evaluation Plan; (4) Student Data Systems; and (5) Performance-Based Compensation.

(1) Effectiveness-based Human Capital Management: Annual evaluation of educator effectiveness using the *Teacher Framework* and the *Principal Framework* (see below) will provide the data needed to make important human capital management decisions. Lansing School District will use educator evaluation data to inform <u>all</u> aspects of its Human Capital Management System, including - <u>*Recruitment*</u>: LSD will strengthen the screening and selection process to assess the effectiveness of prospective teachers, principals and administrators by identifying candidates who understand and embrace the LSD instructional vision. Because recruiting quality candidates is a challenge, the district is mindful of the efficacy of alternative certification programs, partnerships with colleges and universities, and "grow your own" recruiting programs to determine over time which combination of strategies best provide teachers / principals able to raise student achievement. LSD will collaborate with regional *Historically Black Colleges and Universities* to recruit minority educators to teach and lead in Lansing schools (see *Competitive Priority # 1*). <u>*Hiring*</u>: LSD will provide equal opportunity

for employment without regard to age, gender, race, ethnicity, religion, disability, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity or other protected class. Prior to conferring formal employment offers to highly-qualified candidates, HCMS officers will disclose to candidates the components of the Educator Effectiveness Model. Upon hiring, new educators or educators new to LSD will be assigned to Professional Growth Track 1 to facilitate extensive on-boarding that includes training in rigorous Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations. _Placement_: LSD will seek equitable placement of _Effective_ and _Highly Effective_ teachers and principals in highest need schools. Every effort will be made to use data to match expertise with need. New teachers and current LSD educators willing to teach in lowest-performing schools (state-designated Priority and Focus Schools) will be offered opportunities to qualify for compensation incentives that promote equitable access to highly effective educators for students in failing schools (see _Performance-Based Compensation_ below). _Retention_: The LSD HCMS will reward excellence and support continuous educator improvement. _Highly Effective_ and _Effective_ teachers will be rewarded for their efforts through performance-based compensation and advancement opportunities – rewards will increase retention of high quality educators in high-need schools. _Highly Effective_ teachers willing to teach in Priority and Focus schools for three or more consecutive years will receive Priority / Focus School Retention Bonuses to reward outstanding educators for serving highest need students. _Promotion_: LSD does not currently implement a system to promote teachers and principals based on proven ability to raise student achievement. Promotions have been given, in the past, based on evaluation processes that do not utilize validated / objective Effectiveness Rubrics and do not include consistent student achievement metrics. _REAP_ will connect promotion and salary advancement to an Educator Effectiveness Model that includes use of validated educator effectiveness Rubrics and specified student growth measures. Promotion and salary advancement will be linked to performance-based compensation strategies that reward _Highly Effective_ and _Effective_ educators. _Dismissal_: LSD seeks to assist employees in any way possible as they pursue professional growth and will customize individual Professional Growth Plans to improve skills and raise achievement. Educator Quality Supports (see Tier 2) – comprised of _Professional Growth Tracks and Professional Growth Plans_ – will promote educator improvement and facilitate courageous discussions that consider alternative roles for, or dismissal of, ineffective educators. Per 2011 Michigan Tenure Law, educators rated _Ineffective_ for three consecutive years (regardless of Tenure status) are subject to dismissal. _Tenure_: LSD believes awarding tenure (after state-determined probationary periods per 2011 Michigan Tenure Law) should be based on educator ability to demonstrate _Highly Effective_ or _Effective_

performance and success in raising student achievement. As educator tenure is considered, LSD will (1) assess principal performance levels and gains in student performance in principal schools and (2) assess teacher performance levels and gains in student performance in classrooms. Educators must maintain *Highly Effective* or *Effective* performance levels for three consecutive years to be considered for tenure. <u>*Compensation*</u>: LSD will adopt a Performance-based Compensation System for teachers and principals (see PBCS below). <u>*Professional Development*</u>: Effectiveness data will allow administrators to prioritize use of limited professional development funds to target district and school needs while facilitating individual educator improvement. Annual performance labels – *Highly Effective, Effective, Minimally Effective, Ineffective* – connect to one of four Professional Growth Tracks and determine components of Professional Growth Plans (Tier 2).

(2) Educator Effectiveness Model: The LSD Educator Effectiveness Framework uses the Marzano Model (Marzano, Toth and Schooling, 2011) to assess teacher / principal effectiveness across multiple performance domains linked to student growth measures. The evaluation process – embedded in the LSD *Framework for Professional Practice and Teacher Evaluation* and LSD *Framework for Professional Practice and Principal Evaluation* (see *Appendix*) – will inform all components of the LSD Human Capital Management System. The state-approved Marzano Model evaluation systems for teachers and principals assess professional performance across the following domains (see *Appendix* for full teacher / principal rubrics):

Marzano Model Educator Evaluation System Rubric Domains	
Teachers and Non-Instructional Staff	**Principals and Assistant Principals**
Domain 1: Classroom Strategies and Behaviors	**Domain 1:** Data-driven Focus on Student Achievement
Domain 2: Planning and Preparing	**Domain 2:** Continuous Improvement of Instruction
Domain 3: Reflecting on Teaching	**Domain 3:** Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum
Domain 4: Collegiality and Professionalism	**Domain 4:** Cooperation and Collaboration
	Domain 5: School Climate
Michigan Educator Effectiveness Levels	

Highly Effective*	Effective*	Minimally Effective	Ineffective

* *Highly Effective* and *Effective* levels eligible for Performance-Based Compensation.

Marzano Model experts will train principals, Grade Level Directors and district administrators to conduct objective educator evaluations using the rubric, with fidelity, to ensure fair, reliable and credible results. <u>Principal Coaches (see *Management Plan* and *Appendix* for Job Description) and trained external evaluators from Ingham ISD will conduct random "shadow evaluations" across schools and grade levels simultaneously with school principals to provide an outside evaluation of educators for comparison with district-led results to</u>

<u>assess prevalence of rater bias and increase objectivity</u>. Principal Coaches will monitor implementation of teacher / principal evaluation protocols and provide modeling and training that promotes consistent and objective use of tools and increases inter-rater reliability across classrooms, grade levels and schools.

- **Teacher/Principal Effectiveness Formulas**–Annual effectiveness ratings will be based on formula calculations that combine multiple factors:

  o **Evaluations (72% of score) –** individual numerical scores based on extensive observations across four domains of Teacher Evaluation Rubric; five domains of Principal Evaluation Rubric;

  o **Student Growth (25% of score) –** individual educator scores derived from student achievement growth metrics linked to district / school / classroom student performance; and

  o **Educator Growth (3% of score) –** individual progress toward goals in Professional Growth Plans. LSD will utilize the state-approved Marzano Teacher and Principal Rubrics to objectively evaluate educator competencies that reflect state, district and school improvement plans, policies and priorities. Scores generated by observation across teacher and principal domains will be added to student growth metrics and educator growth plans to generate educator effectiveness scores and performance labels. The evaluation process will be initiated at the beginning of each school year.

- **Student Growth Measures –** The inclusion of student achievement growth metrics promotes teacher accountability for individual and school-wide student outcomes and principal accountability for school-wide and district-wide results while reducing educator / union concerns that evaluator bias will impact educator effectiveness ratings and compensation. After considering multiple mechanisms for integrating student achievement into educator evaluation systems, LSD selected three student indicators for teachers and principals to determine annual performance scores:

REAP Student Achievement Evaluation Metrics	
Student Achievement Metrics: Teacher	**Student Achievement Metrics: Principal**
• Metric 1: School Goal	• Metric 1: District Goal
• Metric 2: Classroom Goal	• Metric 2: School Goal
• Metric 3: Teacher Goal	• Metric 3: Principal Goal

Inclusion of student growth metrics in teacher and principal effectiveness formulas promotes comparative analysis of results across schools, increases evaluation objectivity / consistency across the district and complies with state-directed protocols that mandate annual educator effectiveness ratings are substantially impacted by observational evaluations and student achievement indicators.

- **Educator Effectiveness Labels** – Upon completion of annual effectiveness evaluation procedures and after annual student growth data is linked to observational results, each educator will receive an Effectiveness Performance Label aligned to a numerical score:

Label (Score)	Educator Effectiveness Competencies (T = Teacher; P = Principal)
Highly Effective (125-150 points)	• Consistently exceeds instructional practice (T) / leadership expectations (P) • Consistently exceeds student performance expectations / academic growth targets • Demonstrates excellence across assessment parameters per evaluator observations
Effective (90-124 points)	• Consistently meets instructional practice (T) / leadership expectations (P) • Consistently meets student performance expectations / academic growth targets • Demonstrates effectiveness across assessment parameters per evaluator observations
Minimally Effective (50-89 points)	• Requires improvement to meet instructional practice (T) / leadership expectations (P) • Requires improvement to meet student expectations / academic growth targets • Demonstrates inadequacies across assessment parameters per evaluator observations
Ineffective (0-49 points)	• Fails to meet instructional practice (T) / leadership expectations (P) • Fails to meet student performance expectations / academic growth targets • Demonstrates failures across assessment parameters per evaluator observations

Educator performance labels and scores will influence placement in Professional Growth Tracks and help administrators and teachers develop Professional Growth Plans that promote improvement (see Tier 2).

(3) High-Quality Evaluation Plan: Teachers and principals will be assigned annual effectiveness performance labels – *Highly Effective, Effective, Minimally Effective, Ineffective* – upon completion of multi-step evaluation protocols outlined in the LSD *Teacher* and *Principal Frameworks*. Educator effectiveness will drive HCMS decisions and help shape individual Professional Growth Plans. LSD proposes a high-quality effectiveness evaluation plan that includes:

- **Frequent Observation by Qualified Effectiveness Evaluators –** The LSD *Teacher Framework* and *Principal Framework* outline a year-long evaluation process that includes multiple observation strategies. Teacher Observations – Using the innovative *iObservation* software package and mobile devices (iPads / smart tablets), school principals will conduct multiple classroom observations that range from five-minute daily snapshots to quarterly half-day instructional observations. The technology-based tool will enable principals to provide teachers with instant feedback through observation reports. Individual Performance Portfolios will aggregate annual observation data, quarterly evaluation conference feedback, Effectiveness Ratings and Professional Growth Plans into digital portfolios. All school principals and assistant principals

will complete training to utilize the *iObservation* platform aligned to the Marzano Model Teacher Rubric.

Principal Observations – Using the innovative *iObservation* software package and mobile devices, Grade Level Directors (Elementary, Middle, High) will conduct weekly, monthly and quarterly school observations that range from hour-long school snapshots to quarterly full-day operational observations. The technology-based tool will enable Grade Level Directors to provide instant feedback through observation reports. Grade Level Directors and principals / assistant principals – using *iObservation* – will maintain Individual Performance Portfolios that aggregate observational data, quarterly evaluation feedback, Effectiveness Ratings and Professional Growth Plans into digital portfolios. All Grade Level Directors will complete training to utilize *iObservation* aligned to the Marzano Model Principal Rubric.

- **Evaluation Fidelity Monitoring –** LSD administrators and Principal Coaches will conduct an evaluation oversight process that includes random observations of principals conducting teacher evaluations and Grade Level Directors conducting principal evaluations to monitor fidelity to *Frameworks*, implementation of Rubrics, use of *iObservation* tools and assessment of inter-rater reliability to ensure fairness.

  o Principals will receive training from Ingham ISD to utilize the Marzano Teacher Rubric with fidelity / consistency to increase teacher confidence in the objectivity of the *Teacher Framework.*

  o Grade Level Directors will receive training from Ingham ISD to utilize the Marzano Principal Rubric with fidelity / consistency to increase principal confidence in objectivity of the *Principal Framework.*

  o Michigan State University Coaches and Ingham ISD External Evaluators will conduct "shadow observations" with LSD personnel to provide comparative results and reduce inconsistencies;

  o The New Teacher Project coaches will conduct virtual observations for comparative analysis;

  o NYC Leadership Academy will provide Principals and Grade Level Directors inter-rater reliability training to minimize observational bias and facilitate accurate rubric scoring.

Evaluation process monitoring will prevent instances of observational bias, improve inter-rater reliability and increase rigor of the process by holding principals and Grade Level Directors accountable for implementation of effectiveness evaluation strategies. Oversight, internal and external, will allow district leaders and Principal Coaches to recognize flaws in the educator evaluation system and solicit feedback to promote improvement.

(4) Student Data Management: Michigan is one of two states in the nation currently using Successline's Tracker series customized data analysis software called the *Golden Package* that provides Lansing educators with a distinct edge in viewing, interpreting and successfully using student data to improve achievement. All

K-12 data is accessible to LSD educators in a password-protected, Smart Data format on Successline's website. Tracker provides access to data at the district, building, classroom, and individual student levels for in-depth analysis of gaps in performance. The site is customized for every K-12 assessment – aligned to college and career-ready expectations and benchmarks – implemented by LSD to measure student growth. In addition, curriculum alignment reports allow educators to analyze the alignment between curriculum, instruction and assessment, giving them tools needed to improve instruction. Ingham ISD and LSD personnel have been trained in the use of Successline software and during *REAP*, educators will continue to improve their analytic skills as they align teaching and learning to best inspire each of the students they serve.

(5) Performance-based Compensation: LSD will expand pilot performance-based incentives to initiate and sustain a performance-based compensation system that links salary advancement and promotion to annual educator evaluation results and willingness to serve lowest performing schools. Teachers and principals will be eligible to receive annual performance-based compensation rewards based on effectiveness evaluation ratings and Priority / Focus school three-year service bonuses detailed below:

REAP: Performance-Based Compensation Rewards *	
Highly Effective **Teachers**	*Effective* **Teachers**
Performance Reward: ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮	Performance Reward: ▮▮▮▮▮▮
Priority/Focus School Retention Bonus: ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮	N/A
Highly Effective **Principals**	*Effective* **Principals**
Performance Reward: ▮▮▮▮▮	Performance Reward: ▮▮▮▮.
Priority Focus School Retention Bonus: ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮	N/A

* Actual PBCS reward amounts subject to change based on negotiations with relevant unions.

TIER OF SUPPORT 2: Educator Quality Supports. LSD will implement a HCMS, guided by use of *Teacher* and *Principal Frameworks*, that yields annual educator ratings, influences distribution of performance-based compensation and triggers development of Educator Quality Supports designed to increase the number of teachers / principals who attain *Highly Effective* and *Effective* performance ratings. Educator Quality Supports linked to district, school and individual achievement benchmarks will catalyze improvement across all performance levels and include: (1) Professional Growth Tracks; (2) Professional Development; (3) New Teacher Induction; (4) Career Lattice and (5) Aspiring Leaders Internship.

(1) Professional Growth Tracks: The LSD *Teacher Framework* and *Principal Framework* drive all aspects of the educator evaluation process and therefore influence all components of the re-imagined LSD HCMS. A

common component of both the *Teacher* and *Principal Frameworks* is the LSD Professional Growth Tracks

strategy. Annually, all educators – newly-hired and experienced – will be assigned to a Professional Growth

Track based on effectiveness data and ratings:

REAP: Professional Growth Tracks		
Track	**Audience**	**Professional Growth Strategies**
Track 1: Initial Professional Development	• All educators with less than 3 years LSD experience	• Designed to support growth of new educators – both new educators and new to Lansing educators – during probationary period. • Strategies promote assimilation of educators into district culture and promote mastery of district instructional / administrative strategies.
Track 2: Ongoing Professional Growth	• Tenured Teachers – *Highly Effective*, *Effective*	• Designed to support tenured educators demonstrating mastery of educator effectiveness domains. • Strategies promote development of leadership skills, advanced certifications and peer support to promote sharing effective practice.
Track 3: Professional Development – Concern	• Tenured Teachers – *Minimally Effective*	• Designed to support tenured educators demonstrating single-issue concern or single-issue deficiency in effectiveness domains. • Strategies promote development of skills aligned to effectiveness domains and strengthen weaknesses identified during evaluations.
Track 4: Professional Development – Warning	• Tenured Teachers – *Ineffective*	• Designed to support tenured educators demonstrating less than satisfactory performance across multiple effectiveness domains. • Strategies develop skills aligned to effectiveness domains / strengthen multiple weaknesses identified during evaluations. • Strategies mitigate deficiencies to avoid potential dismissal actions.

Annual assignment of educators to Professional Growth Tracks will trigger Professional Growth Plans that

connect educators to support, professional development and quality improvement strategies that promote

educator attainment of *Highly Effective* and *Effective* performance ratings. LSD seeks to raise achievement by

connecting all students attending LSD schools with *Highly Effective* and *Effective* educators.

(3) Professional Development: LSD *Teacher* and *Principal Frameworks* generate objective effectiveness data

used to inform all aspects of the HCMS (Tier 1) and will connect educators – through Professional Growth

Tracks – to diverse and evidence-based professional development that reflects individual needs:

REAP Professional Development: Audiences, Content, Providers	
Provider	**Content / Format**
Central Administration and HCMS Professionals	

Battelle for Kids	• Administrators / HCMS personnel will complete training that supports HCMS performance excellence, strategic staffing, talent management / development, cultural proficiency, performance rewards and <u>attainment of Human Capital Leaders in Education Certification</u>.
American Association of School Personnel Administrators	• The LSD Superintendent, central administrators and HCMS personnel will attend annual AASPA conference that provides professional learning related to the operation of data-driven Human Capital Management Systems; <u>annual conference highlights innovative HCMS strategies aimed at recruiting, supporting and maintaining a diverse educator workforce</u>.
Coaching	
Principal Coaching	• Coaches will work with principals / APs, PreK – 12, to promote best practices in school climate, student achievement, human capital, teacher evaluation and operations management. • Target *Minimally Effective/Ineffective* administrators (<u>480 Principal Coaching days per year</u>).
Master Teacher Coaching	• *Highly Effective* instructional leaders will provide embedded coaching / modeling of best practices to support *Minimally Effective* and *Ineffective* teachers. • Master teachers will organize and lead *REAP* Teacher Forums at each school. • Master Teachers who fail to maintain *Highly Effective* status will be replaced by educators who meet minimum eligibility criteria (<u>108 Master Teacher Coaches - 4 per *REAP* school</u>).
Mentor Teacher Coaching	• *Highly Effective* or *Effective* Mentor Teachers will support lower performing peers by engaging in team teaching, joint lesson planning, modeling of strategies. • Mentor Teachers will be paired with first-year (new) teachers to offer induction support. • Mentor Teachers who fail to maintain minimum eligibility criteria will be replaced to promote high quality supports (<u>54 Mentor Teachers - 2 per *REAP* school</u>).
Peer Support - Professional Learning Communities	
Teacher Forum	• Monthly PLCs led by Master Teachers to share best practices, strategies and peer-learning.
Principal Forum	• Monthly PLCs led by Principal Coaches to support improvement in school leadership.
New Teacher PLC	• Monthly PLCs led by Master / Mentor Teachers to support first through third year teachers.
Teachers	
Michigan State University	• *Launch Into Teaching* online modules will provide targeted support across diverse topics. • Teachers will collaborate with school principals to develop individual Professional Growth Plans that include MSU modules linked to specific skills. • Modules will be utilized to promote collaborative learning in PLCs.
Battelle for Kids	• Teachers will complete training to improve effectiveness – Formative Instructional Practices, value-added data driven instruction, standards-aligned assessment – using innovative, on-demand, self-paced *BFK Connect* professional learning hub modules and strands.

School Improvement Network	•Edivate online, on-demand professional learning resources support customization to reflect individual Professional Growth Plans, align to college and career ready instruction, include cultural proficiency training to promote equity and diversity awareness and enable micro-credentialing of educators to monitor achievement of specific competencies.
Ingham Intermediate School District	•Annual MI Grade Level Content Expectations training will increase educator knowledge of student benchmarks and instructional content aligned to college / career ready curriculum. •Annual Student Learning Objectives (SLO) training will prepare teachers to clearly assess student growth measures linked to grade level expectations / college readiness data.
National Board for Professional Teaching Standards	•Educators receiving *Highly Effective* and *Effective* performance ratings will pursue National Board certification to develop mastery of advanced instructional competencies. •National Board certification will promote advancement through Career Lattice opportunities and placement in Master and Mentor Teacher positions.
Principals	
Learning Sciences Marzano Center	• Marzano experts will train principals to conduct objective educator evaluations using the rubric, with fidelity, to ensure fair, reliable and credible evaluation results. • Experts will facilitate use of the technology-based *iObservation* evaluation platform.
Battelle for Kids	• Principals will complete training to improve school systems – Human Capital Management Systems, Educator Evaluation Systems and Student Data Management Systems – leading to attainment of Professional Human Capital Leader in Education credential.
National SAM Innovation Project	• Principals and Assistant Principals will complete the Wallace Foundation funded *SAM* program – time management and prioritization strategy – to increase efficiency of school leaders so more time is spent engaged in instructional leadership versus managerial tasks.
New York Leadership Academy	• Principals and Assistant Principals will complete *School Leadership Team* development program, year-long leadership training linking an intensive Summer Institute with follow up workshops and leadership coaching.
Ingham Intermediate School District	• Student Learning Objectives training will help administrators determine appropriate student growth measures linked to rubrics to generate educator effectiveness ratings. • Curriculum experts will collaborate with principals to align school instructional practices and curricular content with college and career-ready standards.
Grade Level Directors	
New York City Leadership Academy	• Grade Level Directors and / administrators will complete district level leadership training across three strategies (Strategic Planning and Program Design; Curriculum Design and

	Delivery; Program Assessment) that provides support for principals and assistant principals completing NYCLA *School Leadership Team* training.
Learning Sciences Marzano Center	• Marzano experts will train Grade Level Directors to conduct objective educator evaluations using the rubric, with fidelity, to ensure fair, reliable and credible evaluation results. • Experts will facilitate use of the technology-based *iObservation* evaluation platform.
Principal Coaches / Master Teachers / Mentor Teachers	
New York City Leadership Academy	• Principal Coaches will complete the research-validated *Facilitative, Competency Based Coaching Model* to provide Principal Coaches with coaching skills proven to improve educational leadership in high-need schools and increase principal effectiveness.
Michigan State University	• Master and Mentor Teachers will complete MSU *Launch Into Teaching* Mentor Teacher Support modules to prepare Master / Mentor Teachers with the skills to provide meaningful coaching, mentoring and support using validated methods.

(3) New Teacher Induction: *REAP* will offer annual Induction Support for new teachers entering Lansing School District schools. Annual Induction Orientation – three-day workshop preceding each school year – will prepare new teachers coming to Lansing School District from other districts or from university teacher preparation programs with training on the LSD HCMS, educator evaluation systems / effectiveness tools, district policies and instructional / assessment philosophies.

- **New Teacher PLC:** LSD will launch and sustain a specialized Professional Learning Community for first-year through third-year educators new to the profession to connect new teachers with Master and Mentor Teachers through a collaborative PLC. Master and Mentor Teachers will lead monthly PLCs and connect new educators with instructional and curricular resources and support vital to ensuring new teachers meet and exceed professional performance standards.

- **New Teacher Mentoring:** Every first-year teacher entering Lansing School District from a university teacher preparation program or alternative certification program will be assigned a New Teacher Mentor (LSD teacher who has maintained a *Highly Effective* rating a minimum of three consecutive years) from the same grade level or curricular subject. New teachers will meet with New Teacher Mentors monthly throughout their first year of teaching to learn from experienced Lansing educators and increase support for new teachers vulnerable to attrition from the profession.

 (4) Career Lattice: LSD will provide opportunities for professional growth and advancement linked to educator performance. A Career Lattice will utilize, in partnership with Michigan State University, a micro-credentialing assessment process to identify highest performing educators with the skills to succeed in

leadership roles. Educators who attain *Highly Effective* ratings for a minimum of three consecutive years will be targeted for recruitment to serve as *REAP* Master and Mentor Teachers. MSU professors, in collaboration with LSD administrators, will utilize micro-credentialing assessments designed through the MSU College of Education to evaluate candidate teachers in specialized skills / proficiency domains. Results of micro-credentialing assessments will help LSD identify and recruit educators most likely to excel as peer Mentors and grade level / curricular subject Master Teachers to advance into instructional leadership roles. Master and Mentor Teachers will receive stipends for service in advanced instructional support.

(5) Aspiring Leaders Internship: *REAP* will launch and sustain a new district initiative to identify aspiring leaders from among the ranks of *Highly Effective* Lansing educators motivated to pursue positions as principals or assistant principals in high-needs schools. The Aspiring Leaders Internship will prepare outstanding Interns (candidates with a minimum of three consecutive years of *Highly Effective* ratings and valid Michigan principal credential) to become future instructional leaders of LSD schools. Lansing School District currently lacks a leadership development strategy; the Aspiring Leaders Internship will help LSD overcome recruitment, hiring and retention challenges by supporting the growth of internal education leaders already committed to the success of Lansing youth. The *REAP* Internship will provide six highly-qualified candidates per year with a rigorous one-year experience that provides training across four leadership components: academic leadership; school climate leadership; faculty / staff leadership and operations / business management leadership. Interns will collaborate with *Highly Effective* principals across all education levels (elementary / middle / high) to gain experience filling leadership roles in the HCMS and gain experience implementing components of the *Teacher* and *Principal Frameworks* (including use of Marzano Model rubrics, see *Tier 1*). Candidates who commit to the Aspiring Leaders Internship will also gain experience in central administration departments, including human capital management, finance, technology, transportation and student data management. Successful Interns who complete the program will receive priority placement in future positions.

REAP and its Tiers of Support will provide LSD with a mechanism to make effectiveness-based HCMS decisions, improve instructional leadership, enhance classroom education, improve equitable access to quality teaching for all students and raise achievement in high-needs, low-performing schools.

(3) Activities Evaluated, Monitored, Reported to Public. Lansing School District (applicant and fiscal agent) will contract with EduShift, Inc., a 17-year-old research / evaluation organization, to conduct process and outcome evaluation that links all partners through collaborative data collection, data analysis, reporting

and evaluation feedback, promoting continuous quality improvement throughout the duration of *REAP*. Project Leader and Senior Analyst, Carol Guse, is a seasoned project administrator and evaluator. She has served as principal investigator in over 250 large federal and state government grants since 1990 and has substantial experience administering complex federal, state, corporate and foundation grants. Guse served as an evaluator for the U.S. Department of Education, Michigan and Indiana Departments of Education, as well as dozens of school districts throughout the country. With a strong background in education, grants administration, accounting, auditing, research, implementation and evaluation, Guse, and her team of grant professionals offer tremendous experience and expertise to *REAP*. Evaluation of *REAP* will include: (1) Evaluation Methodology; (2) Performance Measures; (3) Feedback and Assessment of Outcomes and (4) Quasi-Experimental Study.

(1) Evaluation Methodology: Evaluators will utilize the research-based *FORECAST* model (*FORmative Evaluation, Consultation, And System Techniques*) to guide an objective evaluation structure. Four tiers of assessment provide a validated evaluation planning framework:

MODEL – Action Model of Project	Evaluators will construct an action model for each year of the project that includes all events, linking the implementation timeline and logic model with evaluation activities to ensure all facets of the evaluation process are aligned.
MARKER – Indicators of Progress	Evaluators will collect baseline data and identify annual benchmarks based on performance measures (including annual growth targets) to determine if progress is sufficient to attain goals and determine the magnitude of results.
MEASURE – Tools to Assess Achievement	Evaluators, project personnel and partners will implement assessment tools (educator effectiveness rubrics, state content exams, surveys) aligned to *REAP* strategies to collect data. Analysis will link statistical relationships to outcomes.
MEANING – Assess Outcomes, Verify Impact	Data analysis will equip evaluators with indicators needed to draw conclusions / assess strengths and weaknesses. Interpretation of data will provide feedback that helps stakeholders make informed decisions about strategy effectiveness.

The *FORECAST* model will provide evaluators, the Project Director and Advisory Board with feedback regarding the effects of specific program elements. Evaluation of *REAP* using the *FORECAST* model will allow evaluators to address two critical questions (see below for description of Treatment / Control Groups):

1. Do Lansing schools receiving TSL funds (Treatment Group) measure greater student achievement gains than non-Lansing schools that do not receive TSL funding (Control Group)?

2. Does TSL funding improve equity in education by improving student access to *Highly Effective* educators in Lansing Priority and Focus schools compared to Control Group schools?

(2) Performance Measures: The goal, objectives, GPRA measures and indicators will be used to assess implementation progress and the impact / outcomes of services. Evaluation will review program activities and budget expenditures to assess progress in meeting the goal and objectives of *REAP*.

REAP: Goal, Objectives, GPRA Measures, Project Indicators October 1, 2017 - September 30, 2022	Evaluation Source
GOAL: To improve student achievement by increasing access to effective educators in high-need schools.	
GPRA A: % of Educators in all schools who earned Performance-Based Compensation.	
GPRA B: % of Educators in all High-Need Schools who earned Performance-Based Compensation.	
GPRA C: The gap between the retention rate of Educators receiving Performance-Based Compensation and the average retention rate of Educators in each High-Need School whose Educators participate in the project.	
GPRA D: The number of school districts participating in a TSL grant that use Educator Evaluation and Support Systems to inform the following human capital decisions: recruitment; hiring; placement; retention; dismissal; professional development; tenure; promotion; or all of the above.	
GPRA E: The number of High-Need Schools within districts participating in a TSL grant that use Educator Evaluation and Support Systems to inform the following human capital decisions: recruitment; hiring; placement; retention; dismissal; professional development; tenure; promotion; or all of the above.	
GPRA F: % of Performance-Based Compensation paid to Educators with State, local, or non-TSL Federal resources.	
GPRA G: % of teachers and principals who receive the highest effectiveness rating.	
GPRA H: % of teachers and principals in High-Needs Schools who receive the highest effectiveness rating.	
Objective 1: Reduce equity gaps through effectiveness-based Human Capital Management Systems.	
Indicator 1.1: A minimum of 80% of educators in Priority and Focus schools will attain *Highly Effective* or *Effective* rating by end of grant, 10/1/17 – 9/30/22.	Effectiveness Rubric
Indicator 1.2: A minimum of 80% of students – without regard to race, poverty, gender or school of enrollment – will be taught by a *Highly Effective* or *Effective* teacher by end of grant, 10/1/17 – 9/30/22.	Effectiveness Rubric
Objective 2: Assess educator effectiveness using validated tools to ensure objectivity.	
Indicator 2.1: 100% of instructional staff will receive an annual educator effectiveness rating, using state-approved evaluation tool, each year of the grant, 10/1/17 – 9/30/22.	Educator Ratings
Indicator 2.2: 100% of principals / assistant principals will receive an annual educator effectiveness rating, using state-approved evaluation tool, each year of the grant, 10/1/17 – 9/30/22.	Educator Ratings
Objective 3: Improve educator effectiveness through individualized learning and support.	
Indicator 3.1: 100% of educators (instructional and leadership) will maintain annual Professional Growth Plans each year of the grant, 10/1/17 – 9/30/22.	Teacher Portfolios

Indicator 3.2: Reduce the number of educators who receive a *Minimally Effective* or *Ineffective* rating a minimum of 15% compared to previous year, 10/1/17 – 9/30/22.	Educator Ratings
Objective 4: Increase student attainment of state academic performance standards.	
Indicator 4.1: Increase the % of students who achieve ELA state proficiency benchmarks a minimum of 15% by end of grant period, 10/1/17 – 9/30/22.	State Test Data
Indicator 4.2: Increase the % of students who achieve Math state proficiency benchmarks a minimum of 15% by end of grant period, 10/1/17 – 9/30/22.	State Test Data
Indicator 4.3: Increase graduation rate a minimum of 15% by end of grant period, 10/1/17 – 9/30/22.	State Data

(3) Performance Feedback and Assessment of Outcomes: Upon funding, Lansing School District, evaluators and project personnel will collect baseline data for all measures to set annual benchmarks for each year of project. Evaluators will solicit feedback from all stakeholder groups to ensure participants provide valuable data needed to thoroughly assess outcomes and inform decision-making procedures. Feedback and assessment will include: **Process (Formative) Evaluation:** Process evaluation is an internal necessity for staff and planners to determine if the project is being implemented as intended. Process evaluation monitors ongoing implementation in comparison to the funded scope and sequence of the project to monitor fidelity and promote timely, thorough completion of project services. Process Evaluation fills important program assessment steps, including: 1) evaluate and document fidelity and variability in program implementation across sites in relation to Logic Model, Timeline and proposed scope of the project; 2) test validity of implementation model for relationships between interventions and outcomes; 3) monitor dose of interventions across *REAP* sites and across intended recipients of interventions; 4) provide accountability data needed to inform stakeholders and partners of implementation progress and 5) generate feedback data to promote improvement of project, refinement of services and replication of effective strategies. The Timeline, Logic Model and FORECAST action model will serve as process tools allowing evaluators to determine compliance with the scope and schedule of the project. **Outcome (Summative) Evaluation:** The purpose of outcome evaluation is to assess the effectiveness of the project and the outcomes of implementation on the targeted population. Outcome evaluation will measure indicators that correspond to Tiers of Support to determine the magnitude of results and project effectiveness in meeting needs. Outcome evaluation will generate data assessing impact of *REAP* and will equip project managers with information needed to analyze results by project component and by subgroups / schools to determine if interventions yield positive growth and promote success; analysis will promote replication and sustainability of promising practices. Process and Outcome

evaluation methods promoting continuous project improvement and achievement of outcomes include:

- **Data Collection:** Evaluators will collect data to establish baseline for each measure. Annual data will be collected, analyzed, compared and reported using data collection / evaluation tools aligned to services.

- **Evaluation Tools:** Evaluators will utilize multiple instruments to collect qualitative / quantitative data: (1) Educator Effectiveness Rubric: annual district-wide evaluation of educators (see *Project Design*) to monitor performance and assign quality ratings; (2) Student Assessment Scores: annual state administered Reading and Math assessment results, compared to 2016-17 baseline; (3) Site Visits / Focus Groups: multiple evaluation team site visits per year to solicit feedback from stakeholders through focus groups and observational analysis of progress. (4) Teacher / Administrator Surveys: annual surveys to assess perceptions of project quality, instructional / leadership skills, student impact and personal growth.

- **Data Analysis:** Statistical treatments of data will assess associational results, casual inference of outcomes, causal relationships between interventions and results (if any) and correlation of variables to results. Subgroup analysis will track changes in achievement / equity gaps. Evaluators will collect data for Treatment / Control groups to facilitate quasi-experimental evaluation that meets *What Works Clearinghouse* standards:

TREATMENT GROUP	Lansing Priority and Focus – Michigan state designated Priority and Focus schools administered by Lansing School District as of October 1, 2017.
CONTROL GROUP	Michigan Priority and Focus – Random selection of six Michigan Priority / Focus schools across Michigan as of October 1, 2017 matched to grade level of Treatment Group schools.

- **Reporting:** Project Director will submit required Annual Performance Reports to funding agency and share evaluator feedback and results with Advisory Board, school stakeholders and the public via LSD website and Open Educational Resources media to ensure transparency with partners / stakeholders.

(4) Quasi-Experimental Study: Evaluators will use a quasi-experimental study with equating (*What Works Clearinghouse* definition) to evaluate *REAP*. Equating will be accomplished through matching and statistical adjustment. Matching - Treatment schools will be closely matched to control schools on as many characteristics as possible, including school performance designations (Priority / Focus school status), ethnic composition, gender, poverty, academic performance, enrollment, grade level configuration and funding allocations (control schools and treatment schools will be matched to ensure paired schools receive similar funding – if one school receives grant funding, other than *TSL*, its match receives the same funds). Once comparison schools are matched to treatment schools, evaluators will use ANOVA (analysis of variance) to analyze *REAP* results. Since ANOVA only measures if a difference exists between control and treatment

groups and whether it is significant, evaluators hope to demonstrate, due to a diligent matching process, that the program was the cause of the variation in measured objectives. Statistical Adjustment - In accordance with the *What Works Clearinghouse QED, with reservations*, evaluators will also perform ANCOVA (analysis or covariance) on control and treatment groups to assure there are no nuisance / confounding factors (or control them if they exist) between control and treatment groups. Effect Size - Effect size will be calculated by taking the difference in means between two groups and dividing that number by combined (pooled) standard deviation. Effect size tells evaluators how many standard deviations of difference exist between the means of the intervention (treatment) and comparison conditions (an effect size of 0.25 indicates treatment group outperformed comparison group by 25% of one standard deviation). For *REAP*, evaluators will use an effect size of 0.25 as the threshold to meet the evidence type, "Practice with Rigorous Scientific Evidence." Evaluators selected a 0.25 effect size because it represents a conservative estimate of effects and because it meets USDOE *What Works Clearinghouse* "substantively important" effect threshold. Cross-Contamination: Evaluation will assess cross-contamination of control and treatment groups and remediate contamination if necessary. Evaluators will complete statistical treatments of data to assess associational results, casual inference of outcomes, causal relationships between interventions / results (if any) and correlation of variables. Attrition: *REAP* is designed to minimize the impact of attrition on the study. Multiple elements control for possible attrition, including: (1) Performance-based compensation incentives for service in high-needs schools requires a minimum of three years residency in high-needs schools to maintain eligibility for incentive pay; (2) Few Michigan school districts offer Performance-Based Compensation and opportunities to supplement base salary through PBCS will incentivize high quality educators to remain in Lansing School District.

(d) QUALITY OF THE MANAGEMENT PLAN.

On Time/Within Budget, Responsibilities, Timeline, Milestones. Lansing School District will serve as fiscal agent of *REAP*. A structured grant management plan – (1) Equal Access; (2) Timely Implementation; (3) Budget Oversight; (4) Procedures; (5) Personnel; (6) Timeline; (7) Feedback and (8) Dissemination of Results – will ensure timely completion of grant activities and promote continuous improvement. **(1) Equal Access:** Lansing School District will provide equal access for participation across all services regardless of age, gender, race, ethnicity, religion, disability, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity or other protected class. All teachers, administrators, students, families and community stakeholders will be encouraged to participate in activities to maximize impact of project. *REAP* Tiers of Support (Human Capital Management Systems;

Educator Quality Supports) will be administered to guarantee equal treatment of and equal opportunity for all participants. Lansing School District will fully comply with the equal access regulations outlined in the General Education Provisions Act section 427 (GEPA 427). **(2) Timely Implementation:** Lansing School District will initiate *REAP* immediately upon funding and will manage all grant activities – to the maximum extent possible given the chance of unanticipated challenges – in accordance with the *REAP* Timeline (see below). Grant personnel and external evaluators will utilize multiple process evaluation tools to monitor implementation and align progress to the *REAP* Logic Model (see *Project Design* and *Appendix*). Evaluators will develop a FORECAST Model of *REAP* to guide ongoing evaluation of the effort and will share the model with stakeholders to ensure transparency of evaluation and reporting and provide managers with additional tools to support timely implementation of the project. Projected annual milestones (see Timeline below) will help LSD and grant administrators plan and schedule key activities to promote achievement of implementation benchmarks. **(3) Budget Oversight:** The Task Force designed the budget to meet program goals and objectives, ensure equal access and promote sustainability of *TSL* grant strategies. Each line item is linked to one or more grant components, services and / or priorities. The budget is fiscally efficient while providing sufficient funds for targeted, comprehensive programming. The Project Director and LSD Finance Office will manage expenditures in accordance with Michigan and U.S. Department of Education regulations and will prioritize allocations to ensure completion of project. The PD and Advisory Board will identify complementary district / partner programming and funds that expand the reach of *REAP* and sustain systemic changes initiated during grant period. **(4) Procedures:** Service coordination guided by management procedures will help Lansing School District achieve the goal and objectives on time and within budget:

Initiate Grant – LSD will hire staff and host briefing with schools to launch *REAP*;

Implement Records Management Plan – Project Director will maintain records to document implementation, evaluation and milestones throughout the grant;

Implement Fiscal Management Protocol – LSD Finance Office will establish a system of accounting, cost management, reporting and auditing to promote efficient expenditure of funds;

Implement Action Model – Project Director / Evaluation Team will develop FORECAST action model of *REAP*, aligned to Timeline and Logic Model, to ensure completion of project;

Implement Procurement Plan – LSD will procure goods in compliance with applicable regulations;

Implement Evaluation Plan – Ongoing evaluation will measure outcomes, collect feedback to promote

improvement / provide leaders with guidance as Tiers of Support are implemented.

Disseminate Results – Project Director, evaluators and grant personnel will present outcomes, data and progress to stakeholders and the public through reports, School Board presentations and outreach that increases transparency and engages the Lansing community in education and its schools.

Sustain Programs – LSD, grant administrators and Advisory Board will initiate a sustainability plan to ensure continuation of effective strategies beyond the end of federal grant funding.

(5) Personnel: Project management will be a collaborative effort guided by the following key personnel equipped with the skills, knowledge and expertise to successfully implement *REAP*:

REAP Personnel	
Qualifications	**Primary Responsibilities / Duties**
Advisory Board: Planning Task Force will Transition to Ongoing Role	
• Comprised of LSD Superintendent, school leaders, teachers, HCMS managers, union leaders	• Conduct quarterly oversight meetings to provide feedback to Project Director. • Ensure diversity of perspectives shape project to better meet identified needs. • Utilize evaluation data to strengthen weaknesses and promote improvement. • Coordinate sustainability efforts to ensure lasting impact of project.
Project Director: 1.0 FTE – To Be Hired	
• Master Of Education. • Administrator Certification. • 10+ yrs in K – 12 education.	• Manage daily implementation of *REAP*. • Coordinate Advisory Board. • Supervise grant staff and coordinate partnerships.
Principal Coaches: 6.0 Contractors [2 Elementary, 2 Middle, 2 High] – To Be Hired	
• Master of Education. • Min Principal Certification • 10+ yrs Admin Experience	• Provide daily school-embedded coaching to principals, assistant principals. • Provide job-embedded training to Leader Interns in management / leadership. • Model successful use of Teacher / Principal Effectiveness Rubrics.
Aspiring Leaders Interns: 6.0 FTEs – To Be Hired	
• Master of Education • School Principal Certificate • Desire to fill Admin Position	• Participate in daily school-embedded coaching / training by LSD principals. • Complete extensive professional development and leadership training. • Job-shadow *Highly Effective* principals to gain HCMS competencies.
Master Teachers: Four Per School (ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies – Stipend Position) – To Be Selected	
• Master in Education degree • 5+ yr Classroom Experience • Mastery in Core Subject	• Collaborate with district curriculum leaders to align school instructional practices. • Work with teachers rated *Minimally Effective* / *Ineffective* to improve outcomes. • Coordinate and lead school-wide *REAP Teacher Forums.*
Mentor Teachers: Team of Two Per School (Stipend Position) – To Be Selected	

• Master in Education degree	• Partner with first-year & low-performing teachers to mentor / model lessons.
• 3+ yr Classroom Experience	• Collaborate with Master Teachers to integrate performance expectations.
• 3 yr *Highly Effective/Effective*	• Participate in school-wide *REAP Teacher Forums* and share resources / tools.

(6) Timeline: Expert coordination of Tiers of Support by grant managers will ensure delivery of high-quality

services in accordance with an extensive Timeline and Logic Model. Grant managers, Advisory Board and

evaluators will use the timeline to monitor progress, ensure fidelity with project design and assess milestones.

REAP IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE (10/1/17 – 9/30/22)	
KEY: Advisory Board (AB); Project Director (PD); Master Teachers (MT); Mentor Teachers (MNT); Principal Coaches (PC); Leader Interns (LI); Evaluation Team (ET); Human Capital Management System (HCMS); Educator Evaluation (EE); Performance-Based Comp (PBC); Teachers (T); Principals (P); Grade Level Directors (GD)	
ONGOING: Quarterly Advisory Board Meetings, Implement Tiers of Support; Professional Development; Annual Effectiveness Evaluations, Monthly Evaluation Conference Calls; Data Collection and Analysis; Dissemination of Results; Annual Performance Reports; Sustainability of Effective Project Components	
Year One	
Quarter 1 (Oct - Dec) & Quarter 2 (Jan - Mar)	**Quarter 3 (Apr - June) & Quarter 4 (July - Sept)**
• Hire Project Director (S) & Initiate *REAP* (PD)	• Final Educator Effectiveness Evals (GD,P,T)
• Convene Advisory Board; review grant narrative (PD)	• Conduct Teacher, Leader *Forums* (MT, PC)
• Launch *REAP* Tiers- Human Capital Management System, Educator Quality Supports (PD,GD,P,T)	• Finish Year 1 activities /evaluate data (PD,T,ET)
• Initiate Professional Growth Plans (PD,GD,P,T)	• Distribute Performance-Based Comp (HCMS)
• Implement MSU to *Launch* modules (PD,GD,P,T)	• Recruit Master/Mentor Teachers, Interns (HCMS)
• Schedule Professional Development, PLCs, Forums (PD)	• Submit Y1 APR to Fed Program Officer (ET,PD)
• Develop evaluation tools / collect baseline data (ET)	• Plan and organize Year 2 programs (All)
	• Inform stakeholders of Year 1 results (PD)
Year 1: Primary Benchmarks / Milestones	
• Tier 1: Comprehensive effectiveness-based HCMS – Initial Implementation	
• Tier 1: Educator Performance Based Compensation System – Initial Implementation	
• Tier 2: Educator Support System w/Individualized PD – Initial Implementation	
• Tier 2: Leaders Internship for Aspiring Principals – Initial Implementation	
Year Two	
• Launch new year of HCMS and EE (PD,GD,P,T)	• Finish Year 2 activities / evaluate data (PD,T,ET)
• Conduct observations and feedback (GD,P,TNTP)	• Distribute Performance-Based Comp (HCMS)
• Sustain Professional Growth Plans (T)	• Recruit Master / Mentor Teachers, Interns (HCMS)

• Master/Mentor Teacher/Leader Intern Support (GD,P)	• Submit Y2 APR to Fed Program Officer (ET,PD)
• Schedule/Provide Professional Development (PD,GD,P)	• Plan and organize Year 3 programs (All)
• Offer Principal, Teacher *Forums* (MT,PC)	• Begin Sustainability discussions (AB, PD,GD,P,T)
• Implement MSU *Launch Into Teaching* modules (T,P)	• Inform stakeholders of Year 2 results (PD)

Year 2: Primary Benchmarks / Milestones
• Tier 1: Comprehensive effectiveness-based HCMS – Improved, Ongoing Implementation
• Tier 1: Educator Performance Based Compensation System – Ongoing Implementation
• Tier 2: Educator Support System w/Individualized PD – Improved, Ongoing Implementation
• Tier 2: Leaders Internship for Aspiring Principals – Improved, Ongoing Implementation

Years Three - Five	
• Stakeholder meeting to make course corrections (All)	• Continue & measure Tiers of Support / partner activities / adjust as needed (PD,GD,P,T,ET)
• Continue *REAP* activities (All)	
• Assess Professional Growth Plans, adjust (GD,P,T)	• Conduct post-surveys / collect data (ET,PD)
• Update training opportunities (PD,GD,P,T)	• Assess final data (ET); Finish activities (PD,P,T)
• Continue coaching, mentoring, internships (PC,MT,LI)	• Submit Final *REAP* Performance Report (ET)
• Conduct site visits, surveys, focus groups (PD,ET)	• Launch project sustainability (AB)
• Disaggregate data / identify needs (AB,PD,GD,P,T,ET)	• Inform stakeholders of full program results (PD)

Years 3 - 5: Primary Benchmarks / Milestones
• Tier 1: Comprehensive effectiveness-based HCMS – Full Implementation and Sustain
• Tier 1: Educator Performance Based Compensation System – Full Implementation and Sustain
• Tier 2: Educator Support System w/Individualized PD – Full Implementation and Sustain
• Tier 2: Leaders Internship for Aspiring Principals – Full Implementation and Sustain

(7) **Feedback:** *REAP* is designed to engage multiple partners and solicit feedback from stakeholders to ensure diverse perspectives influence project quality and sufficient data is available to facilitate objective process and outcome evaluation (see *Project Design* section):

Participants	*REAP* Feedback Mechanisms
Advisory Board (Quarterly Meetings)	• Convene quarterly meetings to monitor implementation and expenditures; • Review evaluation data to assess magnitude of results / significance of outcomes; • Review / update *REAP* Timeline and Logic Model to facilitate project completion.
Project Director (Monthly	• Coordinate and attend quarterly Advisory Board meetings to guide progress; • Participate in monthly Evaluator progress monitoring conference calls; • Conduct quarterly data review to monitor results compared to goal / objectives / outcomes;

Progress Conference Calls)	• Share evaluation results with Advisory Board and stakeholders and solicit input.
Evaluation Team EduShift, Inc. (10 hours per week)	• Oversee qualitative and quantitative data collection efforts from participants; • Conduct quarterly data review to monitor results compared to goal / objectives / outcomes; • Conduct monthly progress monitoring conference calls with Project Director; • Conduct focus groups / site visits to ensure fidelity with Logic Model / Timeline.
Educators (annual surveys / focus groups)	• Serve as members of *REAP* Advisory Board and attend quarterly meetings; • Complete annual surveys to provide operational / project quality feedback; • Participate in Evaluator site visits / focus groups to provide operational feedback.
Partners / Coaches (surveys / focus groups)	• Serve as members of *REAP* Advisory Board and attend quarterly meetings; • Complete annual surveys to provide operational / project quality feedback; • Participate in Evaluator site visits / focus groups to provide operational feedback.

(8) Dissemination to Support Replication: EduShift will provide annual reports (formative and summative) to LSD to facilitate dissemination of results to diverse stakeholders and encourage replication of effective strategies. *REAP* products will be shared on Open Educational Resources media / portals to support replication across diverse locations and project personnel will present findings, best practices and lessons learned at conferences to disseminate information critical to expansion of effort to new sites.

(e) ADEQUACY OF RESOURCES.

(1) Support After Funding Ends / Commitment of Entities. LSD – from the Board of Education to the Central Office to School Leaders to Teachers – is committed to implementing its HCMS as described in this application. Superintendent Yvonne Caamal Canul has worked tirelessly in LSD for more than five years to implement a vision of improvement for all children. In 2015, her leadership culminated in a courageous move to transform the way education happens in high-need schools, earning her Michigan Superintendent of the Year honors. Focused leadership and intentional work with committed partners has resulted in Lansing School District improving equity in schools – more work remains to be done. The commitment of LSD and school administrators to scale up individual school success to the rest of the district is inspiring. The ongoing reform effort, including all educators and leading to this submission of *REAP*, was and continues to be a collaborative effort that moved forward deliberately with substantial input and involvement of educators across all Lansing School District grade levels and professional roles. <u>LSD is committed to providing substantial Matching Funds (see *Appendix* for Assurance) to expand impact of the grant and promote sustainability of the project through</u>

realignment of LSD expenditures. Educator involvement in reform initiatives leading up to and including *REAP* includes: 1) Collaborative Planning; and 2) Successful Completion of Needs Assessment.

- ☐ **Collaborative Planning:** *REAP* was designed by a *Planning Task Force* comprised of district administrators, human resource professionals, finance officers, curriculum specialists, school principals, teachers, non-instructional professionals and union leaders. Collaborative assessment of needs and collaborative design of reform strategies focusing on validated practices promoted widespread educator buy-in and support of HCMS, educator evaluation, performance-based compensation and professional development initiatives. Collaborative planning and design of *REAP* increases the likelihood that educators will adopt and integrate into daily practice the proposed strategies of the project and also ensures that diverse perspectives were considered during the design and application process. Influence of diverse perspectives enhanced the *REAP* planning process by challenging the *Planning Task Force* to consider problems and potential solutions from multiple angles, find common ground, promote equity, compromise and look for innovative approaches to human capital management issues. The *Teacher and Principal Frameworks* with embedded Effectiveness Rubrics adopted by LSD after extensive collaboration among district stakeholders (see *Appendix*) have been praised by teachers and administrators for their clarity, equity and fairness. All parties know what is expected of them because they contributed toward the final product; enthusiasm for the process has energized LSD and transformed previously routine evaluation procedures into a meaningful, personalized, data-driven support system that promotes success.

- • **Needs Assessment:** LSD convened a *Task Force* to assess needs – through diverse stakeholder interviews; analysis of district / school / student data; review of state-mandated protocols; research of effective performance-based compensation strategies; alignment of LSD policies to research; collaborative assessment of tools / models / professional development strategies – and propose solutions that fill gaps and strengthen weaknesses in programs. During the needs assessment, four primary needs were identified: (1) Lack of resources to consistently implement HCMS; (2) Lack of expertise to objectively evaluate educator effectiveness; (3) Lack of educator quality support system that increases effectiveness and (4) Lack strategies to meet state equity plans. *REAP* – the result of collaborative planning, research, design and compromise – will help LSD improve educator quality in high-need schools, enhance learning opportunities for low-performing students, fill gaps in education programs and strengthen teaching and learning weaknesses that impede student success.

(2) **Incorporation of Project Purposes, Activities, Benefits into Ongoing Program.** *REAP* was designed
to facilitate sustainability. While many project elements have substantial initial costs, most components have
manageable continuation expenses that will be met by well-planned district and school budgets. Sustainable
practices will ensure *REAP* schools meet the needs of educators and students:

REAP Sustainability Strategies	
Tier 1: Comprehensive HCMS	• Upon completion of grant, a comprehensive HCMS will become institutionalized in LSD, eliminating need for Project Director and Administrative Assistant. • LSD will gain the capacity to implement a fully-reconfigured, data-driven HCMS, districtwide, beyond the grant period, that will fully inform human capital decisions. • Investment in technology hardware is a start-up expense of *REAP*; ongoing costs for software and maintenance will be absorbed by the LSD Technology Department. • Investment in technology-based evaluation strategies reduces long-term expense of disposable materials through use of digital evaluation, teaching and learning tools. • The district will work with union partners to revamp the traditional salary schedule and reallocate dollars to fund a compensation system that rewards effectiveness.
Tier 2: Educator Quality Supports	• LSD will realign Title I, II, III and IV funds to support evaluation data-driven professional development to sustain grant-funded strategies and Professional Growth Plans. • Planning Task Force selected curricular models with manageable long-term costs –primary expenses for *MSU, TNTP, Battelle for Kids, NYC Leadership Academy, et al* are initial professional development costs with minimal long-term sustainability costs. • Travel expenses beyond grant period are negligible – most travel costs associated with start-up professional development; continuing education for maintaining skills is available through on-line platforms at little cost to schools or educators.
Partnerships	• The Advisory Board will work to ensure that schools are linked to community partners whose resources enhance depth and capacity of support options.

Lansing School District will engage outstanding HCMS and effectiveness evaluation models, expert partners,
professional development providers and vendor resources to improve educator effectiveness and enhance
teaching and learning in all proposed *REAP* schools and promote achievement of the goal, objectives and
project measures / indicators. Efforts during the grant period will position schools to leverage expertise,
facilities and stakeholder support to sustain *REAP* initiatives upon completion of the grant-funded project.
Lansing has a long history of success sustaining grant projects beyond initial start-up and will continue that
tradition with *REAP* to increase equity, educator effectiveness and student achievement across all schools.