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OVERVIEW: The Western Michigan University High Impact Leadership (HIL) Project is a leadership development program, designed around four leadership principles that support sustainable high integrity and fidelity implementation (HIFI) of evidence-based student success initiatives. The purpose of the Project was to develop principal’s and teacher leaders’ capacity to apply the four leadership principles and sixteen high impact strategies associated with those principles in a systems approach to continuous improvement. The HIL Project intervention is a tiered system of job embedded professional learning and support for practicing principals and teacher leaders. The HIL intervention transforms the way school leaders approach the implementation of change initiatives in ways that better align with positive psychology, adaptive organizational change, school leadership, implementation science, and adult learning. The PIs and Project team developed a leadership model based on an aggregation of elements with efficacy evidence for positive change in student outcomes and positive change in leadership behaviors that are associated with improved student outcomes.

The HIL Model for School Renewal represents a departure from deficit and problem focused change initiatives and fragmented, misaligned, and contextually mismatched implementation processes. As illustrated in Figure 6, below, the HIL School Renewal approach is a tightly aligned, positively framed, and robust model for school change to improve outcomes for all students. The HIL approach addresses the persistent challenge of achieving full implementation of evidence-based practice in schools through an approach that operates from four high impact leadership principles:

a. Cultivating a Positive School Core by an appreciative, strengths-based, and growth focused approach to building a compelling vision for change grounded in the school’s mission and informed by authentic examination of current state compared to desired state for the school community
b. Building Collective Ownership for evidence-based change in a culture of safety, trust, interdependence, shared responsibility and distributed leadership
c. Taking Evidence-Based Decision-Making to a deeper level that permeates school processes through Appreciative Inquiry, performance profiling, progress monitoring, and multiple indicators and measures that include leading and lagging indicators and Vital Behaviors associated with evidence-based practice
d. Fostering continuous Organizational Learning through reflective practice, double-loop questioning, systems thinking, practices associated with adult and student learning

Figure 1, below illustrates the four interdependent leadership principals that work together to build motivation and capacity for sustained adaptive change. The four HIL principles derive from several relevant and well-established bodies of research informed practice (Appendix A).

The four leadership principles draw upon sixteen evidence-based characteristics that derive from (Appendix A):

a. Seven dimensions of learning centered leadership
b. Seven strategic levers for achieving high integrity and fidelity implementation of evidence-based change initiatives
c. Five levels of adult learning in a complex organizational system
d. Renewal approach for transformational change in schools
e. Six principles of performance assessment and feedback that contribute to learning, growth, and adaptation

The HIL Project Co-PIs and Research Team synthesized or developed the body of work that comprises the HIL Model for School Renewal through a number of previous leadership development and school change initiatives out of which they produced a body of scholarly work including research publications and conference presentations, a multi-state approved school leader performance assessment and development system, several books and book chapters, and several validated school leadership assessment instruments. This body of work is the basis for the HIL Model for School Renewal and School Renewal Process as illustrated in Figures 1, 2, and 3 below:
Figure 1. The Four Interdependent Principles and Dimensions of School Renewal: Illustrates how the treatment model for developing high impact leadership practices were synthesized from the literature sources identified in Appendix A.

High Impact Leadership Principles for School Renewal

- Positive Core
  - Mission & Vision Focused
  - Growth Mindset
  - Appreciative Lens
  - Strengths-Based

- Evidence-Based Decisions
  - Collaborative Inquiry
  - Performance Profiling
  - Progress Monitoring
  - Leading & Lagging Indicators

- Collective Ownership
  - Distributed Leadership
  - Shared Responsibility
  - Social Trust
  - Inter-dependence

- Organizational Learning
  - Reflective Practice
  - Double Loop Questioning
  - Systems Thinking & Alignment
  - Levels of Learning

Figure 2. The Three Components of the HIL School Renewal Model Treatment: Illustrates how the HIL Project provides and organizes the training and development elements and resources of the HIL School Renewal Model to develop Facilitator capacity for working with practicing school leaders and emerging teacher leaders in each Project school.
These elements of the HIL School Renewal Model and HIL Project intervention will be referenced throughout this Renewal funding proposal as the foundation of the scope of work and project activities.

Evidence of Impact

The HIL Project is a 30 month intervention in elementary schools that support high needs students (based on socio-economic factors). External evaluators at the University of Kentucky provide a controlled study designed to meet the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Standards without reservations. In the first 15 months of the HIL Model for School Renewal intervention in 75 Cohort A schools across the western half of Michigan’s lower peninsula, external evaluators already identified statistically significant positive impact on student English Language Arts performance with State annual assessment data. External evaluators used April 2019 annual assessment data from publicly released school level data as the ending point for early efficacy testing to capture the 15 month effect on student achievement. They found that schools in the experimental group grew 4.1 percentage points more than the control schools in ELA proficiency rate on the State of Michigan Student Testing of Educational Progress (M-STEP) assessment in the first 15 month duration of treatment under the HIL Project.

Additionally, after 24 months working with the 75 Cohort A schools, external evaluators found statistically significant positive differences between Cohort A schools and the control group on validated measures of principal leadership and school-wide leadership conditions (See Summary of Efficacy Studies for further details). External evaluators initially planned for early efficacy testing to support Project efforts to monitor progress in real-time. As we worked with participating treatment schools and Project partners, three conditions supported this decision:

a. Project formative data already showed multiple indicators of successful project implementation and notable changes in school leadership to support positive change after the first 15 months of treatment
b. Participating treatment group schools were eager to know if the changes they were making were starting to make a statistically significant influence on the two Project evaluation outcomes
c. Project partners and the new State Superintendent of Schools, were anxious to know if the HIL Project was showing signs of efficacy for positive school change to raise Michigan’s literacy profile
This early evidence of HIL Project efficacy is key to understanding how the HIL Project effectively maximized the potential of SEED grant funding to dramatically change the leadership conditions for School Renewal and the impact of that leadership on student ELA achievement in Project treatment schools. The HIL Project formed a partnership with the Michigan Reading Now Network (RNN), a State-wide school leadership initiative committed to early reading development and success for all students regardless of personal circumstances and school demographics. Additionally, the HIL Project partnered with the Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators (MAISA) to focus school renewal for participating schools on the implementation of Essential Literacy Practices identified by the MAISA General Education Leadership Network (GELN) Literacy Task Force of literacy experts. The HIL Project cultivated this powerful partnership triad for raising Michigan’s early student literacy equity by creating a focus for addressing principal effectiveness and enhancing the pipeline for future school leaders with the power of teacher leadership.

The Benefit of Conducting Early Efficacy Studies

External evaluators planned to complete the initial HIL Project efficacy study using April 2020 State ELA data. This would have provided student impact results after 27 months; however, the State ELA assessment for April 2020 was cancelled due to Covid19. The UK evaluation team is currently working with Project PIs and Partners to access and analyze mid-year interim assessment data from January 2018, 2019, and 2020 as an alternative plan to conduct the final treatment analysis of ELA results from those assessments. We expect this analysis to, also, show statistical differences for a 24 month period of treatment (See “Making the Case for Return on Investment” under sustainability Factor 3 below).

Although external evaluators will be using an alternative ELA achievement assessment, this assessment still meets the study design criteria and will preserve the original evaluation design to meet the WWC Standards without Reservations. Moreover, the statistically significant results already derived from external evaluators’ studies establish efficacy for the HIL School Renewal Model—an outcome that both establishes effective use of SEED grant funding in years 1-3 and offers a compelling case for renewal funding for years 4 and 5.

Summary of Additional Project Accomplishments

Table 1. Additional Project Accomplishments with the First Three Years of Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT COMPONENT</th>
<th>INDICATOR OF ACCOMPLISHMENT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed a systemic model for school renewal at a school level</td>
<td>Completion of 2.0 Versions of the HIL Model for School Renewal Framework, Process, and Implementation Guides</td>
<td>Tested version 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruited, trained, and deployed 57 facilitators and developed a Gradual Release Model to guide Facilitator Coaches</td>
<td>Trained and provided field support for Facilitator coaching activities in treatment schools and an expanded corps of trained Facilitators to start a second cohort of 75 schools in February 2020</td>
<td>Developed training scope and sequence and training modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined treatment intervention through an ongoing feedback loop while serving the first Cohort of 75 schools through August 2020. Started the pre-treatment process for 75 additional Cohort B schools in February 2020</td>
<td>Used multiple forms of quantitative and qualitative data to monitor and adjust the intervention model while serving Cohort A schools:  - Weekly Facilitator work records  - Interviews and Observations  - Analysis of School Renewal process  - Artifacts from participating schools  - Progress monitoring instruments  - Validated survey instrument</td>
<td>Established and refined a multi-indicator system for ongoing progress monitoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Produced explanatory findings to support efficacy findings |

Produced efficacy findings |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT COMPONENT</th>
<th>INDICATOR OF ACCOMPLISHMENT</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| School teams completing all five phases of the HIL School Renewal Cycle and the Deliverables for each Cycle. | Completion of the Deliverables for Each Phase:  
- School Literacy Performance Profiles  
- Priority student and adult growth targets  
- Gold Standard Implementation Guides  
- Implementation Monitoring Plans  
- Progress Monitoring Dashboards | All Cohort A schools will complete the first Renewal Cycle/Deliverables by 9/1/20  
75 New schools began Phase I in Feb. 2020 in preparation for starting first Renewal Cycle |
| Developed implementation rubric to assess degree of implementation for the HIL School Renewal Principles, Processes, and Practices | Use of the Appreciating Progress for School Renewal (APSR) by Facilitators, Principals, and Teacher Leader Teams to assess implementation progress and establish growth targets for sustainability | All Schools are currently completing the APSR and finalizing Sustainability Plans |
| Developed and began disseminating School Renewal Rounds process (adapted from Harvard Instructional Rounds) | Completion of Training Modules for facilitating School Renewal Rounds  
Completion of Facilitator Training  
**Completion of HIL School Renewal Rounds Handbook** and review by Harvard IR Director  
Distribution of training and handbook across State | • Trainings completed for Cohort A school Facilitators & Teams  
• Handbooks distributed to all Cohort A and B  
• Distributed 450 handbooks to non-HIL Project schools  
• Completed 4 non-HIL school trainings |
| Developed system for HIL Model dissemination through online learning modules and micro-credentialing | Entered into contract with EduPaths ([https://www.edupaths.org](https://www.edupaths.org)) for development and dissemination of six HIL School Renewal learning modules for school principals and teacher leadership teams | Completed:  
• Scope/sequence  
• Story Boards  
• Graphics  
• Video Capture  
• Distribution and Continuing Ed. Cr. Plans |
| Developed several lines of inquiry on teacher leadership, school renewal, High Integrity & Fidelity Implementation (HIFI), networking, etc. | Developed an assessment of types and levels of school-to-school networking and tested it with HIL Project Cohort A schools  
Completed several studies and literature reviews for publications and national conference presentation | Found evidence of positive association between networking and achievement  
Two peer reviewed articles accepted for American Educational Research Association in April 2020 |
| Sustained, strengthened, and added to project partnerships | Significant stakeholder and partner engagement  
Multi-media Communications System  
Co-developed literacy implementation guides with MAISA-GELN Literacy Task Force [https://literacyessentials.org](https://literacyessentials.org) | Completed Communications System & established engagement calendars  
Co-created Project tools/guides |
| Integration of HIL Model for School Renewal with the Michigan Continuous Improvement Plan (MI-CIP) & the Michigan Blueprint Plan | Agreements between the HIL Project and the Michigan Department of Education (MDE), MAISA, the Michigan Blueprint Director, and the 16 west Michigan ISD GELN directors to align and integrate | Obtained commitments from MDE, MAISA, Regions 3&7 GELN Directors, & Michigan Blueprint Director |
EFFECTIVE USE OF SEED FUNDS TO MOVE TOWARD SUSTAINABILITY OF WORK COMPLETED IN YEARS 1-3 OF THE HIL PROJECT

This section examines how the HIL Project achieved effective use of SEED funds according to the Teacher Quality Program Technical Assistance Provider (TQP-TA) sustainability framework and tools for assessing sustainability across four factors:

- Partnerships, Stakeholder Support, and Communication
- Motivation and Capacity for Widespread Use
- Making the Case for Return on Investment
- Ongoing Financial Support

In the next section, we will use the TQP-TA framework to demonstrate how the HIL Project is on track to sustain the work in Cohort A treatment schools. With renewal funding, we will extend the work to 75 additional schools in Cohort B while scaling up the dissemination of the HIL Model for School Renewal and working with Project partners and participants to sustain the work without federal funding after the years 4/5 renewal period. In the following sub-sections, we summarize our progress toward sustainability within each of the four Factors of the TQP-TA sustainability model below.

Progress Toward Sustainability Factor 1: Establishing Partnerships, Stakeholder Support, and Communication

**Established Relationships with Stakeholders and Partners**

- The HIL Project developed reciprocal relationships with the Reading Now Network and General Education Leadership Network (GELN) through the Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators (MAISA). We expanded partnerships to include 16 ISD’s/ESAs (i.e. intermediate school service agencies) in west and southwest Michigan who have committed to supporting schools with the HIL Model for School Renewal. The HIL Project has captured the attention of key personnel within the Michigan Department of Education who have committed to incorporating elements of the HIL approach into Michigan’s Continuous Improvement Process (MI-CIP).

**Effective Communication across Stakeholders and Partners**

- The HIL Project has cultivated relationships with key informants and ambassadors across all levels of K-12 Education in the state of Michigan to impact state practices and policies. We use our extensive communications database to communicate regularly to 1,300 people within the region and across the state. Two key pieces of the HIL Project communication strategy are the HIL Street News for Facilitators (Coaches) and the View from the HIL for stakeholders. The Project also maintains regular postings on Twitter, YouTube, and Facebook.

**Documentation to Describe and Disseminate**

- The HIL Project Research Team and Co-PIs developed HIL Model training, development, and implementation resources, both print and electronic, to completely describe and detail the HIL School Renewal Model, Process, and Practices. The HIL Coordinator and Management team use these resources to train both Facilitators and school leaders as they:
  - Identify and align priority growth targets of utmost importance to the school
  - Determine what the critical features of evidence-based practices look like and how to implement them in contextually appropriate ways
  - Monitor and celebrate the growth of leadership behaviors and the conditions that support achieving priority growth targets
  - Set new priority targets for the next renewal cycle
- The HIL Project PIs and learning model task group developed the scope and sequence, storyboards, graphics, video segments, and aligned activities and resources. The task group team is, now, working with the EduPaths System designers to complete HIL Model learning modules for dissemination across and outside the state of Michigan
- The HIL Project research team produced six manuscripts for peer reviewed publications. This reflects a rich research agenda and commitment to formative evaluation processes that also contribute to the knowledge base on school improvement, reform, and renewal practices
Progress toward Sustainability Factor 2: Cultivating Motivation and Capacity for Widespread Use

The second factor of the TQPTA sustainability framework is “Capacity for Widespread Use.” The HIL Model for School Renewal (Figure 1) is built on four evidence-based principles that develop both a school’s Motivation and Capacity for positive change. The research base for this Model is current and represents a full range of K-12 educational institutions across and outside of the U.S. Additionally, the HIL Model synthesizes findings from K-12 leadership, school and organizational change, adult learning, cognitive and positive psychology, implementation science, and adaptive school processes. Thus, the Co-PIs have created a model for leadership that is adaptive, current, and relevant for school leaders who have the responsibility for transforming schools for equity and academic success.

Increasing Motivation and Capacity of School Leaders and Staff

- Years 1-3 of the HIL Project provided an opportunity to test the efficacy of the four principles and vital leadership practices or behaviors embedded in HIL School Renewal Model. Summative evaluation findings on the efficacy of the HIL Model for School Renewal and the HIL Project intervention show strong, statistically significant impacts on school leadership and student ELA achievement. In addition to the efficacy results, we also captured formative evaluation evidence that the HIL approach does, in fact, develop both Motivation and Capacity for change in a wide variety of school settings and with very diverse school student and staff populations (see below under Sustainability Factor 3). We do this through the five phases of the HIL Renewal Cycle (Figure 3):
  - **In Phase I,** school teams confirm how student success in a targeted area aligns with the school’s mission and vision and begin a detailed examination of the school’s current state, emphasizing assets and strengths related to that targeted area of student success
  - **In Phase II,** the school leadership team works with staff to develop an in-depth school performance profile of current strengths and growth edges based on student, classroom practice, leadership practice, and school condition evidence
  - **In Phase III,** school leadership teams drill down into post-hoc and real-time student data to identify priority, student growth targets and priority teacher practice, leadership practice, and school condition growth targets that support priority student growth targets
  - **In Phase IV,** school leadership teams develop monitoring plans with specific measures for both student and adult growth targets with progress benchmarks and timelines
  - **In Phase V,** school leadership teams establish a dashboard for tracking and celebrating achieved progress benchmarks and updating the school performance profile to guide each renewal cycle until the school achieves all priority growth targets for the targeted area of student success

Both anecdotal and results of validated measures confirm the motivating influence of this approach—it engages the entire school community, keeps effort focused on real-time growth targets, and enables school teams to watch and celebrate growth in manageable and sustainable increments. Growth accelerates and motivates more growth.

Increasing Motivation and Capacity through Increased Systems Capacity

- The HIL Project Intervention assists principals and teacher leaders in learning, practicing, applying, and ultimately embedding **HIL School Leadership Vital Behaviors** into the school’s ongoing continuous improvement system and process. HIL Facilitators apply the **HIL Gradual Release Coaching Approach** to adjust to the strengths and growth edges of each school and ensure that all HIL Processes are sustained by school leaders.

Increasing Motivation and Capacity through Ongoing Monitoring and Evaluation

- The coordination and management of adaptive support to schools requires clear objectives and constant monitoring of progress toward meeting those objectives. The Management Team at WMU meets weekly to maintain and update progress on all project implementation targets, task groups, research, and evaluation projects. The Management Team created a number of project management processes and tools to support Facilitators and the Coordinating Team who coordinate the school-based field work in regional groups. To ensure planning and delivery of high quality, relevant, and timely learning at Facilitator workshops, the HIL Management Team instituted several formative measures:
  - Feedback capture during every workshop
  - Feedback and specific reporting points each week on Facilitator work records
  - Individual Facilitator interviews at strategic points in the Project
On-site observations of Facilitators working with principals and school leadership teams
- Review of artifacts produced by Facilitators and school leadership teams, including HIL deliverables from the School Renewal cycle

** Increasing Motivation and Capacity through Alignment and Integration **

- Project Partners at the MDE office of Continuous Improvement, the Michigan Blueprint System, and ISDs/ESAs work with HIL Facilitators and school leadership teams to achieve integration and alignment of the HIL School Renewal Principles and Practices with the continuous improvement processes through the MI-CIP and Blueprint systems. Additionally, HIL Facilitators work with school leadership teams to align and integrate the HIL process for literacy improvement with other district change and improvement initiatives.

** Progress toward Sustainability Factor 3: Making the Case for Return on Investment. **

The HIL Project Facilitator (coaching) model is based on an adaptation of the “zone of proximal development” theory to adult learning and adult behavioral change theories. HIL Facilitators work with school principals and teacher leaders through a “Gradual Release” process designed to lead to independent and sustainable command of the HIL Principles and Processes by principals and teacher leaders. This leads to school leadership conditions that are employed across the school and not reliant on external influences or as susceptible to turnover in leadership. Thus, the HIL Model intervention is designed for long-term impact from the initial period of intervention.

** Identification of Quantifiable and Appropriate Outcomes **

- The HIL Project focuses on increasing school leadership to impact student achievement. The Project research design isolates two indicators for testing the HIL School Renewal Model for strong evidence of efficacy. The first indicator is growth in the leadership factors positively associated with school renewal as measured via a battery of validated instruments for school leadership factors positively associated with achievement. The second indicator is student achievement in English Language Arts as measured by standardized State assessments. See evidence from these indicators below.

** Efficacy Evidence from Summative Evaluation Measures and Analyses **

- In April, the University of Kentucky Project Evaluation Team completed impact analysis on measures of Leadership for School Renewal that are positively associated with student achievement. This is the first of two impact studies that meet the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Standards without Reservations. Analysis of study data on all three measures of Leadership for School Renewal yielded statistically significant positive results in a comparison of the experimental and control group teacher and principal responses after the first 24 months of treatment.

- The UK evaluation team also examined the differences between Cohorts A and B in the rate of growth in school academic performance in ELA. This analysis was based on school-level achievement in 2017, 2018, and 2019 from a State school performance database, called MI-School Data. The external evaluators found that the experimental schools grew statistically faster than control schools by as much as 2.05 in the proficiency rate each year. In other words, the experimental schools grew 4.1 percentage points more than the control schools in ELA proficiency rate during the first 15-month duration of treatment under the HIL Project.

** Implementation Evidence from Formative Measures and Analyses **

- The Internal Project Evaluation and Research Team conducted formative evaluation on various aspects of the project implementation. These include (a) monitoring school team participation; (b) following emergence and development of teacher leaders; (c) monitoring the progress of Facilitator training and development; (d) analyzing the nature of Facilitator engagements with school teams; (e) analyzing the HIL Process deliverables produced by school teams; and (f) cataloging contributions and commitments from Project partners and stakeholders.

- To translate formative evaluation into value-added measures, we set and reported Project specific implementation targets and identified measures to monitor those targets. These targets and measures constitute key progress indicators reported on the ED524 Annual Project Report (see mid-year APR for the period of October 1, 2019 through March 30,
We collected data for tracking implementation indicators and measures via interviews, observations, weekly Facilitator work records, feedback forms, participation records, and artifacts of the work from schools.

**Progress toward Sustainability Factor 4: Ongoing Financial Support**

The HIL Project intervention is designed to develop sustainable capacity within and across the school leadership community by changing the ways school leaders work with their staffs to embed high impact leadership conditions and practices throughout the school and school improvement processes. Through multiple strategies and with a two-year renewal grant, the HIL Project will create sufficient dissemination and scale-up of the HIL Model for School Renewal to require very little, if any, ongoing financial support. This is possible, because the intervention design works at the level of job-embedded leadership behaviors that support adaptive change. By working with principals, teacher leaders, and district or ISD/ESA personnel who support school improvement and instructional programs, the HIL Project intends to reach a saturation level that is self-sustaining.

- The HIL Project supports no-cost sustainability of deep implementation of the HIL School Renewal Model through:
  - Distribution of Project handbooks, examples, tools, and resources during years 1-3
  - Refresher and/or new leader training through the on-line Learning Modules through EduPaths
  - Ongoing access to future updates and versions of HIL Model materials.

Under the design for Project renewal, the HIL Project will:

- Develop sustainability support through trained personnel at the district and ISD/ESA levels
- Provide a system of micro-credentialing, prior learning credits tied to micro-credentialing
- Integrate the HIL School Renewal approach with the State system for continuous improvement (MI-CIP) and State model for renewal in priority schools ad districts (Michigan Blueprint)
2. What are the project’s significant milestones, accomplishments, and other notable aspects of its implementation during years 1 through 3? Where did those significant milestones, accomplishments, or other notable aspects of the project’s implementation exceed expectations for planned-for outcomes?

OVERVIEW: Under Section I, Question 1, Table 1 provides a summary of major Project accomplishments under the original design. This section will discuss several significant or notable aspects of Project implementation in years 1-3 followed by a table of implementation milestones associated with Project objectives and outcomes for years 1-3. This section will also explain how the four notable aspects of implementation and the implementation milestones either met or exceeded expectations for planned-for outcomes. The significant or notable implementation aspects fall into four categories:

1. Statistically significant positive impact on school leadership in treatment schools

2. Positive impacts on student achievement at mid-grant benchmark

3. High Integrity and Fidelity (HIFI) implementation of the HIL Model and Process for School Renewal
   a. Each Cohort A school is on target to complete one successful HIL School Renewal Cycle for Literacy Essentials implementation (an implementation fidelity target)
   b. Each Cohort A school is on target to complete the full set of HIL School Renewal Process deliverables (an implementation fidelity target)
   c. Each Cohort A school has made contextually appropriate Integrity Adaptations of the HIL School Renewal Model and Process while maintaining adherence to research-supported fidelity elements and practices of the HIL Model; thus, producing a rich array of integrity adaptation examples for schools that adopt the HIL School Renewal approach going forward

4. Strong interest by MDE MI-CIP directors, GELN directors, school leader professional associations, and local district leaders in working with the HIL Project to sustain, disseminate, and scale-up use of the School Renewal Model and Process to achieve sustainable HIFI implementation of evidence-based student success initiatives.

Notable Aspect A - Positive efficacy results on principal leadership, teacher leadership and student achievement. As measured by three different validated instruments, the HIL Project made a statistically significant increase in school leadership among treatment schools compared to schools in the control group over the course of 24 months. This analysis meets the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations. After 15 months of project involvement, student results in treatment schools showed statistically significant differences in student proficiency rates compared to schools in the control group. We fully expect these results to be statistically significant after we analyze additional data that provides a 24 month test window within an evaluation design that also meets WWC Standards without Reservations. We are excited to see such positive evidence on the two Project efficacy measures after only 24 months of treatment. We are surprised, however, at the magnitude of differences on two of the three teacher measures and magnitude of differences on some of the sub-scales of those two measures—in some cases, 4 or 5 times the standard error for that scale or sub-scale.

Notable Aspect B - Achievement of implementation indicators associated with Project delivery. The HIL Project’s impacts on student achievement and school leadership in treatment schools are a result of an unwavering commitment to living our own model of continuous improvement. This involves constant monitoring of implementation at multiple levels and determining priority growth targets for the Project in real-time. Measures and benchmarks for those priority targets are established immediately and monitored until achieved.

The HIL Project implementation is monitored through weekly work records submitted by the HIL Facilitators and regular check points for following progress on school level implementation. The work record collects indicators related to implementation fidelity so we can ensure each school receives the planned amount of treatment support and adaptive applications of that support. The work record also gathers information about the type of support that facilitators are providing to ensure that they are constantly providing contextually appropriate support according to the HIL Gradual Release Model for Sustainability. This will ensure that each school develops and sustains the work long after the partnership with the HIL Project has ended.
**Notable Aspect C - Achievement of intervention indicators within treatment schools.** The HIL Project’s impacts on student achievement and school leadership in treatment schools is a testament to the achievement of intervention objectives within treatment schools. Most notably, all treatment schools were able to engage in learning modules for research-based literacy strategies that target the most urgent needs of their students. Treatment schools also completed Gold Standard Implementation Guides (GSI Guides) where school teams translate research-based literacy practices into actual teacher classroom behaviors that are aligned to critical features of research-based practice. From there, teachers work in grade level teams to develop integrity applications for each Gold Standard teacher behavior through the strategic use of school resources, structures, and processes in a manner that fits the characteristics of the school’s student population.

School teams complete the GSI Guides with specific principal, teacher leader, and other personnel behaviors that directly support Gold Standard classroom practice behaviors. This is an example of how the HIL Model supports change at the classroom level with aligned support at the school level. This is important because of recent research findings that suggest the school as the critical unit of positive change for student success. While working directly with teachers to change classroom practice is supported in the literature, research findings also show the importance of school-level support to achieve sustainable implementation of those changes and actually achieve growth in student success. The HIL School Renewal Principles and Practices provide the type of leader and school-level support positively associated with this level of impact on classroom practice and student outcomes.

The emergence of the Gold Standard Implementation Guide as a pivotal mechanism for articulating and aligning specific implementation behaviors also influenced school leadership teams to deepen the use of classroom and benchmark assessments and other leading indicators deconstruct and interpret data from lagging indicators. This change deepened school performance profiles with more whole-child and whole-school indicators and measures and strengthened implementation monitoring plans with stronger use of short-term progress benchmarks for all Cohort A schools. This enables school teams to make implementation decisions based on data that reveals specific actionable growth targets and use the Renewal Cycle to accomplish priority growth targets in shorter time periods.

Thus, we found that the critical work in Phase II of the Renewal Cycle serves to deepen work in the other four phases and support the cumulative power of incremental change within a sustained commitment to a shared vision of the desired end-state. This is a fundamental change in implementation strategy and has become a fifth core principle for sustainable implementation of change initiatives; i.e. *Implement evidence-based change initiatives, one critical evidence-based practice, at time based on highest priority student growth targets.*

**Notable Aspect D - Strong interest by Project Partners and Stakeholders to sustain, disseminate, and scale-up use of the School Renewal Model and Process.** Even before the external evaluators confirmed statistically significant positive changes in the leadership practices and conditions associated with student achievement, Cohort A principals, teacher leaders, district and ISD/ESA leaders, and Project Facilitators and Coordinators were seeing formative evidence of fundamental change in how participating Cohort A schools approach, embrace, and persist in the implementation of a research-supported student success change initiative. This evidence included testimonials from Project participants, observed changes in school processes and environment, observed and reported changes in whole staff commitment and engagement, observed and reported changes in positive expectations and optimism, and increased evidence of interdependence and trust among and between staff and school leaders (see Video clip illustrating this point).

As these changes became more evident, they prompted conversations at the district, ISD/ESA, school leadership group, and stakeholder group levels. This led to increasing ISD/ESA initiative to employ HIL Facilitators and train their other instructional and school improvement staff. This also led to agreements (see above) with the MDE MI-CIP Task Force on how elements of the HIL School Renewal principles might be incorporated into the 2020-21 re-issuance of the MI-CIP process and platforms. Additionally, as we began to publish research papers and make conference presentations, school leaders from across Michigan and from other states began expressing interest in dissemination and distribution of the HIL Model. This led to an acceleration of the timeline for issuing the 2.0 versions of HIL Model training and implementation resources and the on-line Learning Modules through EduPaths. The early emergence of this level of interest was both a welcome surprise and a call for the Project Teams to accelerate dissemination planning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The HIL Project will add to the school leadership pipeline</td>
<td>At least 20% (45) of HIL Project Teacher Leaders will move into a formal leadership role by September 30, 2020</td>
<td>After 1 year of implementation, 34 teacher leaders (15%) in treatment schools had met this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The HIL Project will administer the project treatment with high integrity and fidelity</td>
<td>Allocation of 616 Facilitator hours of direct support to each treatment school (working directly with the principal and/or the school leadership team)</td>
<td>By March 30, 2020, the Project had exceeded all three treatment time targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The HIL Project will administer the project treatment with high integrity and fidelity</td>
<td>Sustaining 75 treatment schools in Cohort A</td>
<td>Measure met throughout Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The HIL Project will administer the project treatment with high integrity and fidelity</td>
<td>Principal and teacher leader participation in HIL Project Summits</td>
<td>Maintained an average of 3.4 out of 4 participants per school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The HIL Project will administer the project treatment with high integrity and fidelity</td>
<td>Completion of initial School Renewal Rounds in each treatment school</td>
<td>100% Completed in Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The HIL Project will administer the project treatment with high integrity and fidelity</td>
<td>Completion of a second cycle of School Renewal Rounds in each treatment school</td>
<td>51 of 75 treatment schools completed 2nd round by March school shutdown. Remaining rescheduled fall 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The HIL Project will administer the project treatment with high integrity and fidelity</td>
<td>Hours of direct Facilitator training through workshops</td>
<td>Exceeded 177 hour project target by 3/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The HIL Project will administer the project treatment with high integrity and fidelity</td>
<td>Facilitator follow-up support through formative interviews and observations</td>
<td>Met 100% of target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment schools will apply the HIL Model with HIFI</td>
<td>Develop a robust school performance profile</td>
<td>91% met target by 3/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment schools will apply the HIL Model with HIFI</td>
<td>Increase the number and range of adult practice indicators in monitoring plans and performance profiles</td>
<td>100% met target by 3/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment schools will apply the HIL Model with HIFI</td>
<td>Increased number and range of student indicators in performance profiles</td>
<td>92% met target by 3/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment schools will apply the HIL Model with high integrity and fidelity (HIFI)</td>
<td>Developed Gold Standard Implementation Guides for, at least, one Essential Literacy Practice to address, at least, one student literacy priority growth target</td>
<td>100% met target by 3/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment schools will apply the HIL Model with high integrity and fidelity (HIFI)</td>
<td>Developed and implemented an implementation progress monitoring plan that meets the HIL Model critical features for monitoring plans</td>
<td>(3 lacked a clearly defined student literacy PGT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment schools will apply the HIL Model with high integrity and fidelity (HIFI)</td>
<td>Developed a Progress Monitoring Dashboard to support ongoing cycles of School Renewal</td>
<td>92% met target by 3/30/20 with 8% still working on refinements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment schools will apply the HIL Model with high integrity and fidelity (HIFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>72% met target by 3/30/20 with 28% in progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **What are areas where the project’s design or planned implementation have been delayed or are not expected to meet intended project outcomes? What efforts, if any, have been undertaken to address these challenges?**

**OVERVIEW:** Continuous progress monitoring by the HIL Project Management and Coordinating teams with a steady stream of real-time data helped the Project make quick adaptations to structures, processes, and resources in response to identified opportunities for growth and evidence requiring some version of adaptation. With these processes for continuous progress monitoring in place, the HIL Project is close to meeting all intended project outcomes. In spite of the Covid19 shut-down of participating schools in March, Facilitators are reporting weekly progress in completing Project outcomes, because the momentum was so strong before the shut-down occurred. That said, the Project made several notable adaptations made during the past 2.5 years based on formative evaluation indicators and measures. These adaptations have led to six (6) categories of refinement to stay on track with the planned implementation of the HIL Project design:

1. Increased monitoring and understanding of school and facilitator progress
2. Increased efficiency and effectiveness of management processes
3. Streamlined resources for school leadership teams
4. Learning how to live our own model for sustainable positive change
5. Maintaining unwavering focus on equity through strengths-based and asset focused responses
6. Adapted strategies for supporting School Leadership Teams during the Covid19 school shutdown

These adaptations have allowed the HIL Project to make progress toward meeting all Project outcomes and objectives. They also serve to strengthen the intervention model for realizing the potential power of the HIL Model for School Renewal. For this reason, we will refer to the above listed adaptations as **Progress Adaptations** and describe each one below.

**Progress Adaptation 1 - Increasing understanding of school and facilitator progress.** After 4-6 months of implementation, we began a series of Facilitator interviews and observations plus principal interviews to assess the alignment between Facilitator training and actual Facilitator behaviors being exhibited within schools. Interviews pointed to two areas of potential growth in how we supported facilitators:

- Facilitators needed more assistance in identifying specific leadership behaviors that manifest each of the HIL Principles and Practices. Facilitators reported that it was easy for leaders to get distracted from the work with daily needs that arise. They also reported that principals did not always know how to operationalize an evidence-based leadership practice, so principals reverted to established patterns of behavior. That summer, HIL Project PIs responded by translating the key School Renewal practices into a set of ten specific **Vital School Leadership Behaviors** that align with the Four Principles and the Phases of School Renewal. Facilitators received training on these Vital Leadership Behaviors and how to apply them to the School Renewal Process.

- Interview and observation data also revealed that Facilitators needed a more concrete way to think about how they could adapt their level of support to the needs of the school and developmental level of the principals and teacher leaders. The HIL Project research team responded by operationalizing adult learning and support behaviors from multiple sources; thus, creating the HIL Facilitator Gradual Release Model for Sustainable Change. This model became the Facilitator’s lens for thinking about what level of support was needed from them at each stage of the School Renewal process and with each individual principal and teacher leader. The Gradual Release approach is based, in part, of Hershey & Blanchard’s situational leadership theories and provides Facilitators with a spectrum of options for meeting principals and teachers where they are and moving them forward (See Figure 4 below).

![Figure 4. The Gradual Release Spectrum of Facilitator Support](https://example.com/gradual_release_figure.png)
Progress Adaptation 2 - Increasing efficiency and effectiveness of management processes. After 6 months of Facilitator work in the school, we found the record keeping procedures for facilitator work was inconsistent and provided little information on the progress that each school was making. The WMU management team redesigned the Facilitator weekly work record reporting. Facilitators now record both the nature of their work in the schools, the level of support they provide for that work, and the progress on deliverables from that work on a weekly basis. This has led to a better system for tracking each school’s growth toward independent sustainability.

Progress Adaptation 3 - Streamlining resources for schools to align efforts toward achieving collective vision. Formative data from progress monitoring showed that schools needed additional tools for staying focused on real-time growth targets and establishing alignment between priority areas of growth for students and needed areas of growth in classroom, leadership, and support practice. They also needed additional guidance for how to adapt evidence-based practice in ways that fit the school context and respond appropriately to student characteristics. Failure of large projects to contextualize research-based practices is one reason schools see a constant cycle of initiatives that fail to improve student achievement and are pushed aside when the next shiny initiative comes along.

The problem: We found that too many Project schools experience a conflict between adherence to packaged literacy programs and their understanding of evidence-based literacy practice. To illustrate this conflict, one recorded observation captured teachers in two grade levels in a heated debate. One group argued that the expensive district adopted “total” literacy program was not meeting the needs of their students to achieve the writing standards. They pointed to standards-based assessments to support their desire to “replace or significantly adapt the writing portion of the program”. The other group contended “we have to follow the instructional guides verbatim in order to achieve fidelity to this program that the district spent so much money on”. Both groups used the word, fidelity, but neither had the same interpretation of that word. On the other end of the spectrum, we found that many schools had no consistent ELA resources, no alignment between resources, and vastly different ways of interpreting both the Literacy standards and the strategies to achieve them. In these schools, fidelity was not on their radar.

HIL Project Response: We collaborated with literacy experts from the GELN Literacy Task Force to develop Gold Standard Implementation Guide (GSI Guide) based on the researcher vetted GELN Essential Instructional Practices in Early Literacy and Essential School-Wide and Center-Wide Practices in Literacy. These documents contain research-supported approaches for educators to markedly improve student literacy within the classroom and across the school. Working with literacy experts, Facilitators helped school teams unpack the Essential Literacy Practices to identify the critical features of each practice and describe the “gold standard” teacher behaviors to address those features. This freed teacher teams up to make informed implementation Integrity decisions; i.e. the best ways to select and use resources and organize their classrooms to support the “gold standard” teacher behaviors and achieve the student outcomes based on the unique characteristics of their students and the context of their school.

Distinguishing fidelity implementation features and behaviors from integrity adaptations allows schools to “own” implementation of evidence-based practice by using the strengths of their own school context, student characteristics, and classroom resources to ensure that teachers have the means to implement and sustain those practices. We also designed the Gold Standard Implementation Guides (GSGs) to help teachers assess where they need support to adopt, sustain, and consistently apply the gold standard teaching behaviors. The GISGs also require teacher teams to work with principals to set growth targets for principal support and support from other school and district personnel.

Implementing GSI Guides was a major milestone for the HIL Project and a significant adaptation, because it provided school teams with a means to define specific classroom, leadership, and school support behaviors and find contextually appropriate and sustainable ways to implement those behaviors. By aligning behaviors for all school personnel who share responsibility for successful implementation, the GSIGs avoid the fractures approach of many improvement processes.
Progress Adaptation 4 - Learning how to live our own model for sustainable positive change. Time and time, again, the Management, Coordinating, and Facilitator (coaching) teams encountered situations that required us to step back and examine how we would respond to growth opportunities within those situations. We learned to build better and better systems of progress monitoring with real-time evidence in order to stay adaptive and respond to unfolding nuances of making fundamental change in leadership practice across 75 different schools. We needed to maintain an appreciative, growth-focused, and asset-based approach to work with principals and help them find and deploy untapped leadership capacity among their staffs. We learned that this is easier said than done, so we found it necessary to intentionally practice the leadership strategies embedded in the HIL Model and develop feedback loops to monitor our own growth while also monitoring the growth of Project participants.

An unexpected bonus. By maintaining an unwavering commitment to living the processes that we ask our schools to learn and apply to their own implementation and continuous improvement processes, Project personnel became co-learners in the work with participants. By making that co-learning transparent, reciprocal, and generative of adaptive responses, we were able to engage in continuous refinement of both the HIL Model and the critical behaviors that make that Model work in a variety of school settings. The appreciative lens frames change initiatives as an opportunity to identify and build upon existing strengths, thus generating positive, growth focused change motivation.

Working together to monitor changes in our current state while maintaining a shared vision of the desired state fostered interdependence between participating principals, teacher leaders, staff, and HIL Project Facilitators, Coordinators, and Leaders. We found interdependence and reciprocity of learning critical to the success of the HIL Project. We also had to create safe spaces in which adults can grow, so they will create safe spaces for the students to grow as well. As we implemented the Project in this fashion, we were also modeling the HIL Principles and Processes Facilitators were helping their school principals and leadership teams use to implement change in the Cohort A schools.

Progress Adaptation 5 - Maintaining unwavering focus on equity through strengths-based and asset-focused responses. The HIL School Renewal approach turns the prevailing deficit and problem-focused improvement approach on its head through a focus on assets, growth opportunities, specific real-time actionable and strategic growth targets, and adaptive growth pathways that build positive momentum and optimism. The HIL approach relies on:

- Conducting authentic real-time assessment to maintain a clear picture of the current state
- Cataloguing strengths and growth edges (opportunities)
- Making evidence-based decisions on which growth edges become priority growth targets and when
- Progress benchmarking to mark steady progress toward achieving specific growth targets

The Problem: The HIL approach assumes growth opportunities abound and can be the engine that drives adaptive change. We found that principals and their staffs are not well equipped, however, with the types of data needed to identify actionable growth edges and determine which of those growth edges are most important for students at a given time. They were trying to get students to “the goal line” without knowing exactly where they were on the playing field. They did not have actionable evidence on either students’ literacy strengths or their own strengths in classroom, leadership, and support practice; nor, did they have actionable evidence on specific areas to target for growth (student or adult).

HIL Project Response: The lack of actionable strength and growth edge evidence undermines equity, because it leads to “teaching in broad strokes” rather than in targeted ways. This is frustrating to teachers and deadly for learners. It undermines efforts to teach to the “zone of proximal development” and scaffolding of learning opportunity. To address this issue, the HIL Project has reached out to Project partners to coordinate efforts for helping teachers and school leaders get access to and create more actionable student progress data and adult growth data, and again, we had to increase the emphasis on creating safe spaces in which students and adults can grow.
As we look to the work ahead, under the renewal grant, we know that this is an area where we will need much greater involvement, shared understanding, and commitment for a coordinated effort. This is addressed in Section II.

**Progress Adaptation 6 – Adapting to supporting School Leadership Teams during the Covid19 school shutdown.**

On March 11, we learned that Michigan’s schools would be shutting down for, at least six weeks. This gave us an opportunity to pause briefly to consider alternative means for engaging with and supporting Project school teams. We immediately cancelled physical gatherings for HIL Facilitator workshops and School Team Summits and established a new series of virtual engagements for the remainder of the shut-down period. We altered our support for Facilitators by shifting to weekly 2.5 hour virtual workshops and focusing those workshops on collaborative co-construction of ways to support HIL school teams as they adapt to remote learning for students and carryout HIL Processes through virtual team engagements.

**What we are learning:** The weekly Facilitator workshops are an important response because they are providing Facilitators with valuable experience creating and engaging with remote learning. We are using this time to experiment in adaptive ways to use teleconferencing technologies and provide Facilitators with opportunities to co-create, debrief, and plan. These weekly virtual workshops are also important because School Teams are going through a period of rapidly changing circumstances requiring agility and adaptive responses. Since the HIL School Renewal approach is adaptive and responsive to real-time changes, HIL Facilitators are finding that most of their schools are readily applying what they learned in the first 2.5 years of the HIL Project to the new circumstances they are experiencing under Covid19 shut-down conditions.

The shut-down circumstances are also providing the Project with additional insight into which aspects of the HIL School Renewal Cohort A schools are emphasizing as they respond. As we watch and interpret what we are seeing as each school adapts, we are seeing a trend to focus on the elements of Positive Core and Collective Ownership (see left side of Figure 1), specifically related to working from strengths, holding on to positive expectations for students, collaborating to develop remote learning experiences for students, and approaching the situation as a learning opportunity. In the weeks ahead as school teams get more of a routine established for remote learning, Facilitators will focus on helping their schools maintain those aspects of their work while also exploring ways to monitor student growth remotely, reflect on what they are learning, raise thoughtful questions about how to move forward, and think of systemic ways to respond to what happens next.

The HIL Project is going on this Covid19 journey with our schools as we finish working with Cohort A and gear up for working with a new Cohort under a renewal grant. In Section II, we discuss further adaptations in our treatment model and ways we will disseminate, scale-up, and further adapt both the HIL School Renewal intervention and the means to make even broader impact with the HIL Model and Process for School Renewal.
4. Please describe any significant, planned deviations from the project’s original, approved design that you intend to undertake in order to reposition the project for greater success if awarded additional funding.

OVERVIEW: This fourth part of Section I recaps the significant learnings from years 1-3 of the HIL Project that influence the Project design for years 4-5. Because of the robust formative evaluation system, we made many project adjustments along the way, while still adhering to the goals, objectives, and strategies of the original Project design. An important feature of the original design is the explicit delineation of essential fidelity principles, practices, and processes for the HIL School Renewal Model, Process, and intervention with participating schools. A second and equally important feature is an agile and adaptive approach to influencing how participating schools translate fidelity practices into integrity applications that fit the contextual circumstances of the school and the students they serve. We will preserve this distinction between **fidelity and integrity** as we move into years 4 and 5, because of how we have seen the distinction between these two implementation constructs help principals and teachers develop ownership and efficacy.

What we learned working with the Cohort A schools has revealed some opportunities for further development and reinforced the importance of preserving the essence of this work and taking it to scale in three important ways:

1. **Implement and test out some specific modifications in the treatment plan to help 75 new schools learn and apply the HIL Renewal Model and Process to the implementation of evidence-based change initiatives**
   a. Expand focus to include both literacy essentials and math essentials (both researcher vetted bodies of work by HIL Project GELN Task Force partners)
   b. Condense the amount of treatment time and augment on-site support with virtual engagements (the degree to which will be influenced by the Covid19 situation in 2020-21)
   c. Partner new Cohort B schools in networking arrangements with other Cohort B schools and with Cohort A schools to:
      i. Tap into the promising evidence that networking for reciprocal learning and growth in a targeted area of student achievement is positively associated with achievement growth
      ii. Provide a mechanism for Cohort A schools to continue rehearsing and re-applying the HIL Principles, Processes, and Practices and deepen their command of the approach
   d. Engage Cohort B schools with the new HIL Model learning modules as a second source of learning and development (both with their Facilitator and on their own)
   e. Further encourage the diversity and strength of the school leadership pipeline by:
      i. Helping principals discover untapped leadership potential
      ii. Promoting and following teacher leaders’ opportunities to move into more formal leadership roles
      iii. Provide micro-credentialing opportunities for participating principals and teacher leaders

2. **Develop, utilize, and publish additional work on school renewal, the school as the unit of change, the association between teacher leadership and student achievement, school-to-school networking, and implementation integrity and fidelity**
   a. Disseminate 2.0 Versions of HIL School Renewal Model, Process, and Practice guides, tools, and resources
   b. Refine existing formative and summative measures and develop new ones
   c. Design and carryout additional studies and publish findings

3. **Disseminate the HIL School Renewal Model through Learning Modules hosted by a state and national system for on-line professional learning for educators**
4. Scale-up the application of the HIL Renewal Model to schools beyond Cohort A and B through:
   a. HIL Learning Modules and Micro-credentialing
   b. Training, support, and coordination with district leaders and instructional division personnel at regional service agencies (ISDs/ESAs)
   c. Work with the Michigan Department of Education and Michigan Blueprint Consortium to incorporate HIL Principles and Processes into State sponsored systems of continuous improvement

5. Achieve sustainability for the HIL Model independent of grant funding or other forms of State or federal support
   a. Work with ISDs/ESAs, local districts, project partners, and professional leader associations to ensure broad training and development of coaches, facilitators and other school leaders and achieve sufficient and distributed capacity
   b. Work with WMU College of Education and Human Services (CEHD) and the Graduate College to implement a badging/micro-credentialing system and a self-sustaining Center for School Renewal

Opportunities to achieve sustainability. Evidence of efficacy is the HIL Project strong suit when planning for sustainability. Under the renewal grant, we will work with leaders at the school level, district level, ISD/ESA level and MDE level to (a) directly train district and ISD/ESA support personnel on the HIL School Renewal approach with support from trained HIL Facilitators and Coordinators; and (b) promote and support school principals and teacher leaders engagement with the HIL School Renewal Model Learning Modules with State Continuing Education Credits and opportunities for micro-credentialing. We will be working with WMU officials in the College of Education and Human Development (CEHD) and the Graduate College to establish a self-sustaining micro-credentialing system and to include HIL School Renewal micro-credentials in approved prior learning credit offerings for Educational Leadership graduate degrees. Through further efficacy testing for Cohort A and a new Cohort of 75 additional schools, the HIL Project can further establish evidence of value-added influence on school capacity for school renewal that achieves positive change in student outcomes.

Opportunities for scale-up and dissemination. The strong interest and commitments from ISDs/ESAs, district leaders, the MDE Office of Continuous Improvement, EduPaths Educator Professional Learning System, and leaders of professional associations opened many doors for disseminating the HIL School Renewal Model both within and outside of Michigan. With the refinements and new platforms for dissemination through facilitator certification and school leader micro-credentialing, the HIL Project design for years 4/5 can include very specific strategies and actions for scaling-up the dissemination coupled with a research agenda to follow the impact of those scale-up efforts.

Opportunities to keep refining the HIL Model and Intervention Design. The steady stream of formative data allowed the HIL Project to refine the HIL Model, the intervention system, and the outputs of working with a new Cohort of 75 very diverse schools distributed over the entire west side of Michigan’s lower peninsula. These refinements can, now, be tested with a new cohort while also disseminated to schools and those who support schools and school leaders throughout Michigan and beyond. We have revised implementation guides and resources so that they are more consumable and actionable with reduced support from Implementation Facilitators or other trained facilitator/coaches. The 2.0 versions are being tested by HIL Facilitators as they complete the last nine months of support to Cohort A Schools. New Facilitators and ISD/ESA instructional division coaches and facilitators will be trained using the 2.0 versions by fall 2020. Completion of the 2.0 versions has allowed the Project to accelerate the development of on-line learning modules, so we have moved up the timeline for completing the first four of six modules by September 30, 2020 and the remaining two modules by December 2020 in preparation for rolling out a facilitator certification process in January of 2021 and the system for badging and micro-credentialing by April 2021. The further validation of HIL School Renewal assessment tools will also help in the identification of assessment measures for the micro-credentialing system. Finally, the opportunity to expand virtual learning capacity during the Covid19 shutdown period has increased the repertoire of learning and engagement strategies that Facilitators can employ with district leadership teams and Project PIs and Coordinators can incorporate into the on-line learning modules for greater impact.
Part II: Responses to Selection Criteria (Criteria 1-4)

1. Quality of the Project Evaluation (25 points)

I. The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies.

II. The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

What planned or ongoing efforts to study the impact of the approved project’s activities will you undertake if awarded additional funding?

OVERVIEW: As reported in Part I, Sections 1 and 2, on achievements, one of the key achievements during Years 1 to 3 is that the external evaluation team at University of Kentucky carried out a rigorous design using a randomized trial per What Works Clearinghouse guides and found that The HIL Project has statistically significant positive efficacy on school-wide leadership and ELA student achievement. During proposed Years 4 and 5, we will continue to evaluate the effectiveness of project implementation strategies by using objective performance measures in an extension of the original evaluation design.

The proposed scope of work for Years 4 and 5 falls into three major categories: (a) conducting the project with a new cohort of 75 schools (with modifications to the intervention design) as part of the scale-up efforts, (b) working on dissemination and scale-up efforts with school districts, intermediate school districts, professional associations, and the Michigan Department of Education MDE), and (c) engaging in sustainability activities. The following evaluation plan is consistent with the scope of this work for Years 4 and 5. We will continue to contract with our external evaluators at the University of Kentucky for conducting further summative evaluation and efficacy testing as we expand and modify the Project treatment to a new Cohort of 75 schools and follow the long-term effect of the treatment on the first Cohort of 75 schools.

Additionally, the internal research team will use the continuous progress monitoring approach for collecting and using formative evaluation data to inform the implementation of Renewal Project components and activities as described in Section II (2) and to offer insights regarding efficacy testing results. To sustain the robust formative evaluation process described in Section I, we will continue to employ, refine, and add to formative data collection indicators, measures, and analysis systems and processes established in years 1-3 of the HIL Project.

Methods for both the Summative and Formative evaluation designs are provided under the following two headings.

I. The extent to which the methods of evaluation provides for examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies

Building on the experimental design and positive results for Years 1 to 3, during Years 4 and 5 we will continue to evaluate the effectiveness of project implementation strategies by using objective performance measures. The following table illustrates the overall design for all five years by including Years 4 and 5. As reported previously, we randomized 150 schools into Cohorts A and B at the beginning of the project in late 2017, and used the “random assignment coupled with a staggered roll-out of a program” (Institute of Educational Science, 2010) as a strategy to create a true experimental design during Years 1 to 3, with Cohort A being the experimental group and Cohort B control group.

For Years 4 and 5, Cohort A becomes the long-term experimental group and B the short-term experimental group. We will compare the short-term vs long-term treatment effect (by 2022, Cohort A will be exposed for 5 years and Cohort B...
We will also construct a new propensity-score matched comparison group for Cohort B to build more evidence for project efficacy following the WWC Guidelines. Cohort B will be compared with the propensity-score matched comparison (control) group in 2022. The following is a schematic representation for the design with Years 1 to 3, and Years 4 to 5, with the shaded area being for Years 4 and 5.

Table 3. Expanded Design For Years 4 and 5 for Data Collection and Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Pretest in 2017</th>
<th>Phase I Treatment (Yrs. 1-3)</th>
<th>Midtest in 2020</th>
<th>Renewal Period – Phase II Treatment (Yrs. 4-5)</th>
<th>Posttest in 2022</th>
<th>Groups’ Function in (Yrs. 4-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (75 schools)</td>
<td>3 outcomes: principal leadership, teacher leadership, student achievement</td>
<td>10/2017 – 4/2020</td>
<td>3 Outcomes: principal leadership, teacher leadership, student achievement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 Outcome: student achievement</td>
<td>To compare with Cohort B for long- vs short-term treatment effect on student achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (75 schools)</td>
<td>3 Outcomes; Same as the above</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3 Outcomes: Same as the above</td>
<td>4/2020e-9/2022</td>
<td>3 Outcomes: As previously</td>
<td>In addition to the two tests in the cells above and below, to test if there was a change between mid and posttests in principal and teacher leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity score matched schools to compare with B</td>
<td>1 outcome: student achievement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 outcome: student achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To compare with Cohort B to test the Years 4 and 5 treatment effect on student achievement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because we will work with the 75 schools in Cohort B as part of the scale-up effort for Years 4 and 5, we will not be able to have a randomly assigned comparison group for Cohort B during Years 4 and 5. Therefore, using a state-wide database, we will construct a propensity-score matched comparison group for Cohort B and the design still meets the mandate of “if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project’s effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations”, as stipulated in the original 2017 SEED program RFP published in the Federal Register. We will not be able to collect teacher and principal survey data from the propensity-score matched group, because we will not have access to this group. However, we will be able to compare the growth in school-level student achievement between Cohort B and propensity-score matched group by merging the requested achievement data with the publicly available statewide school characteristics database, a design that meets the WWC guidelines and will give us one more opportunity to affirm the efficacy on school-level student achievement.

The 75 additional schools (called cohort B) as part of the scale-up efforts, provide us with an opportunity for not only replications, but also further more in-depth evaluation to compare the 75 schools in cohort A. Cohort A and B schools were randomly assigned in Fall 2017. The summative evaluation essentially provides us with an opportunity for not only replication, but also inquiring further into other evaluation questions. The following details the evaluation questions and methods.
The following sections describe the Evaluation Plan for the HIL Project Renewal Period in three parts:

1. Summative Evaluation Questions
2. Formative Evaluation Questions
3. Linking the Formative Evaluation and Summative Evaluation


Does the treatment make a difference in principal leadership and teacher leadership? During Years 1 to 3, we have come to a definitive finding regarding the positive effects on principal leadership and teacher leadership by comparing Cohorts A and B. We will use Cohort B’s three-time-point survey data (pre-test, mid-test and post-test) from teachers and principals to test if the mid-point is a turning point for a statistically significant increase from point 2 to point 3. We will use a method called piecewise regression for this test. This test is a within-group test and does not have a comparison group. This new test for years 4 and 5 will add more evidence.

Does the treatment make a difference in student achievement based on data from Cohort B and Cohort B’s comparison group? This is a replication of a similar study that our external evaluator conducted for Years 1 to 3 (based on randomizing schools to have Cohort A as experimental group and Cohort B as the control group). During Years 4 and 5, we will find another 75 comparison schools in the state of Michigan for 75 Cohort B schools via propensity score matching. We will then use a two-level growth model (repeated measures nested within schools) to examine the differences between Cohort B schools and the propensity-score matched schools in the rate of growth in school academic performance in ELA and math (math is being added as the intervention will include GELN Essential Math Practices for Years 4 and 5).

This analysis will be based on school level proficiency levels. Data will be from Michigan Department of Education. The repeated measures model (at the first level) sets up the growth model with adjustment over time-varying (by year) school characteristics of school enrollment size, proportion of male students, proportion of minority students, proportion of English language learners, and proportion of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. The school-level model compared Cohort B schools with propensity-score matched comparison schools in the rate of growth from baseline performance. Via the above methodology, we expect to produce evidence about the project’s effect on student achievement that will meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards with reservations.

Does the treatment have long-term effect on student achievement? Under the delayed treatment experimental design, we have a unique opportunity to examine whether extended practice (in Years 4 and 5 after participation for Cohort A schools) affects outcomes (compared with participation only for Cohort B schools in Years 4 and 5). Practice effects can also be considered as “long-term versus short-term treatment effects.” Across a period of 60 months, the 75 schools in Cohort A completed our program in the first 30 months of Years 1 to 3 and will then continue to apply what they have learned to their work during Years 4 and 5. The 75 schools in Cohort B did not receive treatment during the first 30 months of Years 1 to 3, and will receive treatment during Years 4 and 5, with no opportunity to have extended practice as Cohort A schools.

The second and last waves of data (mid and post) will allow us to assess whether extended practice after participation has any effect on student achievement. Schools’ proficiency level (SPL) on M-STEP is the outcome measure, with $PL_3$ coming from the post-test and $PL_2$ coming from the mid-test:

$$ SPL_3 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 SPL_2 + \beta_2 G + \sum_{m=1}^{M} \beta_{(m+2)} W_m + \epsilon $$

where $G = 1$ for having extended practice after training (Cohort A) and $G = 0$ for training with no extended practice (Cohort B). $W$s are school characteristics. If $\beta_2$ is statistically significant, there are significant practice effects.

What is the mechanism (relationship) among (a) principal leadership, (b) teacher leadership (in learning-centered leadership and orientation to school renewal), and (c) student achievement? Theoretical insights single out a principal’s leadership as the initiator (cause) of school culture and process (effect) and school culture and process as the force (cause) to change student performance (effect) (Goddard, Goddard, Bailes, & Nichols, 2019; Hallinger, 2011; Louis, Dretzke, & Wahlstrom, 2010; Marks & Printy, 2003; Sebastian, Allensworth, Huang, 2016; Sebastian, &
Allensworth, 2017; Supovitz, Sirinides, & May, 2010). The unit of analysis is school, and the mechanism of impact focuses on program participation that sets off the chain reaction. We will integrate first and second waves of data from Cohort A with second and third waves of data from Cohort B to create a total of 150 schools for data analysis of the causal relationship among (a) principals’ leadership, (b) school culture and process as reflected in teacher leadership in learning-centered efforts and school renewal, and (c) student achievement.

Statistical operations are performed in the form of multilevel structural equation modeling (SEM). The use of achievement scores of students (nested within schools) speaks to the multilevel nature of data analysis. At the school level, measures on principal leadership, teacher leadership, and student achievement form the structural relationship as we discussed above. Multilevel SEM models can now be estimated on the Mplus platform. Taking into account school context, we will extend our multilevel SEM model to specify that school context influences the three school measures so as to examine whether the link still holds true once school context is taken into consideration.

Part 2 of the Renewal Project Evaluation Plan: Formative Evaluation Questions

How do HIL Facilitators work with their schools to achieve High Integrity and Fidelity implementation of a literacy and math student success initiative?

- How do they use HIL Model resources to help their school teams learn and apply HIL Principles, Processes, and Practices?
- How do they help their school teams adapt and apply the HIL Model to the context of the school?
- How do they use the HIL Gradual Release Facilitator Behaviors to adapt to the readiness and developmental level of the school?

To ensure fidelity of implementation of the HIL Model for School Renewal in all schools by HIL Facilitators, HIL Management and Coordinator Teams ensure all Facilitators receive a consistent amount of training and have deep understanding of the HIL Model. Monthly facilitator trainings apply a “just in time” learning framework so new Facilitators learn the HIL Project Model and approach and experienced ones refine their command of the work as they work with schools. Facilitator participation and development will be carefully tracked through sign-ins, work records, observations, interviews, and artifacts of the work in Cohort B schools. Monthly meetings with Coordinators, workshop feedback and other Facilitator data will produce a real-time feedback loop for the Coordinating and Management Teams, so they can monitor Facilitator experiences with Cohort B schools and adapt Facilitator support as needed.

Every Facilitator workshop includes new or re-visited learning on some aspect of the HIL Model coupled with opportunities for Facilitators to debrief what they are working on in their schools, collaborate around responding to issues that emerge in serving their schools, plan for how they will apply and adapt elements of the HIL Model to the context of their schools, reflect on their own growth and development, and identify further needs for their schools and their own learning to support the schools effectively. All virtual workshops are recorded as are some learning segments from face-to-face workshops. This format supports the Five Levels of Adult Learning (Appendix A) and provides the Coordinating, Management, and Research Teams with a rich source of data to form a real-time feedback loop.

Facilitators are asked to reflect on their learning through the lens of the Gradual Release Model, as shown in Figure 5 below. The gradient colored strip below represents the Facilitator’s vital behaviors for implementing the Five Phases of HIFI strategies in a way that best suits the specific context of the school, i.e. integrity of implementation. The blue end of the bar represents a status where school leaders are less developed and, thus rely more on the Facilitator. As the bar moves from blue, to yellowish blue, to bluish yellow, and ultimately, bright yellow, the Facilitator is pulling back and the principal and teacher leaders are taking more of a lead because they have developed more capacity and efficacy for a particular aspect of the HIL Process or Practices. Bright yellow is the status of complete school leader independence to use, apply, and sustained the HIL Process and/or specific Practices.
The members of the Coordinating Team connect on a regular basis with each individual Facilitator to guide Facilitator reflection on the progress of the school through the lens of the Gradual Release Model. This gives Facilitators the opportunity to collaborate on the best ideas for employing the HIL Model within the unique context of an individual school. The Management Team also monitors the progress that Facilitators are making toward sustainability through this model on the weekly work record.

**How do principals and teacher leaders work with their schools to achieve High Integrity and Fidelity implementation of a literacy and/or math student success initiative?**

- How do they use HIL Model resources to help their school teams learn and apply HIL Principles, Processes, and Practices?
- How do they help their school teams adapt and apply the HIL Model to the context of the school?
- How do they use the HIL Gradual Release Facilitator Behaviors to adapt to the readiness and developmental level of the school?
- What indications are there that the amount of support from Facilitators is sufficient for principals and teacher leaders to achieve sustainable independence to continue using the HIL Model, Process, and Practices when the Project ends?

As the HIL Project seeks to integrate the HIL Model for School Renewal in a new cohort of 75 schools, a great deal of effort went into establishing the partnerships, relationships, and resources that will provide a similar level of treatment with less direct support from the HIL Project. This requires careful progress monitoring of how school leaders are implementing the HIL Model and developing HIL Project deliverables to ensure that the level of support these schools receive is equivalent in effectiveness as the Cohort A schools received.

To ensure a high level of fidelity of implementation to the research-based principles of the HIL Project, the HIL Management team will use the weekly work record to track progress that schools are making toward the distinct fidelity elements. Schools will complete the **Appreciating Progress toward School Renewal Guide** (APSR) on a bi-monthly basis to monitor and celebrate their progress toward implementing the HIL Model and developing the HIL deliverables. Facilitators will, on a bi-monthly basis, report the school’s progress towards the deliverables by updating their school ratings on the developmental guide. This will help track school progress on the following deliverables across all Cohort B schools:

- School Performance Profile
- Aligned Student Priority Growth Target
- Gold Standard Implementation Guides
- Continuous Progress Monitoring Plan
- Progress Monitoring Dashboard

A key component to the HIL Model is that Facilitators come alongside of each school to appreciate and build on of the existing strengths in each school as they identify and address growth opportunities. To ensure that each school is applying the HIL Model in a way that is contextually appropriate, school leadership teams will use the results from the APSR to identify Priority Growth Targets that are most urgent to each individual school with assistance from the HIL Facilitator. Adhering to the integrity of implementation will maintain the motivation of school personnel to engage as
learners as they build capacity to implement research-based practices associated with Literacy and/or Math and School Renewal leadership.

**How does school-to-school networking influence the implementation of the HIL Model for school renewal?**

- How do schools find ways to network with each other around implementation of an evidence-based student success initiative?
- What is the nature of the exchange between the networking schools?
- Where and how does networking influence the way or the rate of implementing the change initiative?
- Where and how does networking influence the school’s application of the HIL Principles, Processes, and Practices?

One strategy for increasing the amount of support that schools receive while scaling back the direct HIL support is connecting school teams to engage in reciprocal learning relationships. The HIL Project developed an instrument that captures the type and degree of engagement between schools. Results from using this measure with Cohort A suggest that there is a positive relationship between specific forms of networking and student achievement. With Cohort B, we will investigate this further using the instrument, student achievement and qualitative data.

**How do local district and ISD/ESA leaders respond to opportunities to learn and apply the HIL School Renewal Model, Process, and Practices for either supporting Cohort A or B schools or for extending the impact of the HIL Model beyond those schools?**

- How many Cohort B district personnel fulfill the expectation for bi-monthly participation with Facilitators and School Teams as they work on the HIL Process? What influences their participation level?
- How many Cohort B districts seek to incorporate the HIL Model and Process into the district continuous improvement process? What influences their decision?
- How many local districts and Region 3-7 ISD/ESA instructional divisions have one or more personnel complete the HIL Facilitator Training? What influences the decision to participate and complete the training?
- How many district and Region 3-7 instructional divisions incorporate the HIL School Renewal Principles and Process into their support for schools? What influences their decisions? How do they incorporate the HIL approach into their support for schools?

The HIL Model offers a different approach to continuous school improvement and implementation processes; however, the Michigan Department of Education has committed to work with the HIL Project to allow schools to use the HIL approach in their response to the MI-CIP process requirements. Additionally, districts and ISDs/ESAs have indicated interest in learning and applying the Model to their continuous improvement systems and processes. This interest and accommodation by MDE is key to the next step of disseminating and scaling up for the HIL Model; therefore, the spread of the HIL Model will also be an indicator to monitor.

The dissemination, scale-up and sustainability of the HIL School Renewal approach outside Cohort A and B schools will be tracked by multiple measures. These will include participation records, interviews, surveys, feedback forms, and observations. Other means of tracking and interpreting dissemination and scale-up progress will likely emerge as we engage with district and ISD/ESA personnel participate. The following evaluation questions will provide insights into the degree of dissemination, the degree of scale-up, and the prospects for sustainability beyond the federal funding period.

**What is the response to opportunities to access HIL School Renewal Model training through EduPaths Learning Modules?**

- Who enrolls and who completes?
- How do they evaluate their experience?

As the HIL Model Learning Modules go live on-line through the EduPaths Educator Professional Learning System, we will be tracking the scope of dissemination of this source of basic training for school leaders and school leadership teams. The modules are designed to be completed by school teams of principals and teacher leaders. They provide content, processing activities, and application activities. They are intended to be used as either as (a) a stand-alone series of learning modules to
help school leaders and their staffs begin to learn and test out the HIL School Renewal approach in their schools; or (b) as part of the larger micro-credentialing system with additional application and assessment components.

What is the response to opportunities for Facilitator Training Certification and/or WMU badging and micro-credentialing opportunities?

To continue to support the dissemination and scale-up of the HIL School Renewal Model within and outside of Michigan, we are working with WMU Graduate College and College of Education and Human Development (CEHD) officials to establish an ongoing system to train, certify, and support HIL School Renewal Facilitator/Coaches and to provide a system of badging, micro-credentialing and prior learning credits toward WMU Educational Leadership graduate degrees. We are also working with the CEHD to establish a self-sustaining Center for School Renewal.

- Who enrolls, who completes, and for what reasons?
- How do they evaluate their experience?
- What do they do with the completed training and what influences those decisions?
- Who applies for prior learning credits toward a WMU graduate degree in Educational Leadership after completing the HIL Model micro-credential?

Part 3 of the Renewal Project Evaluation Plan: Linking the Formative Evaluation and Summative Evaluation

How are implementation characteristics related to the growth in principal leadership, teacher leadership, and school-level student achievement?

Based on the work in Years 1 to 3, we have developed a work record database detailing the renewal work of each school. During Years 4 and 5, we will continue to collect the work record data, and conduct a set of analyses to associate the implementation characteristics with the growth in school-level principal leadership, teacher leadership and student achievement. For example, we will model the effects of implementation-related variables (such as the participation level in training/summit sessions, the foci of the renewal activities, the level in our gradual release model, time usage pattern of the facilitators with the assigned school, number of networked schools), on the growth of principal leadership, teacher leadership, and school-level student achievement in cohort B schools during Years 4 and 5. This set of analyses will give us more information about the effectiveness of implementation strategy and support further scale-up, sustainability, and dissemination.

II. The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project

The summative and formative evaluation discussed in the above section indicate the evaluation activities proposed are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project to continue to:

1. Accumulate efficacy results and evidence on the effectiveness of the HIL Model for School Renewal and the design for implementing HIL processes and practices in participating schools
2. Use evaluation data to guide the scale-up efforts
3. Continue to build a solid base—not only the efficacy evidence on principal leadership, teacher leadership and student achievement, but also evidence on implementation—to guide further scale-up, sustainability, and dissemination.

Tables 4 and 5 detail the objective performance measures in the summative and formative evaluation. The characteristics of objective performance measures are reflected in two aspects: First, they are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time-bound. Second, for those measures other than counts, such as principal leadership, teacher leadership, and student achievement, we have quality measurement instruments to ensure that the performance measures are objective. In table 4, we will display the psychometric properties of the instruments that we use. Given the quality of these instruments and the effectiveness of the evaluation work of Years 1 to 3, we will continue to use the same instruments on principal leadership,
teacher leadership, and student achievement in Years 4 to 5. The following tables 4 and 5 illustrate the objective performance measures for summative and formative evaluation.

**Table 4. Objective Performance Measures and Details for Summative (Efficacy) Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Evaluation &amp; Objective Performance Measures</th>
<th>Details of the Objective Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Statistically significantly improved principal leadership | Principal leadership will be measured by two instruments: The first instrument is “Principal Leadership,” a section from Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). Both the principal and teachers will use this instrument to rate “principal leadership”. PISA is a well-recognized tool (OECD, no date, 2017). For example, the reliability for teacher’s view of principal transformational leadership (TCLEAD) was 0.919 for the US sample in 2015 (Buchholz & Jude, 2017).

The second instrument is “Data-informed decision-making high-impact strategies”, an instrument that was developed and validated, and published by our research team with high levels of reliability and validity. Principals will rate themselves using this instrument. When used by the principal for self-assessment, the instrument has alpha reliabilities ranging from .90 to .96 for each subscale and .98 for the whole instrument. Factorial validity is also high with Comparative Fit Index 0.91, Tucker-Lewis Index .90 and standardized, root mean square residual .05 (Shen et al., 2012). It is also highly correlated with those school processes associated with student achievement. |
| Statistically significantly improved teacher leadership | Two instruments will be used for measuring teacher leadership. The first is “Learning-Centered Leadership” (Shen et al., 2018) and the second “Orientation to School Renewal” (Shen et al., 2020). Both instruments were developed, validated, and published by our research team. “Learning-Centered Leadership” has alpha reliabilities ranging from .85 to .92 for each subscale and .97 for the whole instrument. Factorial validity is reasonable with Comparative Fit Index 0.87, Tucker-Lewis Index .86 and standardized, root mean square residual .06 (Shen et al., 2018). The rating on the instrument has a statistically significant positive correlation with student achievement in math and reading.

“Orientation to School Renewal” has alpha reliabilities ranging from .81 to .92 for each subscale and .97 for the whole instrument. Factorial validity is also high with Comparative Fit Index 0.93, Tucker-Lewis Index .91 and standardized, root mean square residual .04 (Shen et al., revise and resubmission). The rating on the instrument has a statistically significant positive correlation with not only the current, but also the gain in student achievement in math and English language arts, measured by M-STEP (Shen et al., 2020). |
| Statistically significantly improved student achievement | Michigan Student Test of Educational Program (M-STEP) measures student achievement in school core content areas. It is developed according to the testing standards by professional associations such as American Educational Research Association (2014). The overall marginal reliability of Grade 3, 4 and 5 in 2017 were from 0.92 to 0.94, and 0.94 for all three grades in 2018. The classification accuracy of the test, ranged between 0.80 to 0.83 for all grades in 2017 and 2018 (Michigan Department of Education, 2017, 2018). We will use ELA data from Grades 3, 4, and 5 as we work with elementary schools to focus on literacy. |
| Statistically significantly positive path coefficients (links) from principal leadership to teacher leadership and student achievement | We will combine the data from Cohort A’s data from points 1 and 2, and Cohort B’s data from points 2 and 3 to conduct a structural equation modeling. |
### Table 5. Objective Performance Measures for Formative Evaluation relating to Implementation of the HIL Model in 75 Cohort B schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Evaluation and Objective Performance Measures</th>
<th>Details of the Objective Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We expect 75/75 schools will develop a robust School Performance Profile and establish priority growth targets for a renewal cycle</td>
<td>The School Performance Profile (SPP) is a comprehensive profile of a school’s strengths and growth edges in five critical areas relative to the focus for school renewal: Student Academic Status, Student Social/Emotional and Behavioral Status, Classroom Practice Status, Leadership and Alignment of Resources and Support, and Coordination with Other Initiatives. The Profile serves as the foundation for identifying targets for the greatest opportunities for student literacy growth for the school to focus on and align supports to achieve. Progress in developing the SPP is monitored in real time through the weekly Facilitator work record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We expect that all Cohort B schools will complete at least one additional cycle of internal School Renewal Rounds after the initial HIL Team School Renewal Rounds in Phase I</td>
<td>The HIL Project will bring an external team of experts into each of the 75 schools in the new cohort to conduct a day of School Renewal Rounds. We developed a guide, HIL School Renewal Rounds Handbook and training modules for facilitators and participants of School Renewal Rounds. Facilitators work with principals and school leadership teams to plan and conduct two or more cycles of School Renewal Rounds per Renewal Cycle augmented by learning walks and “walk-throughs”. Progress toward meeting this goal is monitored through regular facilitator surveys and the APSR (a developmental implementation rubric for the HIL School Renewal Principals, Processes, and Practices).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We expect 75/75 Cohort B schools will develop Student Priority Growth Targets for specific areas of student literacy development for the first HIL School Renewal Cycle</td>
<td>Student Priority Growth Targets are the means by which the HIL Model focuses attention on the highest priority specific aspects of student performance in a given academic area. This is important because schools tend to focus too broadly on growth in student achievement with lagging indicators. The HIL Model requires schools to drill down into benchmark and real-time data to find specific areas where academic growth is needed. Progress in setting a Student Priority Growth Target is monitored in real time through the weekly Facilitator work record and examination of the GSIG (see below), the APSR, and Implementation Monitoring Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We expect 75/75 Cohort B schools will develop and implement a Gold Standard Implementation Guide to align and focus efforts and resources toward achieving a Student Priority Growth Target</td>
<td>HIL Schools demonstrate their learning and application of the Essential Literacy and Math practices through the Gold Standard Implementation Guides (GSIG). For each priority literacy or math practice, the Guides include (a) critical features of the practice; (b) Gold standard teacher behaviors to implement those features; (c) Integrity adaptations created by teacher teams to show how they use school resources to deliver the gold standard teacher behaviors in a manner appropriate for the student population and school context; (d) principal support behaviors to help achieve consistent classroom to classroom implementation; and (e) support behaviors to be provided by instructional coaches and other school or district personnel. Progress in developing and implementing a GSIG is monitored in real time through the weekly Facilitator work record, the APSR and examination of the GSIG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We expect 75/75 Cohort B schools will develop and implement an Implementation Progress Monitoring Plan to monitor and celebrate progress toward achieving student and adult priority growth targets</td>
<td>The Implementation Progress Monitoring Plan establishes measures, benchmarks, timelines, roles and responsibilities and target for each progress indicator in the Gold Standard Implementation Guides. Schools are expected to build these monitoring plans with a combination of benchmark and real-time (classroom) assessment and observational measures of adult behaviors through School Renewal Rounds, Walk-throughs, and other forms of observational data collection. Progress in developing and implementing an Implementation Progress Monitoring Plan is monitored in real time through the weekly Facilitator work record, Observation Data, examination of Monitoring Plans, and the APSR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Evaluation and Objective Performance Measures</td>
<td>Details of the Objective Performance Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We expect 75/75 Cohort B schools will develop a Progress Monitoring Dashboard to support ongoing cycles of School Renewal</td>
<td>A Progress Monitoring Dashboard produces the means for ongoing progress monitoring across several renewal cycles focused on a specific change initiative. After completing the first cycle of School Renewal work to achieve the first set of priority growth targets, schools identify the most critical indicators and measures for ongoing progress monitoring and create either an electronic or hard copy mechanism for bringing all those indicators and measures together in one progress monitoring framework. Progress in developing and implementing a Progress Monitoring Dashboard is monitored in real time through the weekly Facilitator work record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We expect each Cohort B school to identify a district level leader or designate an ISD/ESA instructional division leader, specialist, or coach to support the Cohort B Facilitator, Principal, and Teacher Leaders in the implementation of the HIL School Renewal approach</td>
<td>Participation in, at least one, Facilitator engagement with each Cohort B school per month and participate in HIL Summits will be recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation in any Facilitator workshops, Summits or other HIL sponsored events and activities will be recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitator weekly work records will document the frequency and nature of district personnel participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surveys and feedback form will address participation decisions and experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We expect Region 3 and 7 ISDs/ESAs to designate a member of the instructional division leadership, specialist, or coaching staff to participate in the HIL Facilitator Training and work with Instructional Division leaders to apply elements of the HIL Model in their systems of support for schools</td>
<td>Participation, completion, and feedback from participants, plus follow-up surveys, interviews will provide the measures for this objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are not ready to set targets or benchmarks yet for participation in EduPaths hosted HIL Learning Modules or WMU micro-credentialing until we have a year’s worth of participation data</td>
<td>The EduPaths System logs enrollments, creates transcripts, maintains participation data bases, and collects participant feedback. We will use their data for establishing a year of base-line data after the HIL Learning Modules are launched.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We will work with the WMU College of Education and the Graduate School to establish systems for data collection as the micro-credentialing and prior learning systems are set up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, during years 4 and 5 of the HIL Project, we intend to build on the strong (a) efficacy results and (b) formative evaluation results from years 1-3. The additional funding for Years 4 and 5 will provide a great opportunity to produce more empirical evidence for scaling up and sustainability. The proposed evaluation in Years 4 and 5 will provide (a) more efficacy evidence on student achievement for the scale-up phase by comparing Cohort B and the propensity-score matched group; (b) more empirical evidence on the effect on teacher leadership and principal leadership by comparing within cohort B over three time points, (c) more evidence on possible long-term effects by comparing Cohort A and B in student achievement, (d) more evidence on the possible linkage in the logic model from improved principal leadership to improved teacher leadership as reflected in “learning-centered leadership” and “orientation to school renewal”, and ultimately to improved student achievement; and (e) more empirical evidence to continue refining the model of high-impact leadership for school renewal to improve student achievement.

The arrangements for the responsibilities for evaluation remain the same for Years 4 and 5. Using the carry-over funds and the new funding for Years 4 and 5, the external team at University of Kentucky will be responsible for conducting the summative evaluation independently, while the project team at Western Michigan University will be responsible for the formative evaluation.

See Appendix B: References for cited sources.
### 2. Quality of the Project Design (25 points)

#### I. The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

#### II. The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

**What activities will you undertake to continue to build upon the existing body of work related to the focus of the grant’s activities and share its results with the field?**

**OVERVIEW:** Due to a rigorous formative and summative program evaluation process during years 1-3, the HIL Project was able to create an ongoing and robust stream of both quantitative and qualitative data to inform a feedback loop for watching and adapting to the circumstances, factors, and results that emerged (Please refer to Section I). Based on what we accomplished and learned in years 1-3, the HIL Project has a clear and targeted focus for how we will build upon the work we accomplished and the opportunity to continue to grow, refine, and expand the impact of that work.

**What activities the HIL Project will undertake to continue to build upon the existing body of work related to the focus of the grant’s activities and share its results with the field?** Planned activities for years 4 and 5 under Project renewal funding will focus on four areas: (1) Replication of the HIL Model intervention in new cohort of schools and testing of HIL Project intervention refinements; (2) Continued research and development to further refine and validate the HIL Model for School Renewal; (3) Dissemination and scale-up of the HIL Model for School Renewal within and outside of Michigan; also, scale-up in the application of the HIL Model for School Renewal at the district, ISD/ESA service agency, and State Department of Education levels for continuous improvement; and (4) Developing a Sustainability Network of trained school leaders at the school, district, ISD/ESA, and State levels. Additionally, embedding the HIL School Renewal Model into organizations and systems at local district, ISD/ESA, professional association, University, and Michigan Department of Education levels supported by partnerships and collaborations between those levels. Specifically, the scope of work will include:

#### 1. Replication of the HIL Model intervention in a New Cohort and Testing of Intervention Refinements by:

- a. Working with a new cohort of 75 schools, but with changes to the intervention design to reflect Project refinements and accrued capacity achieved in serving Cohort A
- b. Testing refinements to the 2.0 versions of HIL School Renewal Model materials and resources
- c. Implementing and assessing a school-to-school networking component to the implementation design
- d. Implementing and assessing the participation of a district leader to support the Facilitator and school leadership teams
- e. Continued training and development of an expanded corps of HIL Model Facilitators
- f. Continued monitoring and refinement of systems of support by HIL Management/Coordinating Teams

#### 2. Continued Development and Testing of HIL Model and Intervention Refinements by:

- a. Collaborating with [Educational Chair of Instructional Rounds at the Harvard Graduate School of Education](#) to refine the HIL School Renewal Rounds process
- b. Adding and testing strategies to increase school-to-school networking and monitor the impact
- c. Applying the HIL School Renewal Model to the implementation of evidence-based math instructional practices through partnership with the GELN Math Task Force
- d. Working with the MDE MI-CIP Task Group and State Data Hubs to refine platforms, systems, and processes for developing school performance profiles, monitoring plans and progress monitoring dashboards
- e. Working with the GELN Literacy and Math Task Forces to develop additional models and examples for Gold Standard Implementation Guides
- f. Working with the Michigan Association of School Administrators (MASA) to develop a District level HIL School Renewal Framework
3. **Implementing a system for broader dissemination and scale-up of the HIL Model for School Renewal through:**
   a. Training of school and instructional improvement personnel from the instructional divisions of 16 ISDs/ESAs
   b. Training district leaders for both Cohort A and Cohort B schools to sustain support for schools using the HIL School Renewal approach
   c. Working with school leader professional associations to disseminate the HIL School Renewal approach through their school leader professional development programs
   d. Continuing to develop peer reviewed publications and national conference presentations and publication of a HIL School Renewal Model book through ASCD
   e. Developing and disseminating HIL Model Learning Modules through the EduPaths Educator Professional Learning System (both in and out of state)

4. **Developing a Sustainability System for the HIL School Renewal Model by:**
   a. Working with the Michigan Blueprint Consortium and the Michigan Department of Education to incorporate HIL School Renewal elements into the State Continuous Improvement System (MI-CIP) and the State support system for priority schools
   b. Working with the WMU College of Education and Human Development (CEHD) to provide a badging and micro-credentialing system for facilitator/coaches and school leaders on the HIL Model for School Renewal
   c. Supporting principals and teacher leaders in achieving independent sustainability of the HIL School Renewal Model, Processes, and Practices in their schools
   d. Training and supporting local district and ISD/ESA personnel on applying the HIL Model for School Renewal to their continuous improvement work
   e. Working with the WMU Educational Leadership faculty to apply to the WMU Graduate College for prior learning graduate credits toward graduate degrees in K-12 Educational Leadership for people who complete the HIL School Renewal Model badges and micro-credentials
   f. Establishing a Center for HIL School Renewal through the Tate Center for Educational Research at Western Michigan University to continue research and development funded by both future grants and fee for service revenues
   g. Certifying trained HIL Facilitator/coaches who complete the HIL Project intervention with both Cohorts A and B (150 schools) and develop a certification continuation and renewal process through the WMU Center for HIL School Renewal

In Section 2 of Part II, we will describe specific activities that support areas 1 and 2:

- Replication of the HIL Model intervention in a New Cohort and Testing of Intervention Refinements
- Continued Development and Testing of HIL Model and Intervention Refinements

In Section 3 of Part II, we will describe specific activities that support area 3:

- Implementing a system for broader dissemination and scale-up of the HIL Model for School Renewal through

In Section 4 of Part II, we will describe specific activities that support area 4:

- Developing a Sustainability System for the HIL School Renewal Model

The High Impact Leadership (HIL) Project design is built upon a foundation of implementation success and sustainability for initiatives that actually change student outcomes. Under renewal funding, we will extend and expand the impact of the HIL Model for School Renewal by building upon what we achieved in years 1-3 with activities that support Replication and Testing of Refinements, Continued Research and Development, Dissemination, Scale-up, and Sustainability.
Replication of the HIL Model Intervention in a New Cohort (Cohort B) and Testing Intervention Refinements:

We will provide the HIL Model treatment to 75 new schools across the western half of Michigan’s lower peninsula. In January 2020, we were able to confirm commitments from these schools and have started orienting principals and teachers to the HIL Model for School Renewal by conducting initial School Renewal Rounds, holding orientation sessions and Rounds report-out sessions with staff to:

- Begin establishing positive relations with school leaders and staff
- Orient the school leadership and staff to the HIL strengths-based, growth-focused, and mission/vision driven approach to school change
- Establish an initial understanding of school leadership and literacy conditions.

While providing the HIL School Renewal Model treatment to 75 additional schools, we will:

a. Test the 2.0 versions of HIL School Renewal Model implementation resources and HIL Facilitator development workshops, support, and guides.
b. Test the impact of reducing the amount of Facilitator support to principals and teacher leaders by one-third.
c. Continue to invest in the development of a corps of trained and effective Facilitators who are ready to continue serving the new cohort of 75 schools and will adapt their support to the revised activities for the continuation cycle.
d. Increase the engagement of district and ISD/ESA administrators by training one district or ISD representative for each school in the HIL Model for School Renewal. This will increase the alignment of district initiatives to the specific and urgent needs of each building and foster both the motivation and capacity for the school renewal process.
e. Add the implementation of GELN Essential Math Practices to the implementation of Essential Literacy Practices
f. Add the feature of establishing school-to-school networking arrangements between participating schools from both Cohort A and B. This will add additional learning support for Cohort B principals and teacher leaders while helping principals and teacher leaders from the original treatment schools in Cohort A sustain and grow their command of the HIL School Renewal process and practices.

Continued Development and Testing of HIL Model and Intervention Refinements:

There are specific aspects of the HIL School Renewal Model and the application of that model to the implementation of school and district level change initiatives we will continue to investigate, research, and develop. Those include:

a. In the first three years of the HIL Project, we developed an adaptation of the Harvard Instructional Rounds model, called HIL School Renewal Rounds. We are now collaborating with the Educational Chair of Instructional Rounds at the Harvard Graduate School of Education to continue aligning the HIL School Renewal Rounds process with major findings from the work that Harvard Instructional Rounds researchers are doing to promote systems approaches to the use of instructional rounds. To start that work, we worked with [omitted] to develop a Harvard Rounds and HIL Rounds alignment framework.

b. In the first three years of the HIL Project, we conducted a study in which we found a positive association between school-to-school networking and student achievement when schools partner to assist each other in achieving a student success initiative. As we work with a new Cohort of 75 schools we are adding strategies to increase school-to-school networking. Based on an initial study we completed during year 1, we will further explore how pairing schools to collaborate around implementation of a common change initiative increases implementation success and sustainability, as well as growth in student success.

c. Applying the HIL School Renewal Model to the implementation of evidence-based math instructional practices. In furthering our partnership with the MAISA-GELN task forces for identifying essential evidence-based practices, we will support schools using the HIL School Renewal approach to implementing both the Essential Literacy and Math Practices and add changes in student math performance to the outcome we will study for Cohort B schools.
d. Working with the MDE MI-CIP Task Group and State Data Hubs to refine platforms, systems, and processes for developing school performance profiles, monitoring plans and progress monitoring dashboards. In our work with Cohort A, we found a strong need for better protocols, platforms, and strategies for evidence-based decision making to drive positive school change. We will work with Project collaborators on providing better tools and assessing how schools use these tools to achieve greater implementation success.

e. Working with the GELN Literacy and Math Task Forces to develop additional models and examples for Gold Standard Implementation Guides. These guides played an important role in helping schools align all adult behaviors to support the implementation of evidence-based practice. In expanding both the scope and availability of the GSI Guides, we will be able to further assess how schools use these guides to develop contextually appropriate applications of fidelity behaviors to implement evidence-based practices.

f. Working with the Michigan Association of School Administrators (MASA) to develop a District level HIL School Renewal Framework. Michigan has shifted to a continuous improvement model that starts with a District plan. In working with Cohort A schools, we found that these district plans do not always align well with the School Renewal approach as they, generally, are developed from a deficit and problem based frame. District leaders are expressing interest in shifting to the asset and strengths-based approach of the HIL School Renewal Model. Thus, we plan to work with MASA and MDE to develop these adaptations to district continuous improvement approaches. This will be an additional area of study in our research agenda as well.

The above activities will ensure continued research and development of the HIL Model for School Renewal and the HIL Project school-level intervention for principals and teacher leaders. They will also support the activities described in the sections on Scale-up and Sustainability.

I. How the Design for Implementing and Evaluating the Proposed Project will Result in Information to Guide Replication

As described in Section II (1) of this renewal application, the HIL Project research team has set high expectations for the rigor of any evaluation designed to inform the progress and accomplishments of the Project. To inform implementation of the activities described above and in the next two sections, the Project PIs, Management Team, Coordinators and Facilitators will continue to augment the work of external evaluators with a robust formative (process) evaluation strategy through which we will continue to gain insights and important understandings to support real-time adaptations and refinements. Some key mechanisms for establishing a robust feedback loop and supporting the various lines of inquiry associated with Model development and implementation are:

a. Continuing to use a weekly Facilitator work record reporting system that provides data on implementation progress and the nature of how that progress is achieved.
b. Continuing to embed feedback mechanisms in both Facilitator workshops and participant summits.
c. Enhance and add feedback mechanisms for engagements with Project partners and collaborators.
d. Conduct additional studies on (a) teacher leader development; (b) change in practicing principal practice; (c) school-to-school networking processes and impacts; (d) adapting the principles of instructional rounds to a systems approach for School Renewal Rounds; and (e) the utility of treating implementation Fidelity and Integrity as separate, but interdependent, implementation constructs.
e. Continuing to monitor the progress each school is making toward achieving the HIL Project objectives associated with a given student literacy or math priority growth target through the HIL School Renewal Process deliverables (School Performance Profiles, Student Priority Growth Targets aligned with Adult Priority Growth Targets, Gold Standard Implementation Guides, Implementation Monitoring Plans, and Progress Monitoring Dashboards)
f. Continuing to use validated instruments to assess development of school renewal leadership and analyze sub-scale data to understand patterns of leadership development across time

g. Work with project partners and collaborators to track rate, degree, and impact of dissemination

h. Work with project participants, partners, and collaborators to assess the commitment to and capacity for sustaining the HIL School Renewal Model, Processes, and Practices as a school and district level approach to continuous improvement through the implementation of evidence-based change initiatives
i. Track the emergence of a diverse pool of potential school leaders through the development of teacher leaders to assist the principal in leading school renewal change and cultivating school renewal leadership practices within a shared leadership culture.

The adaptive approach through continuous progress monitoring will continue to support both the implementation of designed Project activities and the refinement of those activities as progress monitoring feedback is analyzed and used to develop real-time responses. The continued inclusion of Project participants, Facilitators, Coordinators, PIs and Management Team members, Project Partners, and other stakeholders in progress monitoring activity will further expand broad-based “ownership” and investment, as well as interest in replication. We experienced a rapid expansion of interest, endorsement, and motivation for replication through this process during years 1-3 and are confident that maintaining this approach will continue to (1) produce valuable understandings to guide ongoing Project and Model development; (2) establish important understandings of the ways and means for replication, and (3) generate motivation and commitment to replication opportunities.

In summary, the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed HIL Project renewal work will result in additional information to guide replication. Through implementation with a new cohort of 75 schools, we will refine various useful tools for replication. Through formative and summative evaluation, we will follow information to guide replication by providing:

a. More efficacy evidence on student achievement for the scale-up phase by comparing Cohort B schools and the propensity-score matched group of schools.
b. More empirical evidence on the effect on principal and teacher (school-wide) leadership by comparing within Cohort B over three time points.
c. More evidence on possible long-term effects by comparing Cohort A and B in student achievement.
d. More evidence on the possible linkage in the logic model from improved principal leadership to improved teacher leadership as reflected in the “Learning Centered Leadership” and “Orientation to School Renewal” measures and, ultimately to improved student achievement.
e. More empirical evidence to continue refining the “Model of High Impact Leadership for School Renewal” to improve student achievement.

II. How the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

The proposed Project design for years 4 and 5 is all about building capacity and yielding results. First, in serving Cohort B in a modified way based on learning and results from Cohort A of 75 treatment schools, we identified specific Project replication adjustments and refinements. These include:

a. Strategies to reduce participating principals’ and teacher leaders’ degree and duration of reliance on the HIL Facilitator to help the school learn, practice, and embed evidence-based school renewal leadership practices.
b. Testing the HIL School Renewal approach on the implementation of Essential Math Practices as well as Essential Literacy Practices.
c. Continued refinement of HIL Model learning and support resources, examples, and tools.
d. Developing personnel at a district and ISD/ESA level to support ongoing sustainability of the HIL School Renewal approach.
e. Open and free access to HIL Model, Process, and Practice Learning Modules through EduPaths.
f. Micro-credentialing of school leaders, trainers, and consultants to provide ongoing support for sustaining the HIL School Renewal Model and approach.
g. Working with the Project Partners at MDE to align the HIL School Renewal approach to the Michigan continuous improvement (MI-CIP) and Blueprint processes and platforms.
h. Publishing research findings and a book on the HIL School Renewal approach to augment the Learning Modules and micro-credentialing of persons who apply that learning in real school settings.
Second, the HIL Project will build capacity and yield results by establishing processes and timelines for specific activities to implement and test intervention adjustments and refinements and to sustain the dissemination and utilization of the HIL Model for School Renewal beyond the period of federal assistance:

- By fall 2020, we will open enrollment through the EduPaths System in the first of six HIL School Renewal Learning Modules for school leadership teams. Our arrangement with EduPaths provides access across and beyond Michigan to the HIL Model Learning Modules with State of Michigan Continuing Education credits and provisions for interfacing with badging and micro-credentialing through Western Michigan University (see EduPaths contract).

- In fall 2020, we will apply for inclusion of the HIL School Renewal Learning Modules badging and micro-credentialing under the Western Michigan University Graduate College provisions for credits toward the WMU Educational Leadership MA, EdS, and PhD degrees via prior learning assessments. This will allow the HIL Project to promote the HIL School Renewal Micro-credentials as a pathway toward an Educational Leadership degree. By spring 2021, we will complete plans for operating a HIL School Renewal Center through the WMU College of Education and Human Development (CEHD) funded by additional replication grants and fee-based services for training, consulting, and micro-credentialing.

Third, the HIL Project will build capacity and yield results through the power of its evidence-based processes and practices for school renewal to achieve student success. The HIL approach represents a departure from deficit and problem focused change initiatives and fragmented, misaligned, and contextually mismatched implementation processes. As illustrated in Figure 6, below, The HIL School Renewal approach is a tightly aligned, positively framed, and robust model for school change to improve outcomes for all students.

*Tight Alignment:* Each phase aligns the focus for growth in students with the growth in teacher classroom practice and the growth in school leadership and support conditions. In communicating about the HIL approach, Project PIs often compare the HIL approach to the alignment and fit characteristics of Russian nesting or stacking dolls—starting with a clear vision for how students will demonstrate learning success as the outer most doll, then moving inward to what teacher practice looks like to achieve that student manifestation of...
learning; then, further in to what the leadership practices look like to achieve and sustain the required teaching practice.

**Positive Framing:** The HIL approach operates around a Positive Core to sustain the strengths-based, growth focused, and appreciative process that connects the school’s mission to a vision for positive change. The Positive Core is further enhanced by an appreciative lens for seeing opportunity and a culture of collective ownership, interdependence and shared leadership that form the beating heart of the school.

**Robust Evidence-based and Organizational Learning processes:** As Figure six illustrates, each phase of the HIL School Renewal Process is guided by deep analysis of multiple forms of school and student data to identify strengths and growth edges, to establish priority growth targets, to develop implementation guides and monitoring plans, and to create a progress monitoring dashboard of key progress indicators and measures. Throughout each phase, the use of leading and lagging indicators and real-time and post-hoc measures is key.

Figure 6 illustrates how the four HIL Leadership Principles for School Renewal play out across a five phase renewal cycle. Each phase produces specific deliverables that move the school systematically toward implementation of a research-based student success change initiative.

**Figure 6. The HIL School Renewal Model for Alignment and Deliverables to Achieve Implementation Success**
3. **Strategy to Scale (25 points)**

   **I. The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of populations.**

   **II. The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.**

What activities will you undertake to use renewal funds to build upon and scale successful aspects of the grant project to benefit a larger segment of educators and students at schools not included in the original project?

**OVERVIEW:** In years 4/5 of the HIL Project, we will focus on building upon (a) the number of high needs schools and students we impact; (b) the number and diversity of people who share the work of high impact leadership in schools; (c) the opportunity to enhance the pipeline for school leadership by increasing the effectiveness of practicing principals and developing teacher leaders who share the commitment and capacity to lead positive school change. We will use the refinements to the HIL Model for School Renewal we created by working with over 400 principals and teacher leaders in Cohort A and continue to refine that work as we engage with 400 more through Cohort B. Moreover, we will use the power of state-wide partnerships and collaborations to provide broad access to schools all over Michigan and beyond to the HIL School Renewal Model for High Integrity and Fidelity Implementation of evidence-based student success initiatives. The following provides additional information on the list of Project renewal activities described in Section II (2) to achieve the Renewal Project design:

1. **Dissemination of the HIL Model for School Renewal through:**

   a. *Training of school and instructional improvement personnel from the instructional divisions of 16 ISDs/ESAs.* Eight of the 16 west Michigan ISDs/ESAs already have one or more instructional division staff trained on and using the HIL Model for School Renewal as part of their system of support for schools in their services areas. This support includes instructional coaching, school improvement, and curriculum/assessment development. Thus, the training of ISD/ESA personnel has the potential for influencing the leadership approaches and practices for practicing and developing school leaders.

   b. *Training district leaders for both Cohort A and Cohort B schools to sustain support for schools using the HIL School Renewal approach.* While we invited and encouraged district level leaders to engage with the HIL Facilitators and School Renewal Processes and to participate in the work of implementing the HIL School Renewal approach in their participating schools, we did not require that participation. As we work with the new Cohort of 75 schools we will require it. If the district is too small to dedicate a district leader to this participation, they will be allowed to designate a trained ISD/ESA support person to fulfill that role as long as they agree to liaison with that person for alignment of district support.

   c. *Working with school leader professional associations to disseminate the HIL School Renewal approach through their school leader professional development programs.* In years 1-3, we saw a gradually increasing interest in featuring the HIL School Renewal work at association state conferences. Additionally, the association executive directors all committed to supporting the Project for the full five years and disseminating information and results. Going forward, we will work with them to identify where elements of the School Renewal approach (such as Appreciative Inquiry and School Renewal Rounds) can fit into their established principal and district leader development programs for alternative certification and specialty endorsements.
d. Working with the WMU Educational Leadership faculty to apply to the WMU Graduate College for prior learning graduate credits toward graduate degrees in K-12 Educational Leadership for people who complete the HIL School Renewal Model badges and micro-credentials. In March, the WMU Faculty Senate approved a framework and process for awarding prior learning credits toward graduate degree programs. In September, the HIL Project will finalize a proposal with WMU Educational Leadership Faculty to seek WMU Graduate College approval for a prior learning credit arrangement with the HIL Model micro-credentialing system.

e. Continuing to develop peer reviewed publications and national conference presentations and publication of a HIL School Renewal Model book through ASCD. [Redacted name] is a WMU endowed research chair and full professor in Educational Leadership and Research with seven books and more than 100 peer reviewed publications and presentations in his vita. [Redacted name] is a WMU full professor in Educational Leadership and Research with her own list of peer reviewed publications, presentations, and book chapters. She is also principle author of the School ADvance System for School and District Leader Performance Assessment and Evaluation, adopted by the State of Michigan as one of three approved systems and adopted by just under 80% of Michigan Districts with some distribution in New Jersey, New York, and Virginia. These two scholars are supported by a young, but talented group of researchers who assist in formative evaluation design, develop of inquiry lines and development of research studies and manuscripts. With their established research credentials and the efficacy findings from years 1-3 of the HIL Project, they anticipate the ability to generate interest in a book for publication and national distribution.

2. Scale-up of the HIL School Renewal approach by:
   a. Working with the Michigan Blueprint Consortium and the Michigan Department of Education to incorporate HIL School Renewal elements into the State Continuous Improvement System (MI-CIP) and the State support system for priority schools. The HIL PIs and Project Directors have held several meetings and work sessions to set the stage for the collaboration to incorporate elements of the HIL School Renewal Model into the State’s systems for guiding continuous improvement at the district and school levels. Next steps are identified and will include working with the MI-CIP platform developers to provide schools using the HIL School Renewal approach with an aligned platform and aligned tools for their work.

   b. Working with the MAISA EduPaths educator professional development on-line learning system to develop and distribute HIL School Renewal Model learning modules and provide State continuing education credits. Edupaths has established robust systems for developing and providing learning modules in series formats to educators in and outside of Michigan. They developed the Essential Literacy Practices Learning Modules and are now working on Learning Modules for the Essential Math Practices with the GELN Math Task Force and the HIL School Renewal Learning Modules with HII Project PIs, directors, coordinators, and facilitators. We have developed all the graphics for the modules, the scope and sequence of content, and outline storyboards. We are in progress and on target to complete the first four by September 30 and the last two by mid-December, 2020. These Learning Modules will greatly expand access to the HIL School Renewal Model, Process, and Practices across Michigan and beyond. They are being designed to engage principals and teacher leaders as school change and implementation teams; thus, extending our capacity to influence the pipeline for emerging school leaders.

   c. Working with the WMU College of Education and Human Development (CEHD) to provide a badging and micro-credentialing system for facilitator/coaches and school leaders on the HIL Model for School Renewal.
I. **The feasibility of successful replication of the proposed project, if favorable results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of populations.**

**Feasibility of successful replication.** The following strategies will contribute to the feasibility of replication:

a. We tested the HIL School Renewal approach for achieving positive change in student achievement and school leadership conditions in 75 Cohort A schools and achieved statistically significant on three validated measures of leadership after 24 months of treatment and statistically positive results on ELA achievement after only 15 months of treatment. Those first 75 schools and the new Cohort B of 75 schools encompass the full range of district and school sizes and demographics of Michigan schools that serve populations of economically disadvantaged students. By the end of Cohort B, we will permeate the elementary level schools in one of Michigan’s largest urban districts, along with some of the State’s most rural and impoverished communities. By using a propensity score-matching for comparing the results for Cohort B schools with a state-wide sample of matched comparable schools, we will be able to expand the range of settings and populations even further.

b. By expanding the scope of student success indicators addressed with Cohort B to include math performance along with ELA performance, we will be expanding the implications for feasible successful replication given the above referenced approach to evidence of impact. Additionally, we are adding State approved interim assessments to our student success measures along with year-end State assessments to increase sensitivity to actionable data for both ELA and Math growth.

c. Incorporation of the HIL Model for School Renewal into the Michigan Continuous Improvement (MI-CIP) process and expanding the number of local districts and intermediate services agencies (IDSS/ESAs) with instructional and improvement coaches trained on the HIL School Renewal approach, we will even further expand the number and variety of settings in which the HIL approach to continuous improvement can be applied.

d. Commitments from district, ISD/ESA, leaders professional association to learn and incorporate the HIL Model elements in their systems of support for principals and teacher leaders at a school level significantly increase the feasibility of replication. The State Superintendent, Michael Rice, has announced that he is looking to support change initiatives with evidence of efficacy for raising student achievement, especially in literacy and math. MDE is already recognizing the results achieved in years 1-3 of the HIL Project and stepping up to acknowledge the HIL School Renewal approach through the MI-CIP system.

**Feasibility of achieving favorable results in a variety of settings and with a variety of populations.**

The Design for the proposed renewal project starts with a Model that yielded positive (i.e. favorable) results on the two efficacy indicators when implemented with a first Cohort of 75 schools in Cohort A. That cohort was comprised of schools serving low S.E.S. student populations from some of the most isolated and rural to the most densely urban regions of Michigan. Moreover, the entire HIL Model for School Renewal is built upon research findings that are either directly and positively associated with student achievement, directly and positively associated with adult and organizational change, and directly and positively associated with building motivation and capacity for adaptive change—again in a wide range of settings with a wide range of populations. Given the opportunity to conduct another round of efficacy testing in an equally diverse second Cohort of 75 schools and follow the success trajectory of the first Cohort of 75 schools will go a long way to test again for favorable results and expand the potential for both further replication and vetting.
II. The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Mechanisms to broadly disseminate and support further development and replication. The HIL Project design for the renewal period also builds upon strategies used with considerable impact in years 1-3 and include:

a. The HIL Project has already produced a significant number of research studies, publications, and presentations for national dissemination. We have established lines of inquiry for the efficacy of the school renewal approach, the development of teacher leaders, school-to-school networking, and the validation of school renewal leadership measures. We will continue to expand upon this body of research supported scholarship as a means to disseminate the work and findings from the HIL Project.

b. We have completed a 2.0 version of HIL School Renewal guides, materials and tools. During the renewal period, we will be translating this body of work into a published book. With the significant number of research publications and the efficacy findings from our work with Cohort A, we expect to have strong interest in a book arrangement and have started to explore ASCD as the publisher. The Project PIs have produced and contributed chapters to a number of education leadership books in the past.

c. Through the EduPaths system with provisions for State Continuing Education Credits and a system of badging and micro-credentialing, we expect to increase the rate and degree of dissemination in schools, both in within Michigan schools and outside of Michigan. EduPaths is known for delivering high quality professional learning opportunities for K-12 educators. Through their affiliation with the National Association of School Administrators, the EduPaths collaborating partners have distribution capacity across the U.S.

d. Our collaboration and partnership with the MAISA-GELN Literacy and Math task forces ensure that adopters of the Essential Literacy and Math practices will know about and have access to the HIL Renewal approach for achieving High Integrity and Fidelity Implementation (HIFI) of the Literacy and Math Essentials. Researchers from the University of Michigan and Michigan State University who worked with the GELN Task Forces to isolate evidence-based literacy and math instructional practices are working with the HIL Project to produce “Gold Standard Implementation Guides” that use the HIL School Renewal “vital behaviors” approach to isolate critical classroom instruction, leadership, and school support behaviors to achieve targeted student outcomes. The GSIS tool is being broadly utilized across the State and raising further replication opportunity.

e. Working with MDE to incorporate HIL School Renewal elements into the Michigan Continuous Improvement Process (MI-CIP) and to develop a MI-CIP platform that supports schools using the HIL School Renewal approach will serve to firmly establish the HIL approach as an option for schools across Michigan. We will be able to identify schools that select the HIL School Renewal reporting platform for MI-CIP to track the distribution of the HIL approach throughout the State along with any performance differences.

f. Working with the WMU Graduate College and CEHD, we will be able to offer micro-credentialing for school leaders and potential facilitator/coaches to demonstrate sufficient command of the HIL Renewal Model, Processes, and Practices to, both, replicate in their own schools, school districts, and educational service agencies and/or assist leaders in other contexts to do so. Along with broad access to the EduPaths HIL Model learning modules, this option for those who wish to demonstrate ability to apply the HIL Model in real school settings will further enhance the dissemination and replication.

g. The ability to replicate and evaluate the HIL Project intervention with a new Cohort of 75 schools (Cohort B) under the SEED renewal grant will provide both the summative and formative results to further develop HIL Model implementation resources and processes. Replication in a new cohort will also provide further opportunity to study and report on HIL Model impact.
4. Adequacy of Resources (25 points)

I. The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

II. The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding.

How would your project use renewal funding to develop or enhance capacity in the key areas (human, material, structural, and organizational) necessary to transition successful aspects of the project into system-wide improvements?

OVERVIEW: In years 4/5 of the HIL Project, we will focus on saturating the K-12 school leadership community in western Michigan with the HIL School Renewal Model, Process, and Practices and expanding into the rest of Michigan and beyond with Model dissemination and scale-up strategies described in Section II (2, & 3). Additional renewal activities to support this expansion include the following will address Developing a Sustainability System through:

1. Development of Human Capacity
   a. Supporting principals and teacher leaders in achieving independent sustainability of the HIL School Renewal Model, Processes, and Practices in their schools
   b. Supporting district leaders and ISD/ESA personnel in achieving sustainable command of the Principles, Processes and Practices of the HIL Model and establishing ways to apply those aspects to their particular roles in supporting member schools
   c. Micro-credentialing school leaders and facilitator/coaches who complete the HIL School Renewal learning module assessments, so they can develop new capacity for leading and co-leading the work of continuous improvement through high integrity and fidelity implementation of evidence-based student success initiatives

2. Development of Material Capacity
   a. Continuing to conduct inquiry that feeds further development of the HIL Model for School Renewal
   b. Continuing to issue new versions of HIL School Renewal Manuals, Tools, and Resources as they are developed in response to formative evaluation feedback
   c. Completing development of the HIL School Renewal Learning Modules
   d. Developing and validating additional assessment tools to assist school leaders in achieving independent command of and ability to apply the Principles, Processes, and Practices of HIL School Renewal in a variety of school and district contexts
   e. Continuing to publish and make conference presentations on research related to the implementation and efficacy of the HIL Model

3. Development of Structural Capacity
   a. Working with MDE and MAISA Data Hubs to develop school performance profile, monitoring plan, and progress monitoring dashboard interfaces and templates
   b. Working to incorporate HIL School Renewal elements into the MI-CIP system for continuous improvement

4. Development of Organizational Capacity
   a. Continuing regular schedules and processes for engaging with Project Partners
   b. Continuing to update and enhance elements of the HIL Project Communications System
   c. Continuing to refine aspects of the HIL Project management systems as formative feedback indicates
   d. Continuing to coordinate and align the work of a WMU Project Management Team, the field-based Coordinating Team, and the distributed Facilitator Team
   e. Utilizing the working relationship with WMU Educational Leadership faculty, the CEHD Dean and assistant deans, and the HIL Team to offer the HIL School Renewal micro-credentialing, prior learning credit
f. Establishing a Center for HIL School Renewal through the Tate Center for Educational Research at Western Michigan University to continue research and development funded by both future grants and fee for service revenues

By utilizing renewal funding to further develop and enhance **system-wide capacity** across the factors (see above) that will support broader application and sustainability of the HIL Model for School Renewal, we can also **make sustainable impact at multiple levels of the educational system as follows:**

1. **At the School Level** – Renewal funding will allow us to train, develop, and support 400 additional people (school teams from 75 Cohort B schools) to sustainable independence in the application of the HIL School Renewal approach to the implementation of evidence-based student success initiatives in their schools. This means that 400 additional current and developing school leaders will have the capacity to implement the HIL School Renewal approach in any school they serve. Since the HIL Model provides a set of “vital” leadership behaviors, school leaders can also work with new staff to develop the orientation to school renewal and practice the behaviors associated with the renewal approach and positively associated with student achievement.

2. **At the School District Level** – Districts that host participating Cohort B schools are expected to assign a district level leader to learn and support the HIL School Renewal approach as part of the District approach to continuous improvement. This will enhance the alignment between district level and school level improvement work while honoring the need for each school to use school-based data and collaborative learning processes to guide the way they implement school change.

3. **At the Intermediate Service Agency (ISD/ESA) Level** – Each Michigan school district affiliates with an intermediate service agency (ISD/ESA) for many areas of support and technical assistance as an extension of the Michigan Department of Education (MDE). Under renewal funding, we will be able to expand our support for training and developing instructional and school improvement coaches to apply the principles of the HIL School Renewal Model in their work with all member schools—not just those schools directly served by the HIL Project. The instructional division of the 16 ISDs that support western Michigan have already committed to this training and are encouraging their counterparts in the other half of Michigan to do the same.

4. **At the School Leader Professional Association Level** – The State professional associations for school and district/ISD/ESA levels are all partner in the HIL Project with many members directly involved as participants, Coordinators, and Facilitators. This generates a wide range of options for dissemination and sustaining interest in the HIL Project and School Renewal approach. These associations provide critical Project development, implementation, and feedback collaborators. They are also a powerful venue through which the HIL Project can disseminate the work to both State and national audiences.

5. **At the State Level** – The Michigan Department of Education of Education (MDE) Office of Continuous Improvement has committed to incorporating elements of the HIL approach to School Renewal into the next revision of the Michigan Continuous Improvement Process (MI-CIP) and they have authorized the MI-CIP reporting platform developers to work with the HIL Project to offer an adapted version of the MI-CIP platform that aligns with the HIL School Renewal approach.

6. **At the National Level** – The replication, dissemination and scale-up strategies outlined in this proposal for renewal funding will provide the means by which the HIL Project can verify and deepen evidence of efficacy for the HIL Model, support continued research and development, and build the infrastructure for long-term sustainability. Specifically, the HIL Project will be able to complete the process of testing the HIL Model with some added features, broadening the application of the model across the State through the recognition and integration into the MDE MI-CIP system, certifying trained Facilitators, and establishing an ongoing system of support through WMU.
I. The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends, including, as appropriate, the demonstrated commitment of appropriate entities to such support.

By the time we complete years 4/5 of the HIL Project, we will have established the HIL Model for School Renewal in 150 schools we directly serve and created the dissemination, scale-up, and support capacity to influence broader replication across and outside of Michigan. We will end year five having directly trained, at least, 150 independent, district, and ISD/ESA facilitator/coaches to support implementation of the HIL School Renewal Model by school principals and teacher leaders. Additionally, we will have established a micro-credentialing and on-learning system for training new leaders and facilitator/coaches and providing ongoing support for those already trained and using the HIL approach in their schools and districts. Finally, we have secured renewed and additional support and participation commitments as follows:

1. As indicated by the linked support letters (Region 3 letter & Region 7 letter), the 16 ISDs of Michigan’s regions 3 and 7 have been and will continue to be full partners in the efforts to expand and sustain the impact of the HIL Model for School Renewal. To this end, ISD officials are committed to working with the HIL Project to access training for members of their instructional staffs and to engage with the trained HIL Facilitators for ongoing exchange of ideas, examples, and applications of the HIL School Renewal approach. These ISDs/ESAs will also continue to provide cost-share associated with the involvement of on-loan Coordinators and Facilitators and other instructional/school improvement staff and activities that support HIL Project schools.

2. As indicated by the linked letter from MDE MI-CIP officials, the Michigan Department of Education has committed to the incorporation of HIL School Renewal elements and processes in the State’s continuous improvement system. Also see the linked letter from MAISA, MI-CIP platform developers.

3. As indicated by their Cohort B participation commitments secured prior to the start of the HIL Project, the district leaders and principals for the new Cohort of 75 schools are seeking to achieve independent implementation of the HIL School Renewal approach to achieve high integrity and fidelity implementation of evidence-based student success initiatives. They have committed to identifying and developing the capacity of teacher leaders to achieve shared leadership for school renewal in their schools. In October of 2019, the superintendents and principals of each Cohort B school attended a Project update meeting in which they reviewed the details of participation for the renewal period and recommitted through signed feedback forms.

4. As indicated by the linked letter from the leadership of the Reading Now Network (RNN), this State-wide collaboration for student success will continue to endorse and support the dissemination of the HIL School Renewal Model for achieving implementation success of research-supported Literacy (and Math) student success initiatives across Michigan’s schools and districts.

5. As indicated by the linked letters from MASA, MEMSPA, and MASSP, the state associations for school leaders will continue to support and endorse the work of the HIL Project through their association communications and professional learning activities.

6. As indicated by the linked letter from the WMU CEHD Dean, the CEHD will continue to support the HIL Project in establishing a system of micro-credentialing and prior learning credits under WMU guidelines and continue to support the pursuit of funding to move toward establishing a Center for School Renewal Leadership.
II. The potential for incorporating project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding

Under the Project Renewal design, we will firmly embed the HIL School Renewal Model into the work of several agencies or organizations, including all the Cohort A and B schools and districts that achieve high integrity and fidelity implementation of the HIL approach. To increase the likelihood of sustained use of the HIL School Renewal approach, the HIL Project renewal plan includes other organizational commitments to incorporate the project purposes, activities, and benefits into ongoing programs or systems as follows (see next page):

1. The collaboration between the WMU HIL Project and the MAISA EduPaths system will ensure that leaders and aspiring leaders in the field will have ongoing access to HIL School Renewal Model Learning Modules. Further collaboration with the MDE Office of Professional Preparation will enable completers of the HIL Learning Modules to earn State Continuing Education Credits. Access to these learning modules will be free for Michigan educators, but earning micro-credentials as indicated below, will occur on a fee basis to cover the cost of credentialing assessments and maintaining credentialing transcripts.

2. Western Michigan University will institute a badging and micro-credentialing system in conjunction with the Graduate College prior learning assessment system so that educators who complete the HIL Learning Modules and Assessments will be able to gain micro-credentials and convert those micro-credentials into graduate credits toward an educational leadership degree program. Fees from enrolling in the micro-credentialing system will sustain the ability to provide micro-credentialing assessments and transcripts.

3. Western Michigan University hosts the HIL Project as part of the Tate Center for Educational Research and the Department of Educational Leadership, Research, and Technology. Plans to provide HIL School Renewal Implementation Facilitator/Coaching certifications and HIL School Renewal Model micro-credentialing will be incorporated into the ongoing work of the HIL Project research and management team and sustained through a fee-based training and development structure along with revenues from future scale-up and dissemination grants.

4. The HIL Project PIs have put together a strong research team and management team. The Project has a robust operating system and structure managed by a small, but highly effective, team. The secret to the capacity of the HIL Project is the organizational structure of field Coordinators and Facilitators, who either work as on-loan project personnel from ISDs, ESAs, local districts, and school leader professional associations, or serve as recently retired, highly accomplished school leaders from across the State. Their passion and commitment for the work has created a large community of HIL Project advocates, agents, and providers. This community has earned the respect of Project partners and organizations. Together, with those partner organizations, we have created extensive agency and advocacy for the work of this Project and future HIL School Renewal Projects.

5. Four of the 16 ISDs/ESAs have already incorporated the HIL School Renewal Principles into their system of school support for member schools through their instructional divisions (KRESA, OAISD, SJISD, and VBISD). The others, as indicated by their support letters (see above) are committed to incorporating HIL School Renewal Principles and Practices into the work of their instructional division personnel and are likely to follow the lead of the other four by embedding the HIL Principles, Processes, and Practices into their instructional division support systems as well to complement the work they already do with the MI-CIP, Blueprint, and other major school change initiatives (e.g. MTSS, MiBLSI, etc.).

6. Incorporating the HIL School Renewal Modell into the Michigan Department of Education’s systems, processes and platforms for continuous improvement and ESSA compliance will provide another organizational context for sustaining the work. This will establish the HIL School Renewal Model as a State vetted and authorized option for Michigan schools to meet State continuous improvement requirements under ESSA.