



Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center

News for the Region

A quarterly e-newsletter for educators in Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio

Common Core Standards Are Ready. Are We?

Spring 2010

June 2010 marks a historic event in education in the United States. The national standards movement finally has culminated in the release of the Common Core State Standards by the National Governors Association (NGA) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). The development of these standards has been debated, discussed, and scrutinized in many education circles and forums during the last year. Today, a set of new standards for mathematics and English language arts is finally available for every classroom in the country. Are we ready to deliver the standards to our students?

Approximately 30 states across the country are beginning the process of adopting the standards in their entirety, with the option to add another 15 percent. The Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center has been supporting states, helping them think about how to localize the Common Core State Standards. In May, state teams and representatives from Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio were among 250 participants attending a two-day institute hosted by Learning Point Associates in partnership with CCSSO. They learned about the adoption process and engaged in intense guided-planning processes to get themselves started with a comprehensive implementation plan (see p. 3). State teams worked to delineate specific action steps in the areas of curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development. A special report on p. 7 presents helpful perspectives, from Ohio, on how to begin localizing the Common Core State Standards. The Ohio Department of Education, in collaboration with Great Lakes East, held regional meetings to engage stakeholders in the review of the standards' drafts and to offer suggestions for implementation. As your state continues to plan the adoption of the new standards, the [resources from these articles and from the May institute](#) can be particularly helpful.

This is an exciting time in education; let's all ensure that the quality of education is uniform across the states and puts students on the path to global success and exemplar achievement.

Barbara Youngren, Director
Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center
and Great Lakes East staff members

Vol. 5, No. 2 In This Issue

Highlights of the Quarter

ESEA Reauthorization Hearings	2
Common Core Institute	3
Annual Advisory Meeting	4
Annual Leveraging Resources Conference	5
International Day at NSTA.....	6

Special Reports

Where Are We With the CCSS?.....	7
REL Midwest Briefs Focus on HCRM ...	10
Hiring Quality School Principals.....	11

Focus on States.....

Learn From the State Managers
About Current Great Lakes East
Work in Indiana, Michigan, and
Ohio.

In the News.....

Read Select News From Indiana,
Michigan, Ohio, and the Nation.

Resources.....

Learn About Newly Available Research
and Reports Related to NCLB.

Calendar of Events.....

[E-Mail This Newsletter](#)

[Subscribe](#)

[Unsubscribe](#)

[Send Feedback](#)

This quarterly e-newsletter delivers useful, relevant and timely information related to the NCLB Act to educators in the three states of the Great Lakes East region: Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio.

Great Lakes East
Comprehensive Center

at  **LEARNING POINT**
Associates®

630-649-6548 | www.learningpt.org/greatlakeeast/
Learning Point Associates
1120 East Diehl Road, Suite 200
Naperville, Illinois 60563-1486



Highlights of the Quarter

ESEA Reauthorization Hearings Cover a Range of Critical Topics

By Trish Brennan-Gac, Counsel and Policy Advisor, Learning Point Associates

During a three-month period from March through May 2010, the U.S. Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions (HELP) conducted [a series of eight hearings and roundtable discussions](#) to explore specific topics related to the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Almost every hearing featured a variety of education stakeholders including students, teachers, principals, district leaders, researchers, and leaders from business and nonprofit organizations.

Each speaker's remarks focused on his or her organization's work and the lessons learned through its efforts to improve our nation's schools. Many speakers offered specific recommendations for the ESEA reauthorization. Although each hearing concentrated on a particular theme, it is no surprise that many individual testimonies covered multiple issues such as a focus on teachers and leaders and the use of data to improve instruction. This natural convergence of common themes stresses integration of programs and approaches and shows flexibility in the use of funds.

One area in which policymakers are clearly struggling is the topic of meeting the needs of students and schools in rural communities. In the Great Lakes East region, there are large rural communities where many initiatives and approaches are working successfully. We encourage you to [share with us](#) any successful strategies you and your education leaders are employing in your states.

Following are the topics listed for each hearing with a link to the HELP Committee's Web page where you can watch a recording of the hearing or download a particular speaker's testimony. In addition, a Key Remarks page is provided for each hearing, which highlights particular quotes from each speaker to help you identify which testimonies you may want to read in their entirety.

Date of the Hearing	Topic	Selected Statements	Full Hearing
March 9, 2010	The Importance of World-Class K–12 Education for Our Economic Success	Key Remarks (PDF)	Full testimonies
March 17, 2010	The Obama Administration's Reauthorization Priorities	Key Remarks (PDF)	Full testimony and video
April 13, 2010	School Turnaround	Key Remarks (PDF)	Full testimonies and video
April 15, 2010	Teachers and Leaders	Key Remarks (PDF)	Full testimonies and video
April 22, 2010	Meeting the Needs of the Whole Student	Key Remarks (PDF)	Full testimonies and video
April 28, 2010	Standards and Assessments	Key Remarks (PDF)	Full testimonies and video
April 29, 2010	Meeting the Needs of Special Populations	Key Remarks (PDF)	Full testimonies and video
May 4, 2010	Improving America's Secondary Schools	Key Remarks (PDF)	Full testimonies and video



Institute Helps States Begin Localizing the Common Core State Standards

By Jennifer Reed, Program Specialist, Learning Point Associates

On May 5–6, 2010, Learning Point Associates and the Chief Council of State School Officers (CCSSO) held an institute to help states and districts develop strategies for local implementation of the Common Core State Standards. The institute provided participants with tools, strategies, research, and resources to aid in standards development.

When asked about the critical importance of the core standards, Ted Stilwill, chief officer of State Consulting Services at Learning Point Associates, commented:

As 50 states and 15,000 school districts, we have been working on standards-based reform for the last 20 years. We have not seen much success. Perhaps we have underestimated the complexity and the magnitude of change needed to support 3 million classrooms. I would argue that we need multistate and national collaboration to deliver the needed support. It starts with common standards, moves to consortia of states on assessment systems, and with that—instructional strategies to give teachers the support they have long deserved. It will not happen in a single year, but this new direction has very great potential.



Ted Stilwill

The institute began with a panel presentation and discussion featuring Chris Minnich, director of standards, assessment, and accountability at CCSSO, as well as two of the key leads in writing the mathematics and English language arts (ELA) standards: David Coleman, founder of Student Achievement Partners, LLC, and Jason Zimba, Ph.D., professor of mathematics and physics at Bennington College. Minnich explained why having a common set of standards was so important and how they were developed through CCSSO. Coleman and Dr. Zimba walked the participants through the draft standards and answered questions. One participant said, “The panel presentation was excellent. It really gave the background as to why the change is needed.” The participants also had the chance to work in facilitated groups using a newly developed planning tool through Learning Point Associates and CCSSO—“Blueprint for Implementation.” The tool allowed participants to look at their current and desired standards work and their plans for implementation.

On the second day of the institute, participants attended an interactive presentation by Margaret Heritage, Ph.D., assistant director for Professional Development at the National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing (CRESST). In her session, “Making Use of Assessment Information: Challenges and Prospects,” Heritage engaged participants in thought-provoking discussions. The room was abuzz during the open discussions she led on topics such as “In your current role, what do you actually use assessments for?” and “What do you think future assessments should be like?” One participant noted that the session “was extremely helpful and the resources [Heritage] provided as well as the discussion that have me looking at assessments in a different way were very timely.”

Overall, the institute was a great success and provided participants a chance to learn more about the Common Core State Standards as well as different tools, practices, and [resources to support the local implementation of the core standards](http://www.learningpt.org/greatlakeseast/).



Leadership Through Innovation Discussed at Annual Advisory Meeting

By Jennifer Reed, Program Specialist, Learning Point Associates

On May 20–21, 2010, the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center, along with the Great Lakes West Comprehensive Center, held their annual joint Advisory Meeting in Rosemont, Illinois. Both centers bring together their Advisory Board/Council members each year to review the portfolio of work in the five states and increase understanding of collaborative work with state education agencies (SEAs).

This year, advisory members explored the additional topic of leadership and innovation. How can educators lead effectively in today's world of rapid change and high accountability? During the two days, participants engaged in state-specific conversations as well as distinct topics identified in [A Blueprint for Reform](#). The topics in focus were (1) meeting the needs of diverse learners, (2) fostering innovation and excellence, (3) complete education, (4) great teachers and great leaders, and (5) college- and career-ready students. To dissect each topic, five teams formed to represent several perspectives: teachers, districts, SEAs, institutions of higher education, education service agencies, and business.

The highlight of the meeting was the keynote presentation “State Leadership and Innovation” by Paul Kimmelman, Ed.D., senior advisor at Learning Point Associates. Drawing upon his recent book, [The School Leadership Triangle: From Compliance to Innovation](#), Dr. Kimmelman engaged participants in thinking innovatively about their work and reflecting on their leadership roles and compliance. The informative two-day meeting also brought together state teams to craft next steps for technical assistance work in the near future.

Great Lakes East Advisory Board members represented each state; representatives from each of the three SEAs also attended. We thank each of our Advisory Board members for their continued service and look forward to the coming year of work.



Participants of the panel “What Does It Mean for States to Innovate?” (from left to right): Paul Kimmelman, Senior Advisor, Learning Point Associates; Mary Feldt, Physical Education Teacher, Waupaca Learning Center (Wisconsin); Al Mihajlovits, Principal, Southridge Middle School (Indiana); Stan Heffner, Associate Superintendent, Center for Instruction, Ohio Department of Education (Ohio); and Mark Kiehna, President, Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents of Schools (Illinois).



Collaboration as the Focal Theme at the Annual Leveraging Resources Event

By Gary Appel, Senior Consultant, and Mark Mitchell, Senior Consultant, Learning Point Associates

The annual Leveraging Resources Conference on April 13–14, 2010, brought together the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) along with many of the providers who represent the Technical Assistance and Dissemination Network. These providers include regional resource centers, equity assistance centers, national content centers, and comprehensive assistance centers. Collaboration was one of the themes that ran throughout this two-day meeting in Washington, D.C.

Collaborative Improvement Efforts in Ohio

At this meeting, the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center was invited to be a part of a panel titled “Collaborative Efforts With Our State Partners.” Representing the collaborative efforts in Ohio, members of the panel included Deborah Telfer, Ph.D., executive director of the Center for School Improvement; Michele DiMuzio, a representative of the State Support Team Region 5; and Mark Mitchell, Ohio state manager of Great Lakes East. The presentation of the Ohio team was titled “Supporting Systems Learning through the Ohio Improvement Process.”

OSEP was especially interested in Ohio’s redesign of the state system of support, the Ohio Improvement Process, and the focus on improving the system to meet the needs of all children. Dr. Telfer began the presentation with the main ideas and key features of Ohio’s approach to improvement. She presented some background about the Ohio Improvement Process and the Ohio Leadership Development Framework as well as a description of the redesigned state system of support. A brief overview by DiMuzio followed, describing the regional support structure and Ohio’s efforts to ensure that all students benefit from this improvement process. Mitchell presented the role of Great Lakes East in providing Ohio with technical assistance and support to the redesign of the state system of support and to the design and implementation of processes, tools, and structures that define the Ohio Improvement Process.

Collaborative Response to Intervention Efforts in Michigan

In addition, the meeting included interactive collaborative workgroup sessions, and Great Lakes East participated in the “Response to Intervention as a Systemic Approach to School Improvement” workgroup. In this workgroup, participants learned about current collaborative approaches to response to intervention (RTI) implementation and shared strategies that they have used related to disproportionality, closing the achievement gaps, improving instruction, and improving equitable education outcomes.

In the workgroup, Gary Appel, Michigan state manager of Great Lakes East, and Darren Woodruff, Ph.D., codirector of the National Center on Response to Intervention, presented on their past disproportionality work with the Michigan Department of Education (MDE). They shared information about the technical assistance model that was crafted collaboratively by Great Lakes East and MDE. In addition, they described and discussed the development and piloting of a district self-assessment rubric.

Through presentations and several activities, session participants identified state needs and challenges for technical assistance and support related to RTI implementation and delineated what supports are needed for future collaborative work across the networks represented in the workgroup. They also explored the practices



within various collaborative phases, identifying (1) variables that impact individual and group behavior, (2) practices of how groups negotiate roles and responsibilities, and (3) supports in place or needed to cultivate redefining ways of working together.

International Day at the National Science Teachers Association Conference

By Marie Husby-Slater, Consultant, Learning Point Associates

The 2010 National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) conference, “Connecting Science Past to Science Future,” was held in Philadelphia on March 18–21, 2010. As 2009–10 chair of the International Advisory Board, Wisconsin State Manager Al Hovey was instrumental in planning the international day, “Global Conversations in Science Education—Assessing Student Understanding in Science: Perspectives and Solutions.”



The conference featured two plenary sessions as well as concurrent sessions, poster sessions, and a panel. Rodger W. Bybee, Ph.D., chair, PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) 2006 Science Expert Group, Golden, Colorado, presented the first plenary session, “Assessing Scientific Literacy: International Perspectives and Classroom Possibilities.” He spoke about the contexts, competencies, content, and attitudes assessed by PISA. The second plenary session featured Robin Millar, Ph.D., chair, Departmental Research Committee, University of York, United Kingdom, who spoke on “Assessment: A Key Lever of Change in Science

Robin Millar, Ph.D., Al Hovey, and Rodger Bybee, Ph.D.

Education.” His talk built on evidence from two recent research and development projects that explored the role of assessment instruments in changing science teachers’ practices.

The day concluded with Norman Lederman, Ph.D., of the Illinois Institute of Technology, who served as chair for the day, presiding over a panel discussion with Dr. Bybee and Dr. Millar. The International Advisory Board already is looking forward to the next activity for this group at the NSTA Conference to be held in San Francisco in 2011.



Special Reports

Where Are We With the Common Core State Standards? A Case in Ohio

By Beth Ratway, Senior Consultant, Learning Point Associates

The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) quickly are becoming a reality. They have gone through the final round of public comment and were finalized and released to the public on June 2, 2010. What happens next? The next step is the adoption process in states. All three of the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center states—Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio—have plans to adopt CCSS this summer.



Beth Ratway

States that choose to adopt CCSS must adopt the content of the standards in their entirety. They have the option to add another 15 percent if they choose to. To make the change systemic, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) suggests that the following needs to occur (National Governors Association & CCSSO, 2010):

- Educators must be given resources, tools, and time to adjust classroom practice.
- Instructional materials need to be developed that align to the standards.
- Assessments will be developed to measure student progress.
- Federal, state, and district policies will need to be reexamined to ensure that they support alignment of the common core—throughout the system—with student achievement.

Many states have begun the thinking process about how to implement CCSS into their work. For example, Ohio has engaged stakeholders from across the state in feedback sessions on the latest draft of CCSS. The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) held five regional meetings to engage key stakeholders in the review process. These separate 100-minute sessions (large and small group) for English language arts (ELA) and mathematics engaged each group in a Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats (SWOT) process. Great Lakes East collected the comments from the stakeholder meetings and summarized them into five key areas of implementation: (1) communication, (2) curriculum, (3) professional development, (4) assessment, and (5) specific concerns for middle and high school implementation. Each of these areas is described below.

Build a Solid, Transparent Communication and Rollout Plan

There is a clear need for a communication and rollout plan. Many participants shared their wishes for the development of a comprehensive rollout and communication plan. They want a continually updated and revised timeline and plan that outlines the next steps. They would like more teacher input in the development and impact of implementation. They also would like to visually see the difference between the old and new standards and a companion document that shows the connections between the old and new standards. They emphasized that all of the work *must* be done in phases through a gradual release process. Participants also suggested that the plan should address paradigm shifts and include continued structured conversations, from different stakeholders throughout the state, to get input throughout the entire process. The overall opinion of the stakeholder meetings is that the implementation process must be transparent and ongoing.



Create Frameworks for Classroom Implementation

There is a clear need for the development of some type of scaffolding or framework to help districts and schools build a comprehensive K–12 curriculum using the standards. There is a strong need to help districts understand the difference between standards and curriculum. The standards are the basis for the curriculum. Teachers do not teach the standards; they teach the curriculum that focuses on helping them teach toward the standards. Districts need a framework to help them build a coherent curriculum using the standards. This type of document can be developed to help districts understand their role in developing curricula. Participants would like the document to show how to use CCSS to determine what knowledge and skills students need at each grade level and offer ideas on how to build on the learning from year to year.

Teachers and curriculum directors are looking for a document to help them with the day-to-day implementation of the standards. They mentioned the use of backwards design to build a common framework to help them develop local curriculum documents. This document (or tool) needs to build on a common vocabulary, allow for flexibility, and support a student-centered curriculum. Participants also would like this type of tool to help them differentiate their instruction for different levels of students. They had concerns that CCSS do not address the needs of *all* students and that a complementary document could help them connect with students at all levels. Some suggested that technology could play a large role in the development and usefulness of this tool.

Develop a Systemic Professional Development Plan

The term “professional development” was commonly used throughout all of the Ohio conversations, reflecting many different contexts. Some used the term in a more global context as a way to connect the work of districts and ODE. Most of the participants were looking for some kind of comprehensive statewide approach to professional development. Many emphasized the need for professional development as a change management system, a way to help teachers, students, administrators, and communities shift to a new way of practice. Structurally, they seem to be looking for support for vertical teaming, networking time, and the development of professional learning communities to help unpack the standards and to develop local curriculum, model instruction, and share research-based instructional strategies.

One of the most discussed issues about professional development was the creation of a tool that highlights research-based best practices in teaching and learning in specific content areas. There were many comments about the need for teachers to develop a deeper understanding of their disciplines in order to go deeper into the concepts expected as part of CCSS. Participants would like to see video examples of what good practice looks like in a classroom setting. They suggested the development of professional development modules that focus on helping teachers understand how students learn specific content. They also would like to see examples showing how to implement the standards through project-based learning, incorporate 21st century skills, and create interdisciplinary units. This could complement the tool mentioned previously and could use technology to reach a wider audience.

Design a Comprehensive Assessment System

Participants shared many concerns regarding assessment of CCSS. The common core K–12 standards are based on learning progressions throughout grade levels. Participants saw this as an opportunity to move toward a more balanced assessment system that includes performance-based assessments to gauge progress and to address issues and concerns. They were concerned with how to ensure that there is a comprehensive assessment



program that focuses on project-based learning and addresses interdisciplinary issues. Many wondered how implementation of CCSS and the development of assessments could support and build off of current programs.

Address Specific Middle School and High School Concerns

Many participants worried about CCSS implementation at the middle and high school levels. Specifically, they were confused about the CCSS mathematics pathways and how it would impact course design. Other issues arose concerning how to design thematic/interdisciplinary units and instruction, how CCSS might impact scheduling, and how to break away from textbook reliance. Another concern centered on how successful implementation fits within current and future high school redesign. Participants suggested that these topics might be addressed on a website that focuses specifically on implementation issues.

Additional Areas of Implementation from the “Localizing the Common Core Standards” Institute

All of these topics identified by Ohio’s stakeholders—communication, curriculum, professional development, assessment, and middle school and high school implementation—were the key themes in Ohio. However, these same topics and concerns also were shared by other states at the recent Learning Point Associates “Localizing the Common Core Standards” institute on May 5–6, 2010, held in collaboration with CCSSO. The two-day institute for state and district teams was designed to help the teams build plans to localize CCSS. One additional concern that surfaced at the institute was how to best prepare elementary school teachers to teach CCSS.

More than 250 institute participants shared their concerns about the level of content in CCSS at the elementary level. Overall, the content expectations of the K–12 standards of CCSS reveal higher levels of rigor beginning at the lower grades. This causes some concerns about the depth of content knowledge in mathematics and ELA of elementary educators. Participants were grappling with the ramifications of this for the preparation and continued professional development of elementary educators.

All of these themes highlight several key areas of concern across the country in terms of implementing CCSS. ODE is planning to use these themes to frame a comprehensive support plan for implementation of CCSS at the local level. Other states also could use these themes as a framework for moving forward in creating their own implementation plans. States may want to begin building implementation plans by thinking about how CCSS will impact current practices in curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development. They may want to reflect on what successful implementation would look like, building a vision for implementation. The next step might include a plan outlining action steps, timelines, and responsibilities. Then, finally, states may want to think about which stakeholders are critical to involve in the process and when to involve them.

One of the most critical pieces to remember when building an implementation plan is to make the entire process collaborative, continuously getting feedback from those who are responsible for implementation. The process should be transparent to all stakeholders so that they are constantly aware of how decisions are being made, how pieces fit together, and what their role in the process is. This, in itself, can make for a stronger, more cohesive and supportive educational system that can positively impact all students.

Reference

National Governors Association, & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010, March). *Common Core State Standards Initiative*. Retrieved May 26, 2010, from <http://www.corestandards.org/Files/CCSSIMarch2010.pdf>



REL Midwest Update: Briefs Focus on Human Capital Resource Management

By Marianne Kroeger, Senior Communications Associate, REL Midwest at Learning Point Associates



Human capital resource management (HCRM) in education refers to training, recruiting, developing, and supporting talented and effective educators throughout their careers. Recent literature identifies HCRM as one of the ways in which districts and states can increase school effectiveness and improve student learning. State Policies on Human Capital Resource Management is a series of REL Midwest briefs that describe state policies in four key HCRM areas—preparation and licensure, recruitment, induction and professional development, and compensation and working conditions. [Reports](#) from Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin are available now. Although each brief is state-specific, policymakers in other state and local education agencies may benefit from learning what policies can be offered at the state level for HCRM and the channels through which states have implemented them.

Events Bring Research to Educators

REL Midwest's **Connecting Research to Practice** events provide opportunities for practitioners and policymakers to deepen their understanding of evidence-based research. Visit the [events website](#) for information about upcoming events, newly posted registration links, and archived resources. Here is a preview:

June 25, 2010, Bloomington, Indiana

Effective Leadership to Transform Struggling Schools. REL Midwest and the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Department at Indiana University will cohost a full-day conference designed to engage school and district leaders in a conversation about research on school leadership practices and the connection between that research and the recommendations in the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) Practice Guide [Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools](#). Featured presenters include Sam Redding, Ph.D., of the Center on Innovation & Improvement and Eric Camburn, Ph.D., of the Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

August 4, 2010

Online Learning Opportunities for Rural Schools. Designed for rural educators and stakeholders throughout the region, this full-day conference offers research-based information pertaining to online learning and virtual school environments.

Fall 2010

Adolescent Literacy. This full-day conference is designed to help a regional audience of literacy educators understand the research-based recommendations in the IES Practice Guide [Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices](#) and apply those recommendations to their practice.



Resources to Explore

- Practice Guides from the [What Works Clearinghouse](#), an IES initiative, address instructional challenges and assess the rigor of research evidence on the effectiveness of interventions. Among the topics of Practice Guides available now are dropout prevention, access to higher education, and improving adolescent literacy. To learn more about integrating evidence-based practices into classroom instruction, visit the partner site for [Doing What Works](#).
- Do you need information on a current education issue? Contact REL Midwest through [Ask A REL](#). This collaborative reference desk service functions like a technical reference library and can provide you with links to pertinent websites and resources, referrals to IES research projects and federally funded education organizations, and region-specific education information. In responding to your request, REL Midwest can tap the expertise of RELs nationwide as well as the resources and staff of the National Library of Education.

Hiring Quality School Principals: Guidance Available

By Matthew Clifford, Ph.D., Senior Research and Policy Associate, Learning Point Associates

After school teachers, principals are the most influential school-level factor in student achievement. The right principal can quickly improve teacher working conditions, student achievement, and community relations. For this reason, improved principal recruitment, hiring, and support processes are central to many states' and districts' school turnaround and transformation strategies. Superintendents recognize that selecting the right school leader is one of the most challenging and important decisions that they can make.

A new study by Learning Point Associates suggests that part of the challenge in principal hiring rests with school districts' recruitment and selection processes. The study, which surveyed 730 superintendents from five Midwestern states, found that in the majority of cases school districts tend to:

- Recruit candidates locally or within their athletic conference
- Allocate less than \$1,000 to recruitment and hiring
- Make hiring decisions driven by candidate experience, personality, and certification status rather than professional standards or objective measures of ability
- Evaluate talent mainly through interviews and documents rather than authentic assessments of decision making or leadership
- Seek better ways to hire and attract principals to their districts

The [Quality School Leadership Identification](#) (QSL-ID) tools provide districts an adaptable, research-based, and standards-driven process for recruiting and hiring principals. QSL-ID is a step-by-step approach for districts to determine leadership needs, conduct a nontraditional candidate search, and select the right candidate for the school. These tools, designed by Learning Point Associates researchers and Midwestern administrators, capitalize on best practices in executive hiring that school districts and businesses use and on research about what contemporary principals must know and do to be successful. For information about QSL-ID tools or principal hiring research, or to locate QSL-ID training events in your area, contact Matthew Clifford, Ph.D., at matthew.clifford@learningpt.org.



Focus on States

In this section, Great Lakes East state managers provide regular updates on current state plans undertaken by each state in the region with a specific focus on NCLB implementation efforts. The e-mail addresses of the state managers are included.



INDIANA

State Manager: Frank De Rosa

E-Mail: frank.derosa@learningpt.org

State System of Support

District Improvement. Four years ago, the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) reviewed the curriculum of districts in corrective action and quickly determined that the districts did not have curricula; instead, textbooks or a list of standards to be covered during a set time window were viewed as the curricula. IDOE determined that one of the requirements—to “institute and fully implement a new curriculum”—would be the most appropriate requirement of its local education agencies (LEAs) in corrective action (Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2006, p. 49). During the four years, it has proven to be a lengthy and difficult task for districts to conduct curriculum mapping as a means for creating a new curriculum.

With this result in mind, IDOE has determined that it will unpack the English language arts and mathematics state standards to determine appropriate learning progressions. Districts and schools then will be able to use this initial level of mapping to further identify the tasks underlying the standards for their specific students. They also can align their resources and assessments to these learning targets. IDOE Director of Curriculum and Instruction Schauna Findlay, Ph.D., is working alongside Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center staff Member Jayne Sowers, Ed.D. They are planning a summer academy to conduct the curriculum mapping on July 12–16, 2010. Participants have been selected from schools, districts, and universities. Professional development for teachers and administrators regarding the curriculum mapping process will occur throughout the 2011–12 school year.

As part of IDOE’s plan of support to its districts not making annual measurable achievement objectives, Great Lakes East has continued to provide internal professional development sessions for IDOE English language learning staff. A recent session held on March 24, 2010, had several objectives: (1) understand the key components of Response to Instruction (RTI), (2) reach consensus about RTI application to English language learners (ELLs) and their teachers, (3) develop content topics for teachers with ELLs in their classrooms, and (4) determine delivery methods of the professional development. Content topics included first and second language acquisition, levels of English proficiency, appropriate choice of instructional materials, differentiated instructional strategies, and collaboration between classroom teachers and ELL teachers. Discussions will continue in order to plan professional development, possibly at the regional level of the state and with the inclusion of the RTI initiative.

School Improvement. On December 3, 2009, U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan announced that the Title I School Improvement Grants (1003g) would be available to turn around the nation’s lowest performing schools (U.S. Department of Education, 2009, December 3):



As a country, we all need to get into the turnaround business. Today we are providing \$3.5 billion and four models that have proven results so that school districts, unions, charter operators, universities and the business community can come together to turn around our nation's lowest performing schools.

In response to Duncan's charge, IDOE sought Great Lakes East's assistance in developing the state's School Improvement Grant (SIG) application, a template for district applications, and scoring rubrics for reviewing completed applications. Indiana was among the initial six states that received the U.S. Department of Education's approval of its [SIG application](#) in March 2010. The SIG monies have the potential to allow districts to create substantial changes in school governance; hire, evaluate, and retain teachers; provide professional development focused on curriculum and instruction; extend the school day/year; and hold high expectations for all. Following the approval, IDOE developed a webinar to aid districts in understanding the application processes and the four types of school improvement models or interventions: turnaround, transformation, restart, and school closure.

In their applications, districts were required to use student and indicator data to determine the appropriate improvement model for their schools, describe their capacity to implement the model, indicate their commitment to develop and implement all of the model's components (e.g., replace the principal, provide high-quality, job-embedded professional development), submit a feasible and appropriate budget, and develop appropriate goals with a timeline. Given these specific requirements, reviewers of the grants needed specific and well-articulated rubrics to enable consistent scoring, which was a task led by Great Lakes East. These rubrics were developed, introduced, and practiced through an IDOE and Great Lakes East coconducted training of the reviewers on April 30, 2010.

Instruction

Response to Instruction (RTI). IDOE's new RTI initiative continues with the introduction of a new guidance document and pilot program. In IDOE's letter to pilot schools, Alyson Luther, RTI coordinator at IDOE, describes the [Response to Instruction \(RtI\) Guidance Document](#) as

... a cohesive, unifying instructional model for all learners centered on scientifically based research. It is not a program or curriculum, nor is it an approach that will fade as a new fad emerges. It is a research-driven framework, created in part with experts from the National Center on Response to Intervention (NCRTI) and Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center, for developing effective instruction for all students in Indiana.

Select districts from across the state have been invited to participate in a professional development institute, July 22–23, 2010, in Indianapolis. The institute is being designed by IDOE with support from Great Lakes East and NCRTI. The institute and yearlong pilot program will “provide a structure to support efforts to differentiate instruction appropriately across all content areas and for all Indiana learners,” as stated in the aforementioned IDOE letter to pilot schools. Efforts to achieve Indiana's vision for RTI are focused on six major components: Indiana's context of RTI, instruction, implementation, assessment, leadership, and commitment.

The IDOE and Great Lakes East RTI team leads include Lee Ann Kwiatkowski (director of differentiated learning at IDOE), Alyson Luther, Bruce Passman (technical assistance liaison at NCRTI), Stacy Rush (senior research analyst at the American Institutes for Research), Sandra Gutierrez (research associate at the Center for Applied Linguistics), Jayne Sowers, and Frank De Rosa (Indiana state manager at Great Lakes East).



College and Career Preparation. As a new goal of its technical assistance activities in Indiana, Great Lakes East is working together with IDOE in the area of college and career preparation. The goal is to assist IDOE to develop and implement a plan to improve student achievement in mathematics through expanded and strengthened instruction and support in Career and Technical Education (CTE)/College and Career Preparation and through increased use of effective technology in mathematics instruction. Specific initiatives include (1) Math-in-CTE, an instructional program in which high school CTE and mathematics teachers partner to provide aligned instruction and assessment, (2) technology preparation instruction funded by the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act funds, and (3) the increased use of technology in instruction, Grades 6–9.

Great Lakes East has partnered with IDOE's College and Career Preparation and the Indiana Department of Workforce Development to strengthen and expand its Math-in-CTE program in Indiana schools. Math-in-CTE was developed by the National Research Center on Career and Technical Education (NRCCTE). In July 2010, NRCCTE will conduct a one-week training session for as many as 120 Indiana high school teachers. Teachers from the career pathways of health science, automotive, building trades, and agriculture will partner with mathematics teachers to plan aligned lessons and assessments. These teachers will meet again for five days over the 2010–11 school year to assess progress and modify their plans. Great Lakes East assisted IDOE in assembling a Math-in-CTE steering team and in the development and implementation of a program evaluation and review plan. Math-in-CTE was introduced to Indiana teachers in summer 2009. IDOE's hope is that the program will double in size this year and will continue to grow and improve in the years to come. "NRCCTE's Math-in-CTE program is an example of a strong, evidence-based program that can help CTE students (and non-CTE students) improve math performance in the classroom and on state assessments. Great Lakes East's support in expanding this program across the state is a significant plus for us," said Matt Fleck, director of College and Career Preparation and a member of Indiana's Math-in-CTE steering team (personal communication, May 12, 2010). Other team members include Davis Moore (career preparation specialist at CTE), Andrea Maurer (program director at the Indiana Department of Workforce Development), Doug Walker (RMC Research Corporation), and Frank De Rosa.

Another initiative under the college and career preparation goal targets Indiana's technology grants. IDOE has requested the assistance of Great Lakes East in identifying the winners of the 2010–11 Carl D. Perkins IV Tech Prep grants. The grant announcement, application, and selection process is a new responsibility of IDOE's division of College and Career Preparation, and the staff strive to meet their responsibilities with efficiency, integrity, and fidelity. They received more than 170 applications in five new and continuing categories: New Tech Prep Planning (non-Project Lead the Way), Continuation Tech Prep (non-Project Lead the Way), New Project Lead the Way Pre-Engineering, Continuation Project Lead the Way Pre-Engineering, and Continuation Project Lead the Way Biomedical Sciences). As indicated in the grant application instructions, the selection team is looking for applicants that can accomplish the following:

- Support the implementation of state-approved career pathways leading to dual credits, a technical certificate, certificate, or apprenticeship program
- Positively and significantly impact the Perkins Student Performance Indicators
- Include multiple schools or programs
- Fuel the academic achievement and career preparation of Indiana students



The IDOE and Great Lakes East team collaborated to design and implement a process to identify the grant recipients, including creating the sequence of events, designing and testing the scoring rubric, and evaluating the applications. As Matt Fleck stated, “Great Lakes East’s support and guidance has been extremely helpful to our team, especially as we developed the grant application rubric and evaluation process. It’s invaluable for us to have access to the wisdom of how this process has been done well in other regions and what pitfalls to avoid” (personal communication, May 12, 2010). Other members of the team include Julie Yeater, assistant director of Career and Technical Education, and a Great Lakes East team consisting of Tori Cirks, Doug Walker, and Frank De Rosa.

The third area of this collaborative work is focusing on the increased use of technology in instruction, Grades 6–9. IDOE’s goal to develop and implement a plan to improve student achievement in mathematics is consistent with its plan to “create and promote a statewide culture of academic excellence, in which ... 90% of students pass both Math and English/Language Arts sections of ISTEP+ and End-of-Course Assessments” (Indiana Department of Education—Supporting Student Success, 2009, p. 1). In pursuit of these goals, IDOE and Great Lakes East are partnering to identify participating districts, implement, and appraise technology-based instructional models. Great Lakes East provided assistance in the design of the request for applications, scoring rubric, and identification of pilot districts. Planning and implementation of pilot program appraisal will take place in late summer and fall 2010. IDOE’s Secondary Mathematics Consultant Zach Foughty recently commented:

“As we move forward ... we are excited about the potential for schools to integrate technology into their daily mathematics instruction, which we believe will assist the students in understanding mathematical concepts. The curricular materials chosen by districts provide teachers with on-going support, innovative instructional methods, high-quality formative assessments, and tools for increasing student motivation. By implementing these programs, 35 schools across the state will provide nearly 13,000 students with increased access to high-quality instruction in mathematics” (personal communication, May 13, 2010).

Working on this team with Foughty are Trice Black, elementary mathematics specialist at IDOE; Lisa Palacios, senior program associate, and Brenna O-Brien, research associate, both from Learning Point Associates; and Frank De Rosa.

Common Core State Standards Initiative. As this issue of the e-newsletter indicates, the Common Core State Standards initiative is creating a stir across the country. IDOE has committed to implementing the common core, and as a first step, will study the results of the common core’s alignment to Indiana state standards through the use of the Surveys of Enacted Curriculum. The results from the alignment process should be available in fall 2010 from an external agency and will indicate the similarities, gaps, and redundancies between the state standards and the common core standards. This information will allow the IDOE and Great Lakes East team to create improved alignment between the curriculum, instruction, and assessments, which will be shared across the state through professional development. In addition, curriculum maps will be created to show teachers how to transition from the current Indiana Standards to the Common Core State Standards.

References

Indiana Department of Education—Supporting Student Success. (2009). *The vision, the plan*. Retrieved May 25, 2010, from http://www.doe.in.gov/actionplan/docs/idoe_vision_plan.pdf



Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2006). *LEA and school improvement: Non-regulatory guidance* (Rev. ed.). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved May 25, 2010, from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.pdf>

U.S. Department of Education. (2009, December 3). *Applications now available for \$3.5 billion in Title I School Improvement grants to turn around nation's lowest achieving public schools* [Press release]. Retrieved May 11, 2010, from <http://www2.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2009/12/12032009a.html>



MICHIGAN

State Manager: Gary Appel

E-Mail: gary.appel@learningpt.org

Teacher Quality

State Individual Professional Development Plans. The Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center, with support from the American Institutes for Research, is assisting the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) in conducting a field study of the individual professional development plan in three regions that reflect the demographic differences among districts in Michigan. The field study began in September 2009 and is scheduled to conclude in June 2010. All participating principals, mentors, and beginning teachers complete quarterly Zoomerang surveys, indicating their perceptions about the value and ease of using the individual professional development plan tools. Phone interviews are being conducted with a sample of participants during May and June. A sample of completed individual professional development plans or sections of these plans also will be analyzed to inform future revisions. The individual professional development plan then will be revised based on analysis of all the data and will be made available statewide for the 2010–11 school year.

In addition to working with the individual professional development plan team, Great Lakes East is supporting MDE in its effort to support the work of a cross-functional team at MDE to review and revise professional development policy and guidelines. This spring, MDE further charted the course for a more coherent professional development system in their Race to The Top proposal. As a part of the reform agenda, the cross-functional team will do the following: (1) convene and support working groups that will design professional development for diverse purposes, (2) use grants to incentivize and guide the creation of high-quality professional development programs focused on the key needs of teachers, students, and leaders, and (3) support statewide compliance with federal grants and legislation as well as statewide mandates. At the next meeting of the cross-functional team on June 7, 2010, Great Lakes East will share the results of a review of professional development policies that includes Michigan's current policy and guidelines, their proposed system, and effective policy and practices in other states. Great Lakes East also will facilitate the work of the team as they assess the implications of the review for MDE, begin work with stakeholders to further develop components of the system, and determine ways in which high-quality professional development can be embedded throughout the system.

State Teacher Preparation System Revision. Great Lakes East and the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality have been working with MDE and the Professional Standards Commission for Teachers (PSCT) to design a *Michigan Framework for Excellence in Teacher Preparation*. A work team from PSCT is describing the task and gathering information from the larger committee regarding teacher preparation beliefs



and assumptions. During the PSCT meeting on March 11, 2010, draft assumptions about teacher preparation were discussed and feedback was sought. The team created a matrix to map the overlapping policies and procedures that serve as guidance for teachers. This document, “Professional Preparation Continuum,” will be introduced to other teacher preparation initiative teams for feedback and alignment. The next steps for the work team are to write introductory content for the policies and procedures to allow various audiences to understand their use and articulate the means by which teacher preparation programs demonstrate effectiveness in accordance with the assumptions of high-quality teachers’ preparation and the Professional Standards for Michigan Teachers.

Concurrently, Great Lakes East has been supporting the MDE Office of Professional Preparation Services’ efforts to design a three-tier licensure system in Michigan. MDE brought together a committee of stakeholders, including staff from the two teachers unions in Michigan, institutes of higher education, and districts to develop a set of guidelines for each of the three tiers: Provisional, Professional, and Masters-Level. Preliminary discussions have a beginning teacher enter the field with a Provisional Certificate. During a teacher’s first four years, he or she will be required to complete an individual professional development plan and some university coursework. Advancement to the second tier may require the teacher to receive a specific level on his or her evaluation. Additional coursework and State Board Continuing Education credits will be required to renew the Professional Certificate. The current option at the Masters-Level is National Board Certification. The committee is recommending that this be but one option out of several and will discuss what these options might be at the next monthly meeting.

High School

High School Redesign. Technical assistance continues to be provided to MDE to develop a *Michigan Framework for Re-Imagining High Schools*. After MDE’s High School Unit and High School Core Team members reviewed the principles in Vermont’s *High Schools on the Move* document for alignment to Michigan’s School Improvement Framework, Great Lakes East facilitated a small core planning group during the months of February through April 2010 to begin the process of reviewing and revising the document for Michigan. The core planning group consisted of Sam Sinicropi, MDE consultant, Office of Education Improvement and Innovation; Diane McMillan, associate director, Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals; Kristine Gullen, high school consultant, Oakland Schools; Doug Walker, senior research associate, RMC Research Corporation; and Bersheril Bailey, senior consultant, Great Lakes East. This preliminary work was prepared to share with a larger stakeholder group at an all-day meeting in April.

On April 12, 2010, representatives from MDE, intermediate school districts, local education agencies, and various professional organizations met to review and recommend additions and revisions to the evolving Michigan high school framework. To initiate and guide the conversation for the day, the meeting began with a live webinar where student representatives from across the state provided their views on reimagining high schools. Following the webinar, facilitators guided participants through a “World Café” process to link and build on previous ideas for recommendations, revisions, and additions to the framework. This valuable input was combined and shared with the High School Core Team on May 19, 2010, where additional input was gathered.

In July 2009, State Superintendent of Public Instruction Mike Flanagan issued a challenge to Michigan schools and districts to identify 10–15 students with multiple dropout risk factors and asked them to provide research-based supports and interventions to reduce or eliminate these risk factors. More than 1,100 schools and districts



signed on to this challenge. Great Lakes East is facilitating and coordinating a collaborative team to support Flanagan's Dropout Challenge. The team consists of Jan Ellis, MDE spokesperson, Office of the Superintendent; Leisa Gallagher, codirector of Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners; Sue Codere, MDE consultant, Office of Education Improvement and Innovation; Myra Munroe, Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators (MAISA) instructional specialist; Michele Corey, Michigan's Children; Diane McMillan, associate director of the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals; Nancy Rotarius, Michigan Department of Energy, Labor & Economic Growth, Sara Wraight, research associate, REL Midwest at Learning Point Associates; and Bersheril Bailey. The team is planning a two-day Dropout Prevention conference/K–12 Summit in southeast Detroit on August 11–12, 2010. Intermediate and local school districts, as well as professional organizations and community partners across the state, will be invited to attend. Dropout Challenge schools and districts will be recognized by Flanagan during an evening reception on August 11. Recently, the state of Oklahoma launched an "[ABC 123 Challenge](#)" to schools modeled after Michigan's Dropout Challenge.

In addition, the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals in partnership with MDE has developed a dropout prevention website entitled [Graduation Town](#). The website houses an online electronic learning community dedicated to support efforts that provide opportunities for all students to graduate from high school career and work ready. Great Lakes East has provided research, resources, and technical assistance to support the development of this website, which will be used by schools, districts, students, parents, and community partners across the state.

Alternative High Schools. Great Lakes East continues to facilitate conversations between MDE's Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability (OEAA) and the Alternative Education Focus Group as MDE works to develop a new policy related to alternative high schools and adequate yearly progress (AYP). OEAA is interested in increasing its capacity to understand the issues, barriers, and concerns of alternative educators in order to ensure that the new policy will support alternative high schools across the state. Office representative Chris Janzer, consultant, attended the Alternative Education Focus Group meeting on May 13, 2010.

To promote school and community partnerships to increase student achievement, Marlana Krolicki, alternative education consultant for Oakland Schools and member of the Alternative Education Focus Group, invited Great Lakes East and MDE to participate in and facilitate discussions during a seminar on May 17, 2010, titled "The ABCs of Dropout Prevention: Strengthening Community and School Partnerships to Increase Graduation and Success in College and Careers." Participants collaborated and continued to dialogue; explored current data, resources, and policies; developed strategies to increase graduation rates; and expanded community and school partnerships for student success.

To continue these critical efforts, Great Lakes East also is facilitating conversations among MDE, the Michigan Association of Community and Adult Education (MACAE), and members of the Alternative Education Focus Group to plan a professional development opportunity for educators in alternative high schools across the state. The one-day summer institute will be held on June 24, 2010, in Lansing, Michigan. Participants will learn more about dropout prevention, how to support struggling students, and adequate yearly progress (AYP). Great Lakes East will provide technical assistance to MDE consultants Janzer and Sinicropi to prepare presentations that build the capacity of alternative educators that serve struggling students.



Statewide System of Support

Michigan's Statewide System of Support (SSOS). At the request of MDE and MAISA, Great Lakes East developed an online survey to collect feedback in two areas: (1) team meetings and activities, specifically what works and where modifications might be necessary, and (2) the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the assistance provided by Great Lakes East to the team. The core team members received the survey after the January 14, 2010, meeting. Julia Marchand, evaluation associate at Great Lakes East, provided a report of key findings from the survey. Bersheril Bailey reviewed the survey results with the core team during the March 11, 2010, core team meeting, where the team made suggestions and requests regarding future meetings of the group as well as Great Lakes East support.

On March 4–5, 2010, Great Lakes East invited Sam Redding of the Center on Innovation & Improvement (CII) to Michigan to lead a two-day Statewide System of Support Self-Assessment meeting. CII's manual [*Strengthening the Statewide System of Support*](#) was used to guide MDE to self-assess its system of support in order to plan for improvement. A Great Lakes East team, consisting of Gary Appel, Bersheril Bailey, Linda McDonald (RMC Research Corporation), and Asta Svedkauskaite, compiled all of the information gathered and provided MDE with a draft summary report and a PowerPoint presentation that highlighted key findings. MDE participants reviewed the draft and provided final input, and Great Lakes East provided MDE with a final report on May 28, 2010, which will inform further redesign of the statewide system of support.

Earlier this spring, MDE's SSOS Pacesetter Team participated in CII's Distance Learning #5 on March 24, 2010, along with teams from Arkansas, Idaho, Illinois, Louisiana, and Oklahoma. Steve Ross, professor and senior research scientist at Johns Hopkins University, who specializes in educational evaluation, school reform, and educational technology, discussed how to recognize the qualities of an effective evaluation when evaluating the outcomes of SSOS. State teams were asked to think about how to use the information shared within their own SSOS.

Great Lakes East continues to facilitate collaborative meetings with MDE, MAISA, and the Michigan Association of School and Curriculum Development to develop an *Emerging Practices* website that identifies schools that are “beating the odds.” The website will provide schools and districts across the state with the opportunity to learn about promising practices. To begin this initiative, the Michigan Institute for Educational Management and the Ingham Intermediate School District, along with Scott Buckley of Learning Point Associates, developed draft wireframes of the website for the group to review and consider at a meeting held on April 16, 2010. After reviewing the goals and objectives for the *Emerging Practices* website and the *Teaching for Learning* website, which is being developed by MDE's Curriculum and Instruction, the team determined that the plans for the two websites are similar and that it would be wise to integrate the two websites as opposed to developing two separate ones. Great Lakes East will work with MDE to integrate the work of the department's two groups as the development of the website continues.

English Language Learners. Multiple initiatives to build MDE's capacity related to English language learners (ELLs) continue through the ongoing collaboration between MDE and Great Lakes East and its subcontractor, the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL). One of the current initiatives—providing Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) training of trainers—has its Cohort 2 training-of-trainers session scheduled for the last week of June 2010. Twenty ELL educators were selected to participate through a statewide application process. Once this session is completed, three regional rollout sessions will take place. Six trainers, two for each region, from the training-of-trainers sessions will cofacilitate with CAL staff to complete the SIOP capacity-



building training process. In addition, last year's session participants will be independently facilitating the implementation of several additional mini-regional SIOP sessions at local sites to further expand the capacity-building goal of the project. Sandy Hagman, representing MDE, continues to be the Michigan-based staff member and ensures that regional and mini-regional logistics are implemented.

In addition, Great Lakes East and CAL assisted MDE in planning and facilitating Michigan's ELL State Title III Directors' Conference on April 26, 2010. The opening session, "Using Legal Precedence to Advocate," was presented by Donald Yarab, team leader at the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights, Cleveland Office. The luncheon plenary session, "Considerations when Implementing RTI with English Language Learners," was given by Janette Klingner, Ph.D., professor of education at University of Colorado–Boulder. In addition, 12 concurrent sessions provided Title III directors with updates regarding MDE initiatives and information about ELL special education, ELL teacher preparation, response to intervention (RTI), and English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA).

As an ongoing effort, MDE's joint ELL Advisory Committee met on April 26–27 to share updates from the representative offices: Office of School Improvement (OSI) and the Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability (OEAA). During the meeting, OEAA facilitated working sessions to solicit input on ELPA's (the state's English language assessment) revisions, development, and implementation. Mike Radke, director of the Office of Field Services, whose office will be assuming the responsibility for ELL services this summer, provided an overview of his office's objectives and plans for the transition.

Lastly, the cross-office ELL core team continued to meet. On May 10, 2010, Phil Chase from OEAA presented to the team an update on the progress of OEAA's "Beyond the Booklet" project. The project focuses on providing support for teacher training to accompany ELPA. The goal of this project is to showcase Michigan's best practices for how to use reports for coordinators and administrators. The team discussed the development and implementation of this project and the relevance and implications for ELLs.

Response to Intervention (RTI). The Michigan RTI team continues to develop a statewide framework for RTI, providing guidance and resources for districts and schools. On May 4, 2010, as part of that guidance, Great Lakes East and MDE sponsored a conference, "School Improvement and RTI: One Common Voice—One Plan." A total of 275 school, district, intermediate service district (ISD), and state leaders attended the event. Darren Woodruff, Ph.D., codirector of the National Center on Response to Intervention, provided the keynote. Seven breakout sessions, themed as "Stories from the Field," were provided by school and district teams from Michigan and Illinois. Following the conference, on May 10, 2010, the RTI team met to continue work on a Michigan RTI framework document and begin planning regional professional development for districts and ISDs. These regional opportunities will build on the conference theme and focus on braiding RTI and the Michigan School Improvement Framework as well as attending to the "how" of RTI implementation.



OHIO

State Manager: Mark Mitchell

E-Mail: mark.mitchell@learningpt.org

Assessment and Accountability

Credit Flexibility Implementation. The Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center continues to provide significant support for statewide implementation of credit flexibility through its role with the internal credit flexibility work group at the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) and through collaborative efforts with the IDEA Partnership and the National High School Center (NHSC).

ODE has developed a credit flexibility Web conference series, which follows its recently released guidance as well as connects participants from across Ohio with districts and institutions that have implemented some aspects of credit flexibility. Great Lakes East has provided technical assistance and support for the Web conference series. Following is a list of the Web conferences:

1. Credit Flex and Highly Qualified Teachers (March 17)
2. Credit Flex and Gifted and Special Education Students (March 24)
3. School Finance and Credit Flexibility (April 9)
4. Mastery-Based Assessment Models (April 22)
5. Assessment Tips (May 7)
6. Teacher-Led Credit Flex Initiatives Using Technology (May 17)

Each of these Web conferences was facilitated by ODE staff along with people in districts and other institutions who are implementing aspects of credit flexibility. Credit flexibility resources, including audio recordings and transcriptions of the Web conferences, guidance documents, and case studies, can be accessed through ODE's [Ohio's Credit Flexibility Plan](#) website.

As described in the [winter 2010 Great Lakes East e-newsletter](#), Great Lakes East and NHSC have collaborated on the design of a cross-state process, highlighting common themes and challenges to credit flexibility implementation. The national center's staff interviewed key state education agency staff in Florida, Massachusetts, Oregon, and Texas and collaborated with Great Lakes East to produce a summary report in April 2010 titled *Credit Flexibility Considerations for the Ohio Department of Education*. The purpose of the report is to highlight credit flexibility strategies nationally and lessons learned in other states that ODE might benefit from as Ohio supports local implementation of its credit flexibility policy. The state initiatives profiled in the document include Florida Guide to Public High School Graduation, Florida Public Virtual Schools, Massachusetts Extended Learning Time Initiative, Oregon Credit for Proficiency, and Texas Virtual Schools Network.

Great Lakes East continues to work with the IDEA Partnership to help ODE organize communities of practice and provide training to moderators of these communities. Training sessions occurred on April 23 and May 13, 2010; the majority of attendees were from educational service centers (ESCs).



Standards and Assessment (Emerging Work). This emerging work is closely connected to adoption of the Common Core State Standards in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics and to adoption of revised Ohio science and social studies state standards. As part of this adoption process, ODE designed a series of meetings to update stakeholders across Ohio and to request feedback that would inform implementation support. Great Lakes East provided logistical support and support for summarizing the feedback gathered from these regional meetings. The first series of meetings occurred on March 22–26 and focused on the Common Core State Standards in ELA and mathematics. These meetings were supported by the following regional providers: Cuyahoga ESC, ESC of Central Ohio, State Support Team Region 15 and OSU Endeavor Center, Hamilton County ESC, and State Support Team Region 1. The regional meetings were led by Sasheen Phillips, literacy director at ODE, and Brad Findell, director of mathematics initiatives at ODE. Staff from Great Lakes East collected feedback from stakeholders, who used a Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats (SWOT) analysis to identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats related to implementation of the common core standards. Each piece of feedback was entered into a database and analyzed for themes and patterns that helped to provide some direction for professional development support and planning for implementation.

Another series of meetings on April 26–May 3 introduced science and social studies standards and collected feedback from stakeholders using the same process. These meetings were led by Tom Rutan of ODE and Constance Barsky, science initiatives at ODE. As with the common core state standards meetings, the regional support system provided both help with venues and, in some cases, personnel on-site.

As a result of these common core meetings, Great Lakes East developed a comprehensive summary to be used internally to guide the development of planning and implementation support to the field. A similar summary is being developed based upon themes and patterns that emerge from feedback collected at the regional science and social studies meetings. The Ohio State Board of Education is expected to formally adopt standards for ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies in June 2010.

State Systems of Support

Completion of Processes, Support Structures, and Tools for Stages 3 and 4 of the Ohio Improvement Process. It is no surprise that implementation and monitoring (Stage 3) and evaluation (Stage 4) of the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) are proving to be the most challenging parts of the process, both to design and for district-, building-, and teacher-based teams to fully practice. Systemic implementation of strategies and actions (as defined in district improvement plans and aligned building plans) and systematic monitoring of adult implementation and student progress require changes in adult behavior and practice. Much of the work for Stage 3 has focused on defining the work of teacher-based teams and designing support structures for these teams, primarily through targeted training of internal and external facilitators (ESCs and state support teams [SSTs]).

A teacher-based team training for facilitators was held on April 19, 2010, and included about 300 ESC and SST facilitators along with internal district facilitators. Great Lakes East worked with the facilitator professional development cadre to design this training. Teacher-based teams may be grade-level teams, vertical teams, content-focused teams, or other configurations. The core work of these teams will include using common formative assessments, analyzing student work from these assessments, establishing shared expectations for implementing specific effective changes in classrooms, implementing changes consistently across all classrooms, and collecting and analyzing post-assessment data. To enable this core work to happen across a



district requires strong instructional leadership from principals. Although the Ohio Leadership Advisory Council (OLAC) has articulated essential practices for the superintendent and district and building leadership teams, the seminal role of the principal as instructional leader needs to be reinforced. Future work will focus on clarifying the role of the principal and designing training for principals to support this work.

The Stage 4 work includes two aspects: evaluation of the impact of the OIP and process and evaluation of the overall health or effective functioning of the statewide system of support. Evaluation of the impact of the OIP includes a process for using monitoring data from Stage 3 progress indicators along with systemic observations and self-reports from classrooms to measure impact on adult implementation of strategies and actions and student performance. This evaluation process takes place within a two- to three-year timeframe in which the district improvement plan is implemented and includes interim evaluations with opportunities for midcourse corrections by district leadership teams. At the end of the plan-implementation cycle, a summative evaluation also will be conducted, with a report generated by the district. A draft of the evaluation process has been completed by the Stage 4 cadre of the state-level design team (including a Great Lakes East representative) and will go through a series of edits and further drafts before being tested by selected districts.

The statewide system of support—composed of buildings, districts, regional supports, and the state—has a role to play in improving the system of education for all children. How well each of these levels performs their key functions has been described in sets of key indicators of effectiveness:

- **District and building level.** Evaluation of the overall health of the statewide system of support is done to assess the degree of implementation of strategies and actions and impact on changes in adult practice and student performance.
- **Regional level.** Evaluation data will be used to assess the effectiveness of support provided by ESCs, SSTs, and vendors and to make needed adjustments.
- **State level.** Evaluation will be used to gauge the overall “health” of the statewide system of support and make needed adjustments.

These indicators can be measured to a large degree by existing data and monitoring tools. This is the other work of Stage 4 evaluation—to develop a systemic way to evaluate the overall health of the statewide system of support. When fully operational, student results from the state, district, and building level will be used to validate data collected through the statewide system of support evaluation. Both aspects of Stage 4 evaluation should be completed by the end of Year 5 (September 30, 2010) and ready to be tested in districts and buildings.

Building a Sustainable, Statewide Training Model for Regional Providers. Sustainability includes not only a plan for how to ensure that this work continues but also how to ensure that the collective capacity of the system increases. Collective capacity in this context refers to ESC staff and SSTs who are able to provide highly competent, consistent facilitation support to districts and buildings; this capacity building depends upon sustained, high-quality professional development and training. Much of the work of the state-level design team and the cadre structure is now focused on building the collective capacity of the system in Ohio to support the work of improvement.

State-Level Design Team Cadre Work. The work of the state-level design team continues to evolve in response to scale-up, sustainability, and quality assurance challenges associated with broad implementation of OIP. Following is a list of the cadres and a description of their current work:



- **Stage 4 Cadre.** This cadre will continue to refine its articulated process for evaluation of impact of OIP on adult implementation and student progress. The statewide facilitator training in September 2010 will offer an opportunity to share this work with facilitators and launch some test districts that are ready for Stage 4. Another aspect of the work will be further work to operationalize the systematic collection of data focused on key indicators for the purpose of evaluating the overall health of the statewide system of support.
- **Facilitator Competencies Cadre.** This cadre will build upon its draft set of facilitator competencies and skills needed by external and internal facilitators of OIP and both broaden and deepen its work in this area. Immediate work will include developing a separate master facilitator competency tool with illustrations of what mastery looks like. Longer term, this cadre will develop an apprenticeship and coaching model to help move facilitators through levels of proficiency. Finally, this group will design professional development and rollout of this competency work through the quad and regional support structure beginning in fall 2010.
- **Regional Professional Development Parameters and Fidelity Checklist Cadre.** This new cadre will identify the parameters required in delivering professional development related to OLAC and OIP for all regions. They also will develop a checklist used by all regions to ensure consistent, accurate, and valid content specific to OLAC and OIP.
- **Statewide Facilitator Professional Development Cadre.** This cadre is charged with the ongoing design of ESC and SST facilitator and internal facilitator training, including agendas, presentations, handouts, evaluations, and any other materials. Two large facilitator trainings are planned for June 2–3, 2010, and the week of September 13.
- **OIP Facilitator's Guide and Resource Revision Cadre.** This new cadre is charged with reviewing related OIP documents that should be considered for inclusion in a revised (third edition) of the OIP *Facilitator's Guide*. Another aspect of this work is the development of a *Quick Guide*, based upon key portions of the larger *Facilitator's Guide* (including the Resources section) to enable easy access and understanding of the process for new external and internal facilitators.
- **Building-Level Administrator Training Cadre.** This new cadre will examine and clarify the critical role of the principal as instructional leader and within the district-, building-, and teacher-based team structure. This group also will be responsible for designing training and needed resources. It is anticipated that building-level administrator training will begin in fall 2010 at the quad and regional levels.



In the News

The following articles were selected to provide easy access to news and publications addressing the key education topics within each Great Lakes East state and across the nation during the past quarter.

INDIANA

IDOE Releases New AP Metric—Indiana Department of Education, June 2, 2010

http://www.doe.in.gov/news/2010/06-June/ap_metric.html

“The Indiana Department of Education released a new Advanced Placement (AP) metric today, combining the need for both access and success to the state’s most challenging courses.”

Schools to Receive IDOE Support for Improved Reading Instruction—Indiana Department of Education, May 26, 2010

<http://www.doe.in.gov/news/2010/05-May/ImprovedReading.html>

“Fifteen Indiana elementary schools have been selected to receive support from the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) to implement the state’s new K–6 Reading Framework in the 2010–2011 school year. IDOE will provide each Opportunity School a consultant with strong knowledge of strategies for effective reading instruction as well as funding for professional development.”

Bennett Testifies Before U.S. House Education and Labor Committee—Indiana Department of Education, May 5, 2010

<http://www.doe.in.gov/news/2010/05-May/BennettTestifiesBefore.html>

“Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction Dr. Tony Bennett spoke before the U.S. House Committee on Education and Labor in Washington, D.C., to discuss Indiana’s efforts to reform education,” including educator evaluations, growth in student achievement, and the Common Core Standards Initiative.

Common Core State Standards and Curriculum Mapping—Indiana Department of Education, May 3, 2010

<http://media.doe.in.gov/curriculum/2010-05-03-CommonCore.html>

“Listen to Dr. Schauna Findlay, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, describe the forthcoming Common Core State Standards and the state’s plan for adopting these standards and developing curriculum maps for teachers to help in the transition from our current Indiana Standards to the new Common Core State Standards.”

Media Advisory: Math and Science Programs Receive Funding for Innovation—Indiana Department of Education, April 26, 2010

<http://www.doe.in.gov/news/2010/04-April/MathScienceInnovation.html>

“The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) is pleased to announce the winners of the Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) 2009–10 and the Classroom Innovation in Mathematics 2010–11 grant competitions, totaling approximately \$4.4 million in funding for local school corporations.”

IDOE Halts Race to the Top Efforts, Focuses on Implementing Reform Plans—Indiana Department of Education, April 22, 2010

<http://www.doe.in.gov/news/2010/04-April/IDOEHaltsRttT.html>

State Superintendent of Public Instruction Dr. Tony Bennett issued the following: “Indiana will not apply for Phase 2 funding. Instead, just as today’s students have no time to waste, IDOE will waste no time as we continue our efforts to implement Indiana’s Fast Forward plan without the federal funding. I am hopeful the unions will work with us throughout the implementation process, and I promise to make sure discussions between IDOE and the unions are transparent to all stakeholders.”



State to Better Target Schools' Needs With Improved Plan for Distributing Special Grant Resources—

Indiana Department of Education, April 21, 2010

<http://www.doe.in.gov/news/2010/04-April/StatetoBetterTarget.html>

“The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) today unveiled a network for improved support for students with special needs made possible through Indiana Resource Centers for Improvement Activities special education grants. These six resource centers, called the Indiana Resource Network (IRN), and the grant recipients will work together to provide Indiana’s schools targeted and comprehensive special education support and assistance.”

Indiana to Receive More Than \$61 Million to Turn Around Its Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools—

U.S. Department of Education, March 26, 2010

<http://www2.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2010/03/03262010.html>

“The \$61,312,973 made available to Indiana is being distributed by formula to the state and will then be competed out by the state to school districts.”

NAEP Reading Scores Show Indiana Students' Performance Stagnant —Indiana Department of Education, March 24, 2010

<http://www.doe.in.gov/news/2010/03-March/NAEPReading.html>

“Although Indiana fourth and eighth graders outscore the national average, results released today by the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) on reading achievement show Hoosier students have not shown statistically significant improvement in more than 15 years.”



MICHIGAN

Michigan Submits Race to the Top Application Plan to Strengthen Schools, Help Students Achieve, Has Support of Nearly 90 Percent of State's Schools—Michigan Department of Education, May 27, 2010

http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-37818_34785-237683--,00.html

“The Michigan Department of Education has submitted the state’s second round application for the federal Race to the Top grant, meeting the June 1 deadline. The application outlines the state’s plan to use nearly \$400 million in federal funds to help implement critical school reforms to improve instruction and enhance transparency and accountability.”

Michigan’s complete application is available at: <http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140--236662--,00.html>

State Superintendent's Podcast: Bringing the Mustard—Michigan Department of Education, May 19, 2010

http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-37818_45256-237237--,00.html

“State Superintendent Mike Flanagan rolls up his sleeves as this school year comes to a close. He reflects on the historic reforms and accomplishments of the past year, and prepares for the work ahead to establish a world class education system for Michigan in the 21st Century.”

State Board of Education Unanimously Adopts Balanced, Bi-Partisan Plan to Reform and Finance State's Education System—Michigan Department of Education, May 11, 2010

http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-37818_34785-236815--,00.html

“The State Board of Education unanimously adopted today a balanced and bi-partisan plan to reform, restructure and finance Michigan’s education system, from early childhood education to post-secondary.”



State Board Commends State Superintendent; Extends His Contract by Another Year—Michigan

Department of Education, April 14, 2010

http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-37818_34785-235416--,00.html

“The State Board of Education on Tuesday extended by one year the contract of state Superintendent of Public Instruction Mike Flanagan, through May 1, 2013, while acknowledging the fine work he and the staff of the Michigan Department of Education are doing to lead reforms in Michigan’s education system.”

MEAP Reading and Math Scores Continue to Climb, Achievement Gap Narrows—Michigan Department of Education, March 12, 2010

http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-37818_34785-233315--,00.html

“Students gained three to eight percent in every grade except fourth, where the gain was one percent. Ninety percent of third graders, 84 percent of fourth graders and 85 percent of fifth grade students attained basic proficiency. Students in sixth grade climbed from 80 to 88 percent, seventh graders increased three points to 82 percentage and eighth graders increased from 76 to 83 percent.”

Michigan to Receive Nearly \$430 Million in Additional Recovery Funds—U.S. Department of Education, March 11, 2010

<http://www2.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2010/03/03112010b.html>

“U. S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan today announced that an additional \$429,781,767 is now available for Michigan under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009. To date, Michigan has received \$2,765,006,656 through the Recovery Act. The state recently reported that recovery dollars have been used to provide funding for more than 9,300 education jobs from Oct. 1 to Dec. 31, 2009, while also supporting programs that drive education reform.”



OHIO

New Options for Earning Credits Coming to Woodridge High School—Akron Ohio News, April 29, 2010

<http://www.akron.com/akron-ohio-education-news.asp?aID=8860>

“Ohio Senate Bill (SB) No. 311 established a new core curriculum and mandated a program of ‘Credit Flexibility’ for Ohio’s high schools. In addition to attending and passing courses taught in the traditional classroom, students will have the option to earn credits in nontraditional ways, including independent study, online classes, post-secondary classes at universities, study abroad, portfolio, internship and testing out of classes. ... SB No. 311 requires, beginning in the 2010–11 school year, [these options to] be available to all students who are eligible to earn high school credits, which could include middle school students.”

Ohio Awarded \$5.1 Million to Enhance Data Systems—Ohio Department of Education, May 24, 2010

<https://webapp1.ode.state.oh.us/cncs/view.asp?id=839787229691791784>

“Superintendent of Public Instruction Deborah Delisle today announced that Ohio has been awarded \$5.1 million from the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) to enhance Ohio’s statewide longitudinal data systems (SLDS). Ohio will use these funds to interconnect systems that collect information about pre-kindergarten, K–12 and postsecondary educational systems, as well as information about Ohio’s workforce.”

More Ohio Schools Join Race to the Top Effort—Ohio Department of Education, May 17, 2010

<https://webapp1.ode.state.oh.us/cncs/view.asp?id=875555298521169629>

“Deborah Delisle, state superintendent of public instruction, today announced that 536 public school districts and community schools have affirmed their commitment to strengthening education by agreeing to participate in Ohio’s Race to the Top (RttT) efforts.”



Spring 2010

Ohio School Districts Awarded Competitive Technology Grants—Ohio Department of Education, May 12, 2010

<https://webapp1.ode.state.oh.us/cncs/view.asp?id=635549762374784972>

“eTech Ohio and the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) today announced the 38 recipients of nearly \$11 million in American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Title II-D Round 2 Competitive Grants for the 2010–2011 school year. The purpose of these grants is to provide teachers professional development opportunities to learn how to integrate technology and 21st century skills into daily classroom activities.”

Ohio Receives \$132 Million in Federal School Improvement Funds—Ohio Department of Education, March 26, 2010

<https://webapp1.ode.state.oh.us/cncs/view.asp?id=222137572345459946>

“These resources are aimed at helping struggling schools improve academic performance. The \$132 million award is part of the \$3.5 billion that will be made available to states this spring from money set aside in the 2009 federal budget and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.”

Ohio Students Make Reading Strides on 2009 National Report Card—Ohio Department of Education, March 24, 2010

<https://webapp1.ode.state.oh.us/cncs/view.asp?id=198164897693911578>

“Ohio continues to outperform the national average in reading for both fourth and eighth graders. ... The average scale score in reading for all Ohio fourth-graders was 225, above the national rate of 220. ... The average scale score in reading for all Ohio eighth-graders was 269, above the national average of 262.”

Ohio to Receive More Than \$483 Million in Additional Recovery Funds—U.S. Department of Education, March 8, 2010

<http://www2.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2010/03/03082010b.html>

“U. S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan today announced that an additional \$483,024,288 is now available for Ohio under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009. To date, Ohio has received \$2,986,873,388 through the Recovery Act. The state recently reported that recovery dollars have been used to provide funding for more than 11,800 education jobs from Oct. 1 to Dec. 31, 2009, while also supporting programs that drive education reform.”



ELSEWHERE IN THE NATION

Recent Education News

Final Version of Common Standards Unveiled—*Education Week*, June 2, 2010

<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2010/06/02/33common.h29.html?tkn=LXRFCyGdoGnX5LYQPcVdYPJHmjCXG0GtaNq6&cmp=clp-edweek>

“The final set of common academic standards was released today, capping months of closed-door work to write them and months more to revise them with feedback from state education officials, teachers’ unions, and other education interest groups. The project is an attempt to address the uneven patchwork of standards that results in differing expectations among schools, districts, and states and leaves many students unprepared for work or college.”

Full standards documents are available at: <http://www.corestandards.org/the-standards>



Hawaii Schools Adopting National Curriculum Standards—*Honolulu Advertiser*, May 27, 2010

<http://www.honoluluadvertiser.com/article/20100527/NEWS01/5270360/Hawaii+schools+adopting+national+curriculum+standards>

“Students in Hawaii will soon be held to the same expectations as students in California or Wisconsin or almost any other state, under common national standards adopted by the state Board of Education. ... Beginning next school year, education officials will begin widespread professional development and training to prepare public school teachers for the shift to common educational standards in math and English.”

Maryland Endorses Core Standards for Public Schools—*Washington Post*, May 26, 2010

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/05/25/AR2010052504424.html?hpid=sec-education>

“Maryland ... became one of the first states to endorse academic standards that are part of a movement to unify reading and math instruction across the nation. ... The reforms mean that Maryland's 844,000 students would study the same topics in the same year as peers in other states that sign on to the standards.”

Just 25 Percent of U.S. Children Attend Summer Learning Programs, According to “America After 3PM, Special Report on Summer”—Afterschool Alliance, May 25, 2010

http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/press_archives/AA3PM_African-American_Summer_NR.pdf

“The summer learning report ... finds that 43 percent of the estimated 14.3 million children who attend summer learning programs qualify for free or reduced price lunches. But the unmet demand also is great for African-American and low income children, many of whom are unsupervised during the summer months.”

Full report *America After 3PM* is available at:

http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/documents/Special_Report_on_Summer_052510.pdf

Common-Standards Draft Excludes ELL Proficiency—*Education Week*, May 20, 2010

<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2010/05/20/33common-ell.h29.html?tkn=QOZFBx9foCY3TpjE7IJGwxhZcYIrlcPeHQzY&cmp=clp-edweek>

“The writing teams for common standards have sought the advice of researchers on English-language learners, but the organizations that are coordinating the venture don't plan to produce a set of English-language-proficiency standards to go with the common standards. ... Meanwhile, the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment, or WIDA, consortium, whose English-language-proficiency standards have been adopted by 23 states and the District of Columbia, is already revising them to align with the common standards.”

Obama Administration's Education Reform Plan Emphasizes Flexibility, Resources and Accountability for Results—U.S. Department of Education, March 15, 2010

<http://www2.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2010/03/03152010.html>

“The Obama administration's blueprint to overhaul the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) will support state and local efforts to help ensure that all students graduate prepared for college and a career.”

A *Blueprint for Reform* is available at: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/blueprint/blueprint.pdf>

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act

Race to Top, Round 2: The Contenders—*Education Week*, June 1, 2010

http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/state_edwatch/2010/06/race_to_top_round_2_the_contenders.html?cmp=clp-edweek

“It's certainly not going out on a limb to predict that strong finishers in Round One are likely to be competitive again: Illinois, Florida, Louisiana, and Rhode Island, for example. But let's consider what may happen with a couple of other, lower-profile applicants.”



Other States Join Indiana in Spurning Grant Program—*Indianapolis Business Journal*, May 31, 2010

<http://www.ibj.com/other-states-join-indiana-in-spurning-grant-program/PARAMS/article/20252>

“About two dozen states are going back to Washington for another shot at billions in education grants under the ‘Race to the Top’ program, but at least nine others with more than 7 million children are opting out of trying a second time.”

States Create Flood of Education Bills—*New York Times*, May 31, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/01/education/01educ.html?ref=education>

“This flood of legislation, along with new rules in many states allowing for more charter schools, pioneering union contracts in several cities and a state-led effort to rewrite the nation’s academic standards, have made this spring a watershed period, said Jon Schnur, an education adviser to the Obama campaign who helped design Race to the Top.”

Scramble Begins for \$650 Million in ‘i3’ Funding—*Education Week*, April 20, 2010

<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2010/04/21/29stim3.h29.html?tkn=XYBFfRfWICRZ%2FA%2F0ejbTKxWDhD0o5TvVs9Qd&cmp=clp-ecseclips>

“Nearly 2,500 districts, schools, and nonprofits representing every state have indicated they plan to compete for an [Investing in Innovation grant](#), setting up a furious fight over \$650 million in federal economic-stimulus money that’s designed to scale up creative solutions to education’s most vexing problems.”

Secretary Duncan Releases Application for \$650 Million to Support Innovation—U.S. Department of Education, March 8, 2010

<http://www2.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2010/03/03082010.html>

“U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan today announced the Department of Education’s final priorities and the grant application for the \$650 million Investing in Innovation Fund (i3). The fund, which is part of the historic \$5 billion investment in school reform in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), will support the development of path-breaking new ideas, the validation of approaches that have demonstrated promise, and the scale-up of the nation’s most successful and proven education innovations.”

16 Finalists Announced in Phase 1 of Race to the Top Competition Finalists to Present in Mid-March; Winners Announced in Early April—U.S. Department of Education, March 4, 2010

<http://www2.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2010/03/03042010.html>

“Today the Department of Education announced that 15 states and the District of Columbia will advance as finalists for phase 1 of the Race to the Top competition.”



Resources

This section provides current resources and research available from regional comprehensive centers, national content centers, regional educational laboratories, and other technical assistance providers.

The Condition of Education 2010—National Center for Education Statistics, May 2010

<http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2010028>

“The Condition of Education 2010 summarizes important developments and trends in education using the latest available data. The report presents 49 indicators on the status and condition of education, in addition to a special section on high-poverty schools.”

Designing Common State Assessment Systems—National Governors Association and Council of Chief State School Officers, April 2010

<http://www.nga.org/Files/pdf/1004NGACSSOASSESSMENTS.PDF>

“The next generation of state assessments can make the Common Core State Standards concrete and meaningful to educators, students, and parents and provide a critical vehicle for ensuring that all students master essential knowledge and skills. Recognizing this opportunity, CCSSO and the NGA Center convened in February for a series of conversations with leaders of the six overlapping state consortia that already had formed to seek Race to the Top funds. Participants explored key priorities driving each consortium and identified areas of agreement that would provide a basis for common action.”

The Nation’s Report Card: Reading 2009—National Center for Education Statistics, March 2010

<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pubs/main2009/2010458.asp>

“At grade 4, the average reading score in 2009 was unchanged from the score in 2007 but was higher than the scores in other earlier assessment years from 1992 to 2005. ... At grade 8, the average reading score in 2009 was one point higher than in 2007 and four points higher than in 1992 but was not consistently higher than in all the assessment years in between.”

A Systematic Comparison of the American Diploma Project College Readiness Standards With Those of the ACT, College Board, and Standards for Success—REL Southwest, March 2010

<http://ies.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=REL2010086>

“This study of four national English language arts standards compares the content of three sets of standards with a benchmark set, the American Diploma Project (ADP), to see how closely the sets agree on what students should know in English language arts to prepare for college.”

Better Federal Policies Leading to Better Schools—Center on Education Policy, February 2010

<http://www.cep-dc.org/document/docWindow.cfm?fuseaction=document.viewDocument&documentid=301&documentFormatId=4592>

“This January marked the eighth anniversary of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). These eight years have been fraught with controversy as the federal government has assumed a broader and more forceful role in elementary and secondary education. Some of the ensuing changes have led to positive outcomes, while others have been ineffective. It’s a good time to rethink the federal role in elementary and secondary education.”



Processes and Challenges in Identifying Learning Disabilities Among English Language Learner Students in Three New York State Districts—REL Northeast and Islands, February 2010

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/projects/project.asp?ProjectID=116>

“To help districts accurately identify students who are English language learners and also have learning disabilities, this study examines practices and challenges in the processes applied in three New York State districts in identifying learning disabilities among students who are English language learners.”

Why Race to the Middle? First-Class State Standards Are Better Than Third-Class National Standards—Pioneer Institute for Public Policy Research, February 2010

http://pioneerinstitute.org/pdf/100223_why_race_to_the_middle.pdf

“This White Paper presents an analysis of the September 2009 draft of CCSSI’s College- and Career- Readiness Standards as well as the January 13 draft of its grade-level standards for K-12, which CCSSI sent to the states for inclusion in their RtT applications. Based on an analysis of those two documents and the process used to create them, this White Paper concludes that CCSSI’s initiative has so far failed to resolve the inherent tensions between these two goals and to produce standards that promise to improve both the education of all American students and America’s competitive position in the global economy.”

Improving American Education Through Educational Service Agencies—Association of Educational Service Agencies, January 2010

http://www.aesa.us/Research/AESA_White_Paper_1_2010.pdf

“AESA stands ready to assist the U.S. Department of Education in meeting the four key goals of Education Reform as detailed throughout this white paper.”

Tapping Title I: What Every School Administrator Should Know About Title I, Pre-K, and School Reform—PEW Center on the States, January 2010

http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/uploadedFiles/Title1_PartII.pdf

“This guide provides basic information that superintendents, school board members and other district officials need to make informed choices about using Title I resources to support quality pre-k programs that serve the earliest learners in the community.”

Performance Counts: Assessment Systems that Support High-Quality Learning—Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010

<http://www.ccsso.org/publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=381>

“This white paper describes what a student assessment system could look like if built from the principles and best practices found in current educational research and effective educational systems in the U.S. and high-achieving nations around the world.”



Calendar of Events

For additional listings, check the Great Lakes East website for the [Calendar of Events](#).

JUNE 2010

Date:	June 15	Topic:	Diplomas Count 2010: Graduation by the Numbers
Location:	Online	Audience:	Education leaders
Format:	Webinar	Sponsors:	Scholastic, <i>Education Week</i>
Dates:	June 20–23	Topic:	40th Annual National Conference on Student Assessment
Location:	Detroit, MI	Audience:	Educators, policymakers
Format:	Conference	Sponsor:	Council of Chief State School Officers
Date:	June 25	Topic:	Connecting Research to Practice: Effective Leadership to Transform Struggling Schools
Location:	Bloomington, IN	Audience:	School and district leaders
Format:	Conference	Sponsors:	Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Midwest at Learning Point Associates, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Department at Indiana University
Date:	June 28	Topic:	National Charter School Facilities Institute
Location:	Chicago, IL	Audience:	Entities applying for a charter, opening a first school, or planning to construct a new building
Format:	Institute	Sponsors:	U.S. Department of Education, National Charter School Resource Center at Learning Point Associates
Dates:	June 28–July 1	Topic:	National Charter Schools Conference “Innovators in Education: Leading the Race to the Top”
Location:	Chicago, IL	Audience:	Policymakers, educators, administrators, charter school advocates
Format:	Conference	Sponsor:	National Alliance for Public Charter Schools
Date:	June 30	Topic:	Braiding State and Federal Funds to Support Quality, Comprehensive Early Learning Services for Children Ages Birth to Five
Location:	Online	Audience:	School districts, community-based organizations
Format:	Webinar	Sponsor:	WestEd’s SchoolsMovingUp

JULY 2010

Dates:	July 19–21	Topic:	U.S. Department of Education Reading Institute Early Learning and Development Strand: Birth to Third Grade
Location:	Anaheim, CA	Audience:	Teachers, coaches, principals, state and district administrators
Format:	Institute	Sponsor:	U.S. Department of Education



Dates:	July 25–30	Topic:	A Perfect Match: Using Data and Standards to Drive Program Design
Location:	Chicago, IL	Audience:	Teams of teachers and administrators working to improve their district's language education programs for English language learners
Format:	Workshop Series	Sponsors:	Illinois Resource Center (IRC), the World Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium at the University of Wisconsin–Madison

UPCOMING EVENTS

Dates:	November 1–2	Topic:	Michigan's 13th Annual Charter Schools Conference
Location:	Detroit, MI	Audience:	Leaders of chartered public schools
Format:	Conference	Sponsor:	Michigan Association of Public School Academies
Dates:	November 3–6	Topic:	Midwest Regional Conference on Closing the Achievement Gap
Location:	Chicago, IL	Audience:	Educators, superintendents, student services support staff, Title I teachers and leaders
Format:	Conference	Sponsor:	University of Wisconsin–Green Bay
Dates:	November 11–12	Topic:	Ohio Alliance for Public Charter Schools 3rd Annual Conference
Location:	Columbus, OH	Audience:	Administrators, teachers, board members, sponsors
Format:	Conference	Sponsor:	Ohio Alliance for Public Charter Schools

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

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

4627_06/10