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SIG 1003(g) Bidders’ Webinar Series

1. Introduction to the School Improvement Grant 1003(g) for Cohort 5 FY15 - FY17
2. Pre-Application Needs Assessment
3. Successful Applications by Design
4. Budget Webinar
5. Compiling and Submitting the SIG 1003(g) Application
Agenda

- Application Scoring Timeline and Process
- Scoring Strategy
- Improvements to the Rubric
- Working Backward from the Rubric
- Resources
Application Review Timeline

- Application’s Due to ISBE May 7, 2014
- External Reviewers Score Each Application Using the Rubric
- Earned ≥ 50% of Capacity Points
  ISBE ranks schools by Readiness Score
- ISBE Recommends Schools for Funding, Interviews Top Scoring Schools, Issues Conditions of Funding
- ISBE Consultants Document Level of Compliance with Requirements
Capacity and Readiness

• Capacity – the LEA’s ability to support implementation of the selected intervention model during the grant period and to sustain the reforms at the end of the grant period.

• Readiness – The degree to which the school has implemented structures, policies, practices and associated strategies to enact the intervention model.
Appendix C: Capacity Scores

• There are a total of 16 Criteria for Turnaround or Transformation
• Each capacity criterion is worth 10 possible points.
• In order to be considered for funding, the LEA’s total Capacity score must be ≥ 50% of the total possible points.
• *Think in terms of earning at least 5 points (moderate to strong) for each LEA criterion.*
Appendix D: Readiness Scores

• There are a total of 13 Criteria for Turnaround or Transformation Schools; each is worth 10 possible points

• Individual Schools whose LEA earned 50% of total capacity are ranked by their readiness score

• Additional readiness points may be assigned

• Think in terms of earning the most points possible in this section.
Why Change the Rubric?

- Changes in school code and passage of time
- Change in ISBE formula for identifying priority schools
- Stronger connection with federal requirements
- Statistical Analysis of past Criteria Scores
- Minimize redundancy
- Need to make a clear distinction between LEA capacity and school readiness in the narrative and final decision
Criteria: Current Format

• Every sub-criteria has a Strong, Moderate, Limited, Not Provided Component.
• Highlighted sub-criteria are given added weight.
  – Evaluative: Will it work?
  – Evidence of Collaboration and Assent: MOU or Letter of Support
  – Evidence of Progress
## Weighted (Boldfaced) Sub-Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LIMITED</th>
<th>NOT PROVIDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 points</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>2 points</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A
- **Description is strong and specific.**  
  - ...described with moderate detail.  
  - ... described with limited specificity.  
  - This section is missing.

### B
- **The [intervention] will substantially support the district's ability to...**  
  - The [intervention] will moderately support the district's ability to...  
  - The [intervention] will partially support the district's ability to...  
  - The [intervention] will not support the district's ability to...

### C
- **Evidence of approval is provided in the form of a signed MOU**  
  - Evidence of approval is provided in the form of signed letters  
  - Approval is stated in the narrative.  
  - There is no evidence of approval.
Added Weight: Evaluative

- Non-evaluative: The LEA strongly describes, in the narrative, specific strategies, with a corresponding timeline, that it will use to identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates (where applicable).

- Evaluative: The reward system described will strongly and substantially support the district's ability to identify and reward staff members who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates (where applicable).
Added Weight: Evidence

• Collaboration and Assent
  – Evidence of approval for the development and implementation of a structure that will identify and reward teachers, and other staff, who in implementing this model have increased student achievement and/or high school graduation rates (if applicable) is provided in the form of a signed MOU or language within an existing Collective Bargaining Agreement or contract between the school board and the teachers (union).

• Progress
  – The narrative provides evidence that the principal’s actions resulted in substantial progress by specifying improvements in student achievement data, leading /lagging indicators, and other metrics that measure the success of school turnaround.
Avoid Redundancy in These Sections of the LEA and School Proposals

- Needs Analysis
- Principal
- Extended Time
- Lead Partner
- Budget and Timeline
Working Backward from the Rubric

- Appendix C – LEA Capacity Scoring Rubric
- Appendix D – Individual School Readiness Scoring Rubric

An asterisk (*) indicates a change from previous RFPs
Stakeholder Involvement and Commitment

- LEA - I.1 Needs Assessment
- School - I.1 Administration of the Needs Assessment
- School - I.2 Level of Commitment
- School - I.3 Stakeholder Consultation
Needs Assessment

• I.I LEA – Needs Analysis
  – Emphasis on thorough understanding of key issues
  – Strong evidence of collaboration

• I.1 Individual School – Administration of the Needs Assessment
  – Local, multi-step process involving all stakeholder groups
  – Strong rationale for selection of intervention model AND non-selection of other models
### Part IV. Determining the (Best-Fit) Intervention Model for School

The chief question to answer in determining the most appropriate intervention model is: What improvement strategy will result in the most immediate and substantial improvement in learning and school success for the students now attending this school given the existing capacity in the school and the district? There is no “correct” or “formulaic” answer to this question. Rather, relative degrees of performance and capacity should guide decision making. The following table outlines key areas and characteristics of performance and school, district, and community capacity that should be considered as part of your decision making. In the first column, check the boxes that accurately describe the school. The checks in the right four columns indicate that if this characteristic is present, the respective intervention model could be an option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of Performance and Capacity</th>
<th>INTERVENTION MODEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARACTERISTIC</strong></td>
<td>TURNAROUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ All students experiencing low achievement/graduation rates</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Select sub-groups of students experiencing low performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Students experiencing low achievement in all core subject areas</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Students experiencing low achievement in only select subject areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Strong, current (2 yrs or less) or readily available turnaround leader</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Evidence of pockets of strong instructional staff capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Evidence of limited staff capacity</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Evidence of negative school culture</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ History of chronic low achievement</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Physical plant deficiencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Evidence of response to prior reform efforts</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Willing to negotiate for waivers of collective bargaining agreements</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Needs Analysis - Tip

• The Needs Analysis should drive
  – Goals/Objectives
  – Strategies
  – Budgets and Timelines
  – Proposed Activities
  – Selection of the Lead Partner, etc.
School – I.2 Level of Commitment

• Five letters of support for the five most dramatic changes
  – Union leadership
  – School Board
  – Three additional letters from organizations with large constituencies
School – I.3 Stakeholder Consultation

• External and internal stakeholders were given multiple opportunities to plan and assess

• The team included members from five constituencies: parents, community members, union leadership, school staff, and LEA staff

• Weight: Communications and outreach is substantial; Evidence
LEA - 1.2 Goals and Objectives

• Goals and objectives are ambitious and **Strategic**, **Measurable**, **Achievable**, **Realistic**, and **Time-bound** (SMART)

• At least one goal is in reading

• At least one goal is in mathematics

• Include various forms, trend, *growth*, and *fidelity* metrics*
Examples

• Trend: 80% of all students will meet or exceed standards on the state exam in FY2015.
• Growth: 75% of students will make expected gains on the NWEA exam in reading.
• Fidelity: All ELA and social studies teachers will demonstrate common core instructional shifts during informal observations.
Theory of Action Handout

1. Establish specific district wide Goals and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1 Reading</th>
<th>Evidence of Improvement or Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The FY13 SIG high school had an average 2012 Reading M/E of ___%, therefore it will demonstrate an increase in academic achievement in reading to ___% PSAE M/E (2013) and ___% in 2014 through the implementation of comprehensive school improvement plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
90% of 9th grade students will be on-track to graduate  
(Relates to graduation rate and dropout rate metrics)  
50% of students will make expected gains between the Explore to Plan  
50% of students will make expected gains between Plan to ACT  
(Directly relates to achievement metrics)  
% of students who complete AP courses during SY2014 increases by 20 percentage points  
(Relates to advanced coursework metrics)  
Increase student attendance rate by 5% each quarter  
Out of school suspensions will decrease by 10% each quarter for 9th graders |

Objectives [Levers³]  

1.1 Develop and implement targeted Tier II/III interventions for at-risk students  
1.2 Increase student outcomes by aligning the curriculum and assessments to the Common Core State Standards  
1.3 Increase student outcomes by increasing AP participation, support systems, and course offerings  
1.4 Increase instructional time by improving attendance, decreasing truancy, and decreasing out of school suspensions
Metrics and Expected Year of Improvement

Appendix B
SIG 1003(g) Metrics and Expected Improvement Cycle

All data should be disaggregated by subgroup, and when appropriate, by grade level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Expected Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Behavior and Climate Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Attendance Rate¹</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Incidents</td>
<td>X²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy Rates</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-Out Rates</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Essential Survey², Culture Climate Indicators</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced Course Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Placement and/or International Baccalaureate Rates</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Math (Higher than Algebra 1, Geometry, Algebra 2)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade On-Track (Illinois State Course System)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th, 11th Grade On-Pace (Illinois State Course System)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Grade Course Enrollments (Illinois State Course System)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Talent</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹,²,³,⁴,⁵ Refer to specific notes or sources not provided in the image.
The Principal

- LEA – II.1 Recruitment and Selection of the Principal
- School – III.1 Staffing
LEA - II.1 Recruitment and Selection of the Principal

• Complete **whether or not** the principal remains
• Recruitment and selection process is extensive, research based, rigorous, and multi-step
• Specifies competencies (knowledge, skills, patterns of thinking)
• Describe lead partner involvement
Research Example
Principal Competencies

• School Improvement Resources Handout
• Public Impact: Competencies and Tool Kit for Interview Protocols
• Peoria School District – Habermann Model and Protocols
• CPS Application: Local Competencies and Protocols
• Doing What Works Website
School – III.1 Staffing, 2\textsuperscript{nd} half

• Complete 2\textsuperscript{nd} half only if the principal will remain

• Principal may not remain if hired before the transformation began (up to 2 years)

• Describe how the principal matches the competencies describe in LEA II.1

• Provide evidence of substantial progress under principal’s leadership: Strategies and Outcome measures

• Cohort 1 Principal Waiver
LEA - II.2 Operational Flexibility

• Commitment and capacity to provide principal with flexibility
  – LEA policies, practices
  – Calendars, time, scheduling, budget
  – Continuous, collaborative process to review and remove obstacles*
LEA - II.3 Evaluation System

• Rigorous, transparent, evaluation system for teachers AND principal
• All four criteria must be met:
  – Uses factors such as multiple observation-based assessments
  – Differentiates teachers into four categories
  – Designed and developed with teachers, support staff, and principal
  – Takes into account data on student growth
LEA- II.3 Evaluation System

• Year 1 pilot with growth component; Year 2 full implementation*

• Guidance for development and implementation of the growth component

http://www.isbe.net/PEAC/default.htm
LEA- II.3 Evaluation System

• Evidence of approval and assent is weighted

• Lead partner involvement must be specified
LEA – II.4

• Turnaround Only – Placement of Teachers and Staff
• Transformation Only – Identify and Reward Increased Student Achievement
II.4 Turnaround - Placement of Teachers and Staff

• Detailed, efficacious recruitment, selection and screening process
• 50% rule applies to entire staff, not just teachers
• Weight
  – Signed collaboration and assent
  – Processes ensure high quality staff will be attracted
II.4 Transformation Only

- Identify and Reward school leaders, teachers and other staff for increased student achievement and/or high school graduation rate
- Identify, remediate, and remove teachers who after ample opportunities to improve, have not done so
Examples of Rewards

- Group level stipends based on a matrix
- Open-Door Model Teachers
- Assigning extra duties, such as summer school, mentor teachers, or department chair, based on performance
- In-kind rewards
- Shout-outs during assemblies
Rewards That Don’t Fit Under This Category

- All teachers receive the same reward
- Reward is not connected to increased student achievement
- Incentive is tied to some other metric, such as teacher attendance
- Recruitment and/or Retention Incentives
Polling Questions #2
II. 4 Transformation - Rubric

• Weight
  – Evidence of approval and assent
  – Described activities are efficacious

• Costs described in the budget or other funding source is described

• Lead Partner involvement is specified

• Plan to sustain activities is included
LEA II.5 – Incentives for Recruitment and Retention

• Examples of strategies
  – Increased opportunities for promotion and career growth
  – More flexible work conditions
  – Grow Your Own Teacher Induction Programs

• Weight
  – Evidence of collaboration and assent
  – Strategies are effective
LEA II.5 – Incentives for Recruitment and Retention

• Describe lead partner involvement*
• Describe how the strategies will be sustained*
• Previously funded schools must describe the extent to which they sustained these strategies*
Extended Time

• II.7 LEA – Extended Time (Actual Increase)
• II. 1 School – Use of Extended Time
LEA II.7 Extended Time (Actual)

- Explicitly quantify the **actual** increase in school day, week, year for ALL students
- Describe Lead Partner involvement*
- Reference associated costs in the budget
- Describe how the extension in time will be sustained*
- Weight
  - Increase is the students’ time in school is significant
  - Evidence of collaboration and assent
School II.1 – Use of Extended Time

- Describe the increase in all three areas
  - Core subject areas
  - Non-core or enrichment activities
  - Teacher collaboration for planning, PD, data analysis, etc.

- Increase must be available for all students
  - Before and after school programs are not as effective as those applied during school
School II.1 – Use of Extended Time

- **Weight**
  - Increased use of time in all three areas will significantly impact student achievement
  - The extension in learning time is applied to all students

- If previously funded, extension in time has been sustained*

- Plan describes how it will sustain this strategy after the grant*
Curriculum and Instruction

• LEA – II.7 Alignment of Standards
  – Implement and monitor vertical and horizontal alignment of standards

• School – II.4 Comprehensive Instructional Reform
  – Target instructional strategies that meet the needs of all students within the school
LEA II.7 Alignment of Standards

• Vertical alignment and alignment with the Illinois Learning Standards
• Alignment is consistent all students, including LEP and students with IEPs
• Includes the Lead Partner’s involvement*
• Describes procedures and protocols to ensure fidelity and efficacy of implementation*
School - II.4 Comprehensive Instructional Reform - Examples

• Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions
• Establishing small learning communities
• Providing supports for SPED and ELL students
• Credit recovery
• Re-engagement strategies
School - II.4 Comprehensive Instructional Reform - Examples

- Basic skills remediation
- Early Warning Systems
- Transitional Support services, such as freshmen academies
- Opportunities for advanced coursework (AP, IB, dual enrollment)
- Other research based strategies
School - II.4 Comprehensive Instructional Reform

• Specific supports based on identified needs
• At least five of the strategies listed in the rubric
• Describe protocol for monitoring and fidelity measures*
• Weight: Plan ensures access to a high-quality curriculum for ALL students
• Resource: Effective Implementation of School Improvement Grants
LEA - II.8 Governance

- Turnaround – Turnaround Leader or Office that reports directly to the district Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer
- Transformation – Transformation leader or project manager who reports directly to the district Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer
Purpose of Governance
Requirement

• Weight: The plan includes significant structural and programmatic changes at the LEA level to support the work
• Coordination and Support
• Ensure operational flexibility
• Direct communication line between the principal/school and superintendent/district
Governance Considerations

• How should the current district and responsibilities of cabinet members be restructured?
• How many schools will be served?
• Will you keep this position after the grant period?
• What are the strengths and weaknesses of the LEA?
Lead Partner

• **II.10 LEA - Selecting Lead Partner**
  – Selection process is rigorous and designed to match individual school’s needs.

• **II.7 Individual School – Role of Lead Partner**
  – Role is specifically defined and extensive with specific measurable outcomes
  – Selected lead partner provides evidence of intent and assent
School II.7-Role of the Lead Partner

• A strong proposal will list 7-10 contracted responsibilities

• The lead partner will be held accountable for specific academic performance, climate/culture, or teacher talent outcome measures*

• Weight: Evidence of assent and daily on-site presence
Lead Partner Involvement
Sub-criteria

The roles, responsibilities, and decision making authority of the Lead Partner (or other external agency) as they relate to this process are described specifically.
Lead Partner Sub-Criteria

Cross Reference

- LEA II.1 – Recruitment and Selection of the Principal
- LEA II.3 – Evaluation System
- LEA II.4 – (Turnaround) Placement of Teachers and Staff
- LEA II.4 – (Transformation) Identify and Reward Increased Student Achievement
Lead Partner Sub-Criteria

Cross Reference

• LEA II.5 – Incentives for Recruitment and Retention
• LEA II.6 – Extended Time (Actual)
• LEA II.7 – Alignment of Standards
• LEA II.8 – Governance
• School II.5 – Job-Embedded Professional Development
• School II.6 – Community Engagement
Lead Partner Resources

• School Improvement Grant Resources
  – USED School Turnaround Learning Community
  – State Development Network

• ISBE Lead Partner Webpage
  http://www.isbe.net/apl/default.htm

• Sample Decision Rights Matrix
Illinois Approved Lead Partners

- Academy for Urban School Leadership (AUSL)
- Atlantic Research Partners, Inc.
- Cambridge Education LLC
- Consortium for Education Change (CEC)
- Edison Learning, Inc.
- Evans Newton, Inc
- Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents of Schools (IARSS)
- JHU – Diplomas Now
- JHU - Talent Development
- Learning Point Associates
- University of Chicago - Network for College Success (NCS)
- Strategic Learning Initiative
- Success for All Foundation, Inc.

http://isbe.state.il.us/apl/default.htm
Questions?
LEA II.10 – Sustainability Planning

- Sustainability planning is now an annual process*
LEA II.10 – Sustainability Planning

• Weight: Plan includes all of the following*
  – A cost-benefit analysis and return on academic investment
  – Building staff capacity
  – Repurposing Staff
  – Resource reallocation
  – Re-evaluating Partner agreements
  – Incorporating meaningful stakeholder engagement
LEA II.10 – Sustainability Planning

• Weight: Plan measures the impact of academic and social interventions against their associated costs*

• The Lead Partner’s involvement is specified*
Sustainability Sub-Criteria

• The narrative describes how it will sustain full implementation of ____ after the grant cycle is complete with strong detail.
Sustainability Sub-Criteria
Cross Reference

- LEA – II.4 Identify and Reward Student Achievement
- LEA – II.5 Incentives for Recruitment and Retention
- LEA – II.6 Extended Time – Actual Increase
- LEA – III.1 Budget
- LEA – III.2 Timeline
Sustainability Sub-Criteria Cross Reference

- School - II.1 Use of Extended Time
- School – II.5 Job-Embedded Professional Development
- School III.2 Budget
Previously Funded SIG Schools

• Must describe the extent to which they have sustained certain requirements
  – LEA -II.5 Incentives for Recruitment and Retention
  – School II.1 Use of Extended Time
LEA II.10 Sustainability Planning

• Reference these documents listed on your resource handout
  – Massachusetts Department of Education Sustainability Toolkit
  – Southeast and Texas Comprehensive Center Toolkit

http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip_1003_resources.htm
LEA – II.11 Pre-Implementation

• Staff recruitment and selection
• Recruitment and assembly of the principal and leadership team(s)
• Staff instructional planning
• Negotiation costs associated with SIG related adjustments/waivers to the CBA
• Training for the intervention model
• Develop program monitoring system
• Operationalize new governance/schedule
LEA – II.11 Pre-Implementation

- Pre-Implementation is the period after the grant award begins (July 1) and before school goes into session.
- Pre-Implementation activities support the full implementation of the model at the start of the school year.
- Make sure that actions described in this section are listed in the budget detail breakdown – Detail breakdown – (Pre-Implementation)
Program Monitoring and Communication

• II.13 LEA - Monitoring
  – LEA monitors the performance of the school and lead partner regularly

• II.2 and II.3 Individual School
  – Data Driven Decision Making – Climate and Culture
  – Data Driven Decision Making – Student Achievement
School II.2 – Data Driven Decision Making (Climate and Culture)*

• Coherent plan to improve school culture among students and faculty
• Interventions must align with the RtI framework*
• Metrics used to monitor progress, frequency of measurement and analysis is described*
• Weight: Interventions are research-based and will substantially respond to students needs.
School – II.3 Data Driven Decision Making, Student Achievement*

• Described interventions align within the three tiers of RtI*

• Assessment data is described
  – Formative, short cycle, interim and summative
  – With whom it will be shared, frequency

• Weight: Intervention Strategies will substantially improve students’ academic achievement and graduation rate
Monitoring Cross Reference

– LEA – II.9 Selecting the Lead Partner
– LEA – II.11 Pre-Implementation
– School – II.4 Comprehensive Instructional Reform
– School – II.6 Job-Embedded Professional Development
Budget and Timeline

• LEA Specific
  – LEA III.1 Budget
  – LEA III.2 Timeline

• Individual School Specific
  – School III.2 Budget
  – School III.3 Timeline
Remaining School Level Criteria

• II.5 Job-Embedded Professional Development
• II.6 Community Engagement
• III.1 Staffing
School – II.5 Job-Embedded Professional Development

• Three-year timeline
  – Topics, persons responsible, persons receiving, delivery method

• Weight
  – Fidelity and efficacy are monitored
  – Associated metrics
  – Will significantly improve student achievement
School – II.6 Community Engagement

• Various Forms:
  – Outreach with hard to reach families
  – Supports for newcomers
  – Range of family involvement opportunities
  – Public meetings to review progress
  – Satisfaction surveys
  – Communication in the home language
School – III.1 Staffing

• Job-descriptions
  – New staff positions
  – Modified positions*

• Job Descriptions include
  – Qualifications
  – Interventions and metrics for which they will be held accountable

• Principal – if remaining describe fully
  -if not, so state
If You Have Questions

Springfield
E. Robin Staudenmeier
estauden@isbe.net
A. Rae Clementz
aclementz@isbe.net

Chicago
Linda Shay
lshay@isbe.net