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Statutory 1003(g) Purpose

- The U.S. Department of Education (ED) awards School Improvement Grants under section 1003(g) of the ESEA to States.

- States award subgrants to districts that apply for funds that can demonstrate commitment to serve Title I schools in improvement, corrective action or restructuring so as to enable those schools to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) and exit improvement status.
Administration’s 1003(g) Focus

- Identify and serve the lowest-achieving Title I schools in each state;
- Support only the most rigorous interventions that hold the promise of producing rapid improvements in student achievement and school culture;
- Provide sufficient resources over several years to implement those interventions; and
- Measure progress in achieving results.
Guiding Principles

- Students who attend our persistently lowest achieving school deserve better options
- We can not afford to wait
- Quality grants – not quantity
- Need to build capacity and support at all levels
- Multi-year activities

Implement *radical improvement* to:

- Transform school culture
- Increase student outcomes
Eligibility

An LEA is eligible to apply for SIG funds if it—
(A) Receives Title I, Part A funds; and
(B) has one or more schools that are eligible to receive SIG funds as identified by the SEA.

Eligible schools will be identified as either Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools.

Funding priority will go to Tier I and Tier II schools.
1003(g) Tier I Schools

- Is a Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that—

- Is within the lowest achieving 5% of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action or restructuring in the state based on the 3 year average performance of the ALL group in reading and math combined (15.8% or less in 2009-2010), OR

- Is a secondary school with a graduation rate of less than 60% over each of the last 3 years;

- Has demonstrated lack of progress.
1003(g) Tier II Schools

- Is a secondary school that is eligible, but does not receive Title I funds that:
  - Is within the lowest achieving 5% of secondary schools that are eligible, but do not receive Title I funds in the state, based on the 3 year average performance of the ALL group in reading and math combined (35.2% or less in 2009-2010), OR
  - Has a graduation rate of less than 60% over each of the last 3 years;
  - Has demonstrated lack of progress.
1003(g) Tier II Schools via Waiver

- Is a Title I secondary school in improvement, corrective action or restructuring that does not qualify as Tier I that:
  - Is no higher achieving than Tier II schools (35.2% or less in 2009-2010), based on 3 year average performance of the ALL group in reading and math combined, OR
  - Has a graduation rate of less than 60% over each of the last 3 years;
  - Has demonstrated lack of progress.
Waivers

ISBE will apply to ED for this authority and then LEAs will be able to apply to ISBE for consideration.

- Allow Tier I schools that implement a turnaround or restart model to “start over” in the school improvement timeline.

- Waive the 40% poverty threshold to permit the LEA to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I school that does not meet the poverty threshold.
Funding

- Annual grant awards to LEAs will range from not less than $50,000 to $2 million per participating Tier I and Tier II school, subject to available funds.
- Actual allocations based on the intervention model chosen and SEA guidelines.
- Grants are renewable for two additional one year periods, except in the case of school closure.
- The total amount of funding available is $137 million.
Funding Continued

- ISBE must give priority to LEAs that apply to serve Tier I or Tier II schools.
- ISBE will carry over 25% of FY 2009 SIG funds and combine with FY 2010 if we do not fund every Tier I school in FY 2010.
- ISBE is requesting a waiver that will extend the period of SIG funds to September 30, 2013.
Working With a Provider

- LEAs and schools are required to choose a Lead Partner to help them implement one of these models.
- For those LEAs desiring to use a provider not included on the Illinois Approved Provider List, pre-approval must be obtained from ISBE. LEA must describe how they recruited, screened, and selected the provider to ensure its quality.
# Illinois Approved Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Partners</th>
<th>Support Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy for Urban School Leaders</td>
<td>Academy for Urban School Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America’s Choice Inc.</td>
<td>Associated Colleges of Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium for Education Change</td>
<td>Consortium for Education Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison Learning Inc.</td>
<td>Federation for Community Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hopkins University - Diplomas Now</td>
<td>Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hopkins University – Talent Development</td>
<td>Illinois Association of School Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents</td>
<td>Learning Point Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Point Associates</td>
<td>New Leaders for New Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success For All Foundation Inc.</td>
<td>Teach for America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Intervention Models

LEAs receiving funds must agree to implement one of the following rigorous interventions in the Tier I and Tier II schools that the LEA commits to serve.

- Turnaround Model
- Restart Model
- School Closure
- Transformation Model

Note: an LEA with nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools would not be able to implement the Transformation Model in more than 50 percent of those schools.
Dramatic School Improvement Strategies

- Turnaround
- Restart
- Closure
- Transformation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers and Leaders</th>
<th>Instructional and Support Strategies</th>
<th>Time and Support</th>
<th>Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replace principal</td>
<td>Select and implement an instructional model based on student needs</td>
<td>Provide increased learning time</td>
<td>Provide sufficient operating flexibility to implement reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement new evaluation system</td>
<td>Uses student growth as a significant factor</td>
<td>Staff and students</td>
<td>Ensure ongoing technical assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed with staff</td>
<td>Identify and reward staff who are increasing student outcomes; support and then remove those who are not</td>
<td>Provide ongoing mechanism for community and family engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses student growth as a significant factor</td>
<td>Implement strategies to recruit, place and retain staff</td>
<td>Partner to provide social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TURNAROUND MODEL

### Teachers and Leaders
- Replace principal
- Use locally adopted “turnaround” competencies to review and select staff for school (rehire no more than 50% of existing staff)
- Implement strategies to recruit, place and retain staff

### Instructional and Support Strategies
- Select and implement an instructional model based on student needs
- Provide job-embedded PD designed to build capacity and support staff
- Ensure continuous use of data to inform and differentiate instruction

### Time and Support
- Provide increased learning time
- Staff and students
- Social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports

### Governance
- New governance structure
- Grant operating flexibility to school leader
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RESTART MODEL OPTIONS

Restart School

Converts to charter

Charter School Board

Performance contract

Education Management Organization

Charter Management Organization

Independent Operator

Education Management Organization

Charter Management Organization
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School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving.

Other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.
School Improvement Grant (SIG) Intervention Models

A webinar series prepared by the Center on Innovation & Improvement for use by the regional comprehensive centers and state education agencies to inform local education agencies.
Featured Presenter

Lauren Morando Rhim
Member, Scientific Council, Center on Innovation & Improvement and Education Consultant
WEBINAR OVERVIEW
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BRUTAL FACT #1: HIGH COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH LOW PERFORMANCE...

High Costs
- Unfulfilled potential
- Remediation
- Incarceration rates
- Job training
- Resources devoted to failed school interventions
- Lack of productivity (e.g., tax revenue)

Low Performance
- Failure to advance to the next grade
- Drop-out rates
- Illiteracy
- Lack of job skills
- Lack of preparation for post-secondary
“The status quo needs to change”

“This is not the kind of stability I want. I’m looking for improvement.”

Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, New York Times, March 1, 2010. Administration requires states to give priority in awarding SIG funds to LEAs with persistently lowest-achieving schools
U.S. Department of Education Priority Schools

Tier I schools: Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that —

• (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State; or
• (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years;

Tier II schools: Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that —

• (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds; or
• (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

Tier III schools, which are defined as any Title I school in

• improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is not a Tier I school. States may set additional criteria to differentiate among these schools, which might include schools with low absolute performance but high growth rates over a number years, or the bottom 6–10 percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
Dramatic School Improvement Strategies

- Turnaround
- Restart
- Closure
- Transformation
Determining best fit should be based on an appraisal of school and district capacity as well as an assessment of the supply of external partners or providers available to lead effort.

States, districts and individual schools must commit to making intentional choices and making intentional changes.

School districts must *develop and implement a strategic approach* to achieve goals given challenges.
DIFFERENTIATE INTERVENTIONS BASED ON SCHOOL AND SYSTEM CAPACITY*

Different Performance/Capacity = Different Intervention

- Closure
- Turnaround/Restart/Transformation
- Incremental Improvement
- Support and Sustain

* Distribution is not accurate representation of performance/capacity levels distribution
EMERGING BODY OF RESEARCH

No one approach or formula

Most definitive research conducted to date by CEP found:

• Multiple coordinated initiatives breed success
• Schools that exited restructuring use data (e.g., at least once a month)
• Replacing staff can improve but also, have negative consequences if not handled well
• Source: Center for Education Policy (December 2009). Improving Low-Performing Schools: Lessons from five Years of Studying School Restructuring under No Child Left Behind. www.cep-dc.org

Examples:

• Baltimore, MD
• Chicago, IL
• Hartford, CT
• New Orleans, LA
• New York City, NY
• Philadelphia, PA
• Washington, DC
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DISTRICT ROLE: BIG PICTURE I*

Commit to success

Identify schools for targeted intervention

Assess capacity in order to determine “best” intervention strategy

Cultivate pipeline of highly capable leaders

Create conditions for success

*Adapted from Kowal, Hassel & Hassel, December 2009
DISTRICT ROLE: BIG PICTURE II*

Set clear, fast timelines for results; expect strong gains in Year One

Develop credible “or else” to drive meaningful change

Proactively engage the community

Maintain laser sharp focus on tracking performance and when necessary, rapid “retry”

Highlight schools that dramatically improve performance

*Adapted from Kowal, Hassel & Hassel, December 2009
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...Select the best intervention model given the particular school/district/community context and then provide the highly capable leader with the flexibility required to make the changes necessary to drive dramatic improvement for the children currently enrolled in the school.

There is no ONE right answer or blue print
Develop model and partner/provider profiles

Develop school profile

Determine best-fit model and partners/providers for school

Define roles/develop contracts

Forge relationships

*Adapted from Redding (2010). Selecting the Intervention Model and Partners.
1. DEVELOP MODEL AND PARTNER/PROVIDER PROFILES

What state statutes and policies limit, create barriers, or provide support for each of the four intervention models?

What district policies address, limit, create barriers or provide support for each of the four intervention models?

What district contractual agreements, including collective bargaining, will affect each of the intervention models?
2. DEVELOP SCHOOL PROFILE

Characteristics of school and students?

- Grades served
- Enrollment
- % students qualified to receive free and reduced price meals
- % students eligible to receive special education services
- % students eligible to receive second language services/supports
- Community dynamics?
- School feeder pattern?

Leader background and core competencies?

Instructional staff?

- number and duration at school?
- Teacher evaluation process?
- Teacher absenteeism
2. DEVELOP SCHOOL PROFILE cont.

- Prior reform efforts and outcomes?
- Performance profile by grade, subject area and subgroup?
- Noteworthy performance trends/patterns?
3. DETERMINE BEST-FIT MODEL AND PARTNERS/PROVIDERS FOR SCHOOL

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?

Characteristics to consider:

- School performance?
- School capacity?
- District capacity?
- Community capacity?
4. DEFINE ROLES AND DEVELOP CONTRACTS

Given identified capacity and “best fit,” determine what if any role each of the following stakeholders play in the intervention model.

What are the performance expectations?

State Education Agency?  
Local Education Agency?  
Internal Partner/Provider (LEA staff)?  
Lead Partner/Provider?  
Support Partner/Provider?  
Support Partner/Provider?  
Principal?  
School Teams?  
Parents & Community?
Regardless of the intervention model selected, it is critical that the LEA forge a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities associated with the school improvement effort.

- How will the LEA manage the working relationships among the groups and partners/providers committed to this intervention?
- What are the formative and summative performance expectations for the lead partner/provider and supporting partners/providers?
- How will the LEA’s monitor implementation of the intervention model? Who will do what and when?
5. FORGE RELATIONSHIPS: KEY TERMS*

AUTONOMY TO BE EXTENDED?

- **Personnel decisions**, including hiring and firing, management, performance standards and grievance processes
- **Financial management**, including which portions of the budget may be allocated at the school level
- **Educational program**, including curriculum, instructional approaches, discipline policies, professional development and parental involvement
- **Governance and operations**, including board and/or management structure, calendar and length of the school day.

*Adapted from Hassel & Hassel (2005). Starting Fresh Series*
5. FORGE RELATIONSHIPS: KEY TERMS

STUDENT PERFORMANCE METRICS?

- **Student achievement results**, including absolute, value-added and comparative performance on state standardized and nationally-normed assessments
- **Other measures of academic success**, including attendance and graduation rates and mission-specific outcomes

FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE METRICS?

- **Financial management and viability**, including prior and pro-forma budgets, cash flow statements and student enrollment

LEGAL PERFORMANCE METRICS?

- **Educational programs**, including special education and English Language Learner programs
- **Health and safety**, including student discipline and due process
- **Facilities**, including building code and accessibility
- **Fiscal compliance**, including internal controls and generally accepted accounting principles
- **Governance**, including open meeting laws and by-law adherence
**SIG Grant Timeline**

- **Feb ’10**
  - Feb 2010 SEAs’ SIG applications due to ED
  - ED awards SIG grants to States

- **March-April ’10**
  - LEA application process

- **May ’10**
  - SEA awards grants to LEAs
  - LEAs begin implementation

- **Fall ’10**
  - SIG schools open/reopen
SAMPLE DISTRICT-WIDE IMPLEMENTATION
TIMELINE

March–April ’10
• LEA application process
• Identify Tier 1, II, and III Schools
• Develop process to assess school, district, community, and external provider/partner capacity
• Release call for proposals from external providers/partners committed to school improvement

May ’10
• SEA awards grants to LEAs
• Conduct intervention selection analysis for all schools identified for intervention
• Identify “best fit” model given school/district/community capacity
• Develop plan to manage intervention portfolio
• Forge relationships

June – Aug. ’10
• Provide support to schools preparing to initiate dramatic improvement effort
• Develop plan to maximize key school assets: time, people, and resources
• Plan opening day event initiating school improvement campaign and set high expectations for dramatic improvement

Sept–Dec.’10
• SIG schools open/reopen
• Track intervention models using identified benchmarks
• Identify and celebrate early wins
• Monitor efforts that fail to show evidence of key dramatic improvement indicators

Jan. ’11 –
• Identify schools targeted for school improvement
• Restart cycle to assess school, district and provider/partner capacity and determine best fit
• Monitor intervention efforts to identify candidates for rapid retry efforts
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PITFALLS TO AVOID

Selecting one-size fits all intervention models absent tangible data about school performance, district capacity, and availability of partners/providers

Waiting for a prescriptive solution or blueprint for how to dramatically improve persistently low-achieving schools

Failing to conduct due diligence about potential partners/providers

Mistaking “I don’t know how” for “I can’t” or “it can’t be done”* (*paraphrased quotation from Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, NYU)

Failing to construct clear and transparent performance expectations and measures, and rewards as well as consequences associated with success and failure in school improvement efforts
Approximate Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>- Tier II Waiver posted for comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid March</td>
<td>- Tier II Waiver comments due &amp; sent to ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- ISBE 1003(g) application submitted to ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Draft LEA 1003(g) RFP released for planning purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late March</td>
<td>- ED approval of SEA 1003(g) application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early April</td>
<td>- LEA 1003(g) RFP released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early May</td>
<td>- LEA 1003(g) RFP’s due to ISBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early June</td>
<td>- Funds awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Implementation begins immediately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions and comments can be sent to sip1003g@isbe.net
Resources

- **ED School Improvement Grants:**

- **ISBE’s School Improvement Page:**
  [http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip_1003.htm](http://www.isbe.net/sos/htmls/sip_1003.htm)

Check back often – this page will be updated when new information becomes available.
FURTHER QUESTIONS....

http://www.centerii.org/

Webinar citation:
LEA Tier I & II
Technical Assistance Day

March 29, 2010
Bloomington, Illinois

Please Register at sip1003g@isbe.net