

**Report of Task Force on
Innovation, Intervention, and Restructuring**

January 1, 2010

Task Force Members

Senator Pam Althoff	Illinois General Assembly
Gina Burkhardt	Chief Executive Officer Learning Point Associates
Representative Roger Eddy	Illinois General Assembly
Donald Feinstein	Executive Director Academy for Urban School Leadership
Susie Morrison	Deputy Superintendent and Chief of Staff Illinois State Board of Education
Dorland Norris	Deputy Superintendent Curriculum Design, Educational Services and Equity Champaign Unit 4 Schools
<i>Chair</i> - Sam Redding	Director Center on Innovation & Improvement
Senator Heather Steans	Illinois General Assembly
Jose Torres	Superintendent School District U-46 (Elgin)

The Task Force was ably facilitated by Peggie Garcia, Learning Point Associates, who arranged the meetings, recorded minutes, and circulated drafts of documents among the Task Force members. The Task Force met in Bloomington on November 23 and December 21, held a conference call meeting on December 18, and exchanged drafts of documents by email. Meeting minutes, as approved by the members, are attached as an addendum to this report.

Innovation, Intervention, and Restructuring – Defining the Terms

Innovation. A persistently low-achieving school has not demonstrated acceptable improvement after a number of years of failed attempts. Obviously, marked change is in order so that more students are not sacrificed. Innovation is a change in course, a break from business as usual, a new way to solve a problem. Interventions in persistently low-achieving schools, over the next three years, will take a variety of forms and will be executed by many school districts and external partners. Innovation is to be expected.

Intervention. This Task Force was initiated by the General Assembly, and the timeframe for the Task Force’s work coincided with the U. S. Education Department’s (USED) release of information about federal funding and regulatory programs that place a heavy emphasis on interventions in persistently low-achieving schools. Through the federal programs, the interventions are executed by the Local Education Agency (LEA), with State Education Agency (SEA) support and guidance, using federal dollars (School Improvement Grants for all states and Race to the Top funds in some states, competitively determined). USED defines four intervention models as follows, and the Task Force operated within these definitional bounds:

- **Turnaround model:** The Local Education Agency (LEA) replaces the principal and rehires no more than 50% of the staff; gives greater principal autonomy; implements other prescribed and recommended strategies
- **Restart model:** The LEA converts or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, charter management organization, or education management organization
- **School closure:** The LEA closes the school and enrolls the students in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving
- **Transformation model:** The LEA replaces the principal (except in specified situations); implements a rigorous staff evaluation and development system; institutes comprehensive instructional reform; increases learning time and applies community-oriented school strategies; and provides greater operational flexibility and support for the school.

Note: The four intervention models are those provided and defined by the U. S. Department of Education, and the task force takes no position on their relative effectiveness.

Recommendation: The task force recommends that ISBE establish a firm definition of a successful intervention that can be applied in determining whether a turnaround effort (by any intervention model) has been successful. That definition might include:

- Three-year time frame, from the beginning of the intervention to the expected results;
- at least 50 percent of students in the school meeting proficiency in reading and mathematics;
- closing at least half the gap between the school’s baseline year performance (percent of students testing proficient or better) on state assessments in reading and math and the performance of non-poverty students in the state; and
- a set of metrics to measure the progressions of growth over time on multiple indicators.

Restructuring. Restructuring is defined under current federal law (NCLB) as a sanction for Title I schools that have made inadequate yearly progress for five or more years. The LEA is required to restructure these schools in one or more of five ways:

1. reopen the school as a public charter school;
2. replace “all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal) who are relevant to the failure to make adequate yearly progress”;

3. contract with an outside “entity, such as a private management company, with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the public school”;
4. turn the “operation of the school over to the State educational agency, if permitted under State law and agreed to by the State”; or
5. engage in another form of major restructuring that makes fundamental reforms, “such as significant changes in the school’s staffing and governance, to improve student academic achievement in the school and that has substantial promise of enabling the school to make adequate yearly progress”(No Child Left Behind, Sec. 1116, 20, U.S.C.A. §6301-6578; 2002).

Non-regulatory guidance from the U.S. Department of Education in 2006 further defines this fifth “other” option to include reforms such as:

1. changing the governance structure of the school either to diminish school-based management and decision making or to increase control, monitoring, and oversight by the LEA;
2. closing the school and reopening it as a focus or theme school with new staff or staff skilled in the focus area;
3. reconstituting the school into smaller autonomous learning communities;
4. dissolving the school and assigning students to other schools in the district;
5. pairing the school in restructuring with a higher performing school; or
6. expanding or narrowing the grades served.

For the 2007-08 school year, 3,500 schools—or 7% of all Title I schools—were in restructuring planning or implementation status (CEP, 2008), and that number was escalating each year. A study by the Center on Education Policy (2008) found that the “other” option for restructuring was chosen in 89% to 96% of the cases, state to state, in the five states studied.

An analysis of the CEP data and related studies and review of restructuring successes by the Center on Innovation & Improvement (Brinson & Rhim, 2009) concluded that:

- Few leaders of schools identified for restructuring were implementing significant changes to school governance and staffing as envisioned in NCLB (USDE, 2007);
- Districts often choose the least prescriptive restructuring option for their schools; and
- All of the four most significant restructuring options are not available to schools.
 - In 10 states, charter conversion is not an option because charter schools are not allowed by state law. In many states that do have charter school laws, charter caps or other restrictions may limit conversion as a restructuring approach (Hassel, Hassel, Arkin, Kowal, & Steiner, 2006).
 - Some states have constitutions or laws forbidding state takeover. In other states, many top administrators believe that takeover would be a logistical quagmire (Steiner, 2006).
 - Contracting with an outside provider for many schools—especially small schools or geographically isolated schools— was difficult because contractors are simply not available or affordable.

- Replacing some or all of the teachers and administrators met obstacles including the availability of leaders likely to obtain better results and high-quality teacher replacements (Kowal, 2009).

For these reasons, the U.S. Department of Education, through initiatives including those associated with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) have urged changes in state statute and policy to allow for the adoption of intervention models such as the four prescribed in the School Improvement Grant program.

References

- Brinson, D. and Rhim, L. (2009). *Breaking the habit of low performance*. Lincoln, IL: Center on Innovation & Improvement. Retrieved from www.centerii.org/survey
- Center on Education Policy. (2008). *A call to restructure restructuring: Lessons from the No Child Left Behind Act in five states*. Washington, DC: Author <http://www.cep-dc.org>.
- Hassel, E. A., Hassel, B., Arkin, M. D., Kowal, J. & Steiner, L. M. (2006). *School restructuring under No Child Left Behind: What works when?* Washington, D.C.: Public Impact for Learning Point Associates. <http://www.centerforcsri.org/files/RestructuringGuide.pdf>
- Kowal, J. (2009). *Performance-based dismissals: Cross-sector lessons for school turnarounds*. Center on Innovation & Improvement. Available at www.centerii.org/survey.
- Steiner, L. (2006). *School restructuring options under No Child Left Behind: What works when? State takeovers of individual schools*. Washington, D.C.: Public Impact for Learning Point Associates. <http://www.centerforcsri.org/pubs/restructuring/KnowledgeIssues1StateTakeovers.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education (2007). *State and local implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, Volume III—Accountability under NCLB: Interim report*. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service, D.C., 2007.

Recommendations for the Seven Assigned Tasks

The recommendations of the Task Force relative to the seven tasks assigned it in Public Act 096-0109 follow:

Task 1: Ways in which Illinois can identify schools requiring more intensive interventions.

A framework of criteria for identifying schools requiring intensive intervention has been provided by the U. S. Department of Education relative to the Race to the Top competition and the School Improvement Grants (supplemental to Title I). ISBE has operated within this framework to identify the persistently lowest-performing schools.

ISBE recently (December 2009) released three lists of schools identified by this definition, based on data from 2007-2009. See Appendix of this report for lists of schools and also see definitions and lists at: <http://www.isbe.net/SFSF/default.htm>

Priority Schools. ISBE identifies "Illinois Priority Schools" using data from all schools in the State, regardless of Title I status, that have been in existence for more than three years. ISBE uses the three-year average performance of the "all students" group on state assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.

The Priority Schools are:

- a. The lowest achieving 5% of those schools, using three-year average performance of the "all students" group on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and
- b. Any secondary school with an average graduation rate of less than 60% over the last three years.

In December 2009 identified 181 Priority Schools. 151 of the 181 Priority Schools are high schools. Again, these are the lowest-achieving 5% of all schools in the state, based on a three-year average of performance by all students in the school on state assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.

Because federal funds for school improvement are tied to Title I, ISBE identified two tiers of low-achieving schools applying federal criteria for School Improvement Grants.

Tier I schools: Title I schools in federal improvement status (more than two years not making adequate yearly progress). Schools identified as Tier I schools from this group meet one of two criteria:

- a. Being in the lowest-achieving 5% of Title I schools in federal improvement status. Achievement was based on the average performance of the "All" group on the state assessments over the last three years in reading/language arts and mathematics combined.
- b. Having a graduation rate below 60% for the last three years.

In December 2009, ISBE identified 40 Tier I schools. All Tier I schools are high schools.

Tier II schools: Title I eligible secondary schools not receiving Title I funding. Schools identified as Tier II schools from this group meet one of two criteria:

- a. Being in the lowest-achieving 5% of these schools. Achievement was based on the average performance of the "All" group on the state assessments over the last three years.
- b. Having a graduation rate below 60% for the last three years

In December 2009, ISBE identified 15 Tier II schools. All 15 Tier II schools are high schools.

ISBE will identify a third tier of low-achieving schools. Again, consistent with federal criteria, Tier III schools will be a subset of schools that are in Title I improvement status, possibly 5% of those schools beyond the 5% identified in Tier I. The amount of federal funding will determine the percentage bracket that will be applied. In other words, more funds will allow for more schools to be identified and served with interventions.

With the federal School Improvement Grants from USED, ISBE will be able to provide three years of support for districts to implement intensive interventions in Tier I and Tier II schools, subject to successful application for the funds by the districts. This level of funding will allow for grants of up to \$500,000 per school per year for three years. If Illinois is successful in receiving an award in the highly competitive Race to the Top program, an additional \$200 million to \$400 million would be available, allowing ISBE to extend the intervention support to Tier III schools.

Districts and schools not receiving additional funding from the School Improvement Grants or Race to the Top will still be subject to the Title I sanctions in place since No Child Left Behind, including corrective action and, for schools, restructuring.

Recommendations for Task 1

The task force had no recommendations for Task 1.

Task 2: Strategies for strengthening leadership at struggling schools and otherwise strengthening school district capacity to effectively implement reforms and ensure continuous improvement.

The task force members agreed that leadership of turnaround schools is different than leadership in traditional schools. As a result, a different kind of preparation is necessary for these leaders. Charter Management Organizations (CMOs), Education Management Organizations (EMOs), and other organizations contracted by districts to implement re-starts and turnarounds will be expected to select, prepare, and support principals and other leaders to perform the duties of a turnaround leader. When districts choose to manage their own turnarounds and transformations, they will benefit state efforts to prepare a pool of leaders for these intervention strategies.

Recommendations for Task 2

1. The task force recommends that Illinois establish a residency model to “incubate” principals for service in turnarounds and transformations. Such a program would place a prospective turnaround leader as an understudy in a school going through a turnaround as part of the preparation for leadership in their own turnaround school. The program should maintain mentoring and support for the principal when that principal assumes leadership in a turnaround or transformation situation. The Illinois turnaround leader residency model might be provided in conjunction with CMOs, EMOs, and other organizations with similar interests in the state. The cost of the program might be shared by the state and districts that receive the trained leaders.
2. The task force further recommends that training for principals who will be placed in turnaround and transformation situations should include: (a) the dynamics of change in a dramatic intervention; and (b) skills necessary to strong instructional leadership.
3. The task force suggests that Illinois consider certifying “school administration managers” (SAMs) to serve alongside principals who could then focus on instructional leadership.
4. ISBE will need an effective, regional support system to provide training, consultation, and support for leaders and teachers, especially to prevent more schools from becoming persistently low-achieving.

Task 3: Strategies that have been involved in successful turnaround efforts and a template for evaluating turnaround efforts.

The Innovation, Intervention, and Restructuring Task Force was charged with delineating an overall goal for the Illinois Turnaround and Transformation efforts that will be funded over the next three years with ARRA legislated funding – both through Race to the Top competitive dollars and through state-allocated 1003G dollars (School Improvement Grants). Additionally, the Task Force was asked to recommend strategies for monitoring and reporting success of this effort over the three year period and at the end of the funding cycle. Below you will find our response to this charge.

Note: While by federal definition, a “turnaround” is one of four intervention models, all the models are intended to turn a school around or replace it with a better educational setting for the students. The task force uses “turnaround” here to apply to all the interventions except school closure, which would be the turnaround, transformation, and restart intervention models.

Goal of an Illinois Effective Turnaround Effort: Turnaround is a dramatic and comprehensive intervention in a low-performing school that: a) produces significant advances in closing achievement gaps among student groups and significant gains in student achievement within 3 years; and b) readies the school for the longer process of transformation into a high-performance organization.

A school designated for turnaround, transformation, or restart has specific conditions that are part of the comprehensive intervention. In order to ensure that the intervention is designed and implemented in the most efficient and effective manner, there are indicators that must be tracked and reported over time to allow for continuous improvement, monitoring, and accountability.

The metrics associated with each of these indicators will be developed by ISBE in collaboration with the education community.

Recommendations for Task 3

1. Following are indicators the Task Force recommends that the ISBE use to collect data to measure continuous progress and success of the turnaround effort. The ISBE should work with experts in education as well as representatives from the field to develop benchmarks and metrics against which success in each of these areas can be measured. Success at the school, district, state and provider levels are all important to the overall measure of the success of the turnaround effort. And, while it is ultimately most important to positively affect student achievement and to close the current and pervasive achievement gaps among student groups, there is considerable data that need to also be collected to determine the return on investment in Illinois from this turnaround effort.

Students

Leading Indicators

- Attendance
- Student Engagement

Goal - Improved student achievement – Narrowing Achievement Gap

- Absolute test score
- Gain/Growth model
- Increased Graduation rates
- Increased College enrollment and sustained enrollment
- Enhanced Workforce readiness

School

Leading Indicators

- Improved climate/culture
- Improved student attendance
- Reduction in misconducts, referrals and dismissals
- Enhanced parent/community engagement
- Re-enrollment of dropouts

Goal - Improved student achievement – Narrowing Achievement Gap

- Absolute test score
- Gain/Growth model
- Increased Graduation rates
- Increased College enrollment and sustained enrollment
- Enhanced Workforce readiness

Turnaround/Transformation/Charter Providers

- Efficient and leveraged budget
- Inclusive of a performance management system against which metrics are defined and data collected

- Qualified personnel with rigorous performance evaluation conducted regularly and stringent accountability
- Timely and high quality reporting
- Rapport with teachers, community, and partners
- Ability to serve multiple sites and evidence of serving diverse populations and geographic areas
- Clearly defined intervention model with strong instructional and human capital components
- Ability to identify and recruit successfully from a high quality staffing pipeline
- Research/evidence base of effectiveness at raising student achievement
- Highest quality organizational resources
- Highly effective internal and external communication strategies
- Demonstrated client satisfaction

State

- Performance monitoring system that captures data about fiscal management, student performance, and school performance
- Data collected and presented on graduation rates
- Process for selecting and monitoring provider performance
- Internal capacity for an effective system of support for providers, leaders and teachers (e.g., turnaround unit within ISBE)
- Summative rigorous measure of student achievement
- Metrics developed and made transparent to schools and community; mechanisms for effectively collecting and reporting data on a regular basis to multiple audiences
- Ability to aggregate
- SLDS to capture longitudinal employment data
- Reduced college remediation rates

The Task Force provides the following recommendations for the ISBE to consider related to the goals and indicators presented above:

1. The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) should use a set of common metrics to evaluate the success of all turnarounds in Illinois; incorporating general indicators that are applied to all schools and unique metrics to address specific local or school contexts. The ISBE should consider developing indicators and metrics that are specific to elementary schools and others that should be designed for high schools.
2. The ISBE should create a transparent and fair mechanism for developing targets for how much an identified school needs to improve if the turnaround effort is to be characterized as successful. Schools will start in different places and there must be a way to determine success for schools that start in different places. Options may include closing achievement gaps in any given school by half or third (closing the achievement gap should be not within school, but statewide) and increasing graduation rate by some designated percentage. The ISBE should strongly consider defining the point of transition

from triage to stabilized; e.g., continual school improvement as more than the majority of students at or above proficient

3. The ISBE should include achievement in reading and mathematics explicitly in the definition of turnaround success. It should be noted that the state assessment will most likely change during the next three years so that it will not be possible to measure improvements in reading achievement in turnaround schools on the same measure over the next five years. However, since it is unlikely that the national consortium will develop and implement new standardized assessments that are linked to the common core standards before 2014, 2010 data could serve as the baseline in Illinois and turnarounds could be judged on their performance between 2010 and 2014
4. The ISBE is strongly encouraged to include in the student assessment indicator, not just the state achievement test, but multiple assessment measures that can be used to show growth at the elementary and high school levels. These may include formative and benchmark assessments that are approved by the ISBE. Benchmarks should include leading indicators related to achievement and multiple measures that assess climate and culture. And, no matter what turnaround model is implemented or what provider is chosen to work in a school or district, the benchmarks should be the same.
5. The ISBE should develop a matrix, using the benchmarks submitted by vendors proposing to work with turnaround schools, to help these identified schools understand what type of growth over time is expected and to allow schools to create early indicators to monitor for success or failure of the turnaround effort
6. The ISBE must include sustainability as a category because turnaround schools will need to consider how to use unprecedented federal funding over the next few years to build capacity and develop structures that will enable their success to continue beyond this short-term funding stream.
7. The ISBE should establish the expectation that a partner organization working with the district to turn schools around phase out their involvement in year five.
8. The ISBE should create an effective process for monitoring and oversight of the turnaround school effort. It is highly recommended that the ISBE create a designated unit within the agency that has authority and resources to oversee the lead and supporting partners' efforts as well as to track and share best practices and collect data on effectiveness. The ISBE should develop an oversight office whether or not they receive funding through Race to the Top. A single person with expertise in rapid school improvement should be charged with responsibility for the operation of this office.
9. The ISBE should recognize that the transformation designation/model is incremental reform and should be encouraged to support other intervention models that include more aggressive human capital strategies.
10. The ISBE should recognize the financial burden of teacher dismissal on districts outside of Chicago and be encouraged to develop a strategy that supports districts in choosing the best teacher assignments that "fit" for the school, rather than seniority, to fill vacant positions with the most talented people possible
11. Two additional legislative changes should be considered by the ISBE – that the exemption for Chicago related to teacher dismissals be extended to apply to low-achieving schools statewide and that, as in California, legislation prohibit collective bargaining agreements from including seniority bumping provisions.

12. The ISBE should consider including a recommendation for Illinois to require a residency model to prepare leaders and teachers for turnaround schools. Illinois should also require mentoring for these leaders and teachers and provide them with a network of support.

Task 4: The autonomies, resources, and support that need to be available to achieve and maintain over time a successful turnaround.

Much more will be known to answer this task when Illinois has a body of evidence about successful turnarounds from which it can draw conclusions. Task 5 addresses how that body of evidence might be obtained. In general, the task force assumes that:

1. Greater school-level autonomy will be necessary in persistently low-achieving schools, including flexibility in staffing, budgeting, curriculum, and scheduling. In short, turnaround leaders must be able to replace staff, extend learning time, and reallocate resources to fit the immediate local need.
2. Greater autonomy and flexibility must be accompanied by greater accountability for results, including decisions made about continued employment of leaders and staff.
3. Illinois will need a larger pipeline of qualified and effective leaders and teachers to meet the human capital needs of the intervention efforts.
4. Illinois will need an adequate number of qualified providers (CMOs, EMOs, external partners).
5. Illinois will need a comprehensive, connected, integrated longitudinal data system at state, district and school level.
6. Illinois will need sound methods for tracking costs and providing cost to benefit analyses related to innovations, interventions, and turnarounds.

Task 5: Mechanisms for model innovations to be captured and shared across this State.

The Illinois Partnership Zone is the name ISBE has chosen to describe the cluster of low-achieving schools in which interventions will be applied and the districts and external partners that serve them. One benefit of the Illinois Partnership Zone is that it creates a natural laboratory within which a variety of hypotheses will be tested, and from which lessons will be learned that may be applied for the improvement of all Illinois schools, and especially for turning around low-achieving schools. For this reason, it is necessary for ISBE to put in place systems for collecting data from the beginning of the Zone's operation, a design for analyzing the data, and a plan to disseminate the lessons learned. While ISBE should assume primary responsibility for the design of the studies and their dissemination, ISBE will require resources to engage consultants in both the design phase and in the implementation of the studies and their dissemination.

The Partnership Zone is premised upon three primary assumptions:

1. Low-achieving schools can be categorized into three Tiers based on available data, and interventions and supports (including funding) can vary by according to the Tier.
2. A low-achieving school can be rapidly improved (within three years) through one of three intervention models: Turnaround, Restart, or Transformation.
3. Some schools will not adequately respond to one of the three aforementioned intervention models, and their students will benefit from a fourth intervention model—the school’s closure and the students’ placement in higher-achieving schools.

Within each of the four intervention models (Turnaround, Restart, Transformation, and Closure), great variety will be displayed in the mix of external partners employed, the leadership applied, and the strategies implemented. This variety lends itself to systematic analysis of the relationship between the actions taken and the results achieved.

The collection of data and the analysis of these data should include, but not be limited to, an examination of the following questions:

A. School Context and Selection/Implementation of an Intervention

1. What were the school’s prior context, student demographics, and performance?
2. What changed in terms of student demographics and enrollment with the onset of the intervention?
3. Which intervention model was employed?
4. What factors were considered in selecting the intervention model and who was involved in making the decision?
5. Which external partners were engaged, and what was the role and extent of involvement of each?
6. What level of funding was available, both in terms of the school’s standard operational budget and the additional funds provided for purposes of the intervention, and how was the funding allocated?
7. What is the theory of action (or theory of change) for the intervention, as expressed by the district itself (turnarounds and transformations) or the lead agency (restarts)?
8. What new flexibility in staffing, scheduling, and budgeting was granted the school leaders? [Review key documents such as policies, contracts, job descriptions, and budgets.]
9. How did the district support the intervention, the school leaders, and the school staff?
10. How did the state support the intervention, the school leaders, and the school staff?
11. How did the community support the intervention, the school leaders, and the school staff?

B. School Closures and Staff Dismissals and Reassignments

In School Closures

1. In which higher-achieving schools were the students enrolled, and how did the influx of students affect these schools?
2. How were the receiving schools staffed to accommodate the influx of students?

3. What support did the district and state provide the receiving schools?
4. How did the students enrolled in the closed school fare in the receiving schools?
5. What were the consequences of school closure to the school's neighborhood, enrollment area, or community?
6. How were the students and their families supported by the LEA through the re-enrollment process?

In School Closures and in Other Interventions that Required Staff Dismissal or Reassignment

7. How many and which staff were dismissed, reassigned?
8. How was current staff dismissed or reassigned—process for determining which staff was dismissed and which staff was reassigned?
9. How did the statutory, policy, and collective bargaining context relevant to the school affect removal or reassignment of current staff?
10. What were the consequences to recipient schools where staff was reassigned?
11. What were the budgetary burdens of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that was necessary?

C. Leadership and Decision Making (Interventions other than closure)

1. What leadership changes were made, what factors were considered in selecting new leaders, and what background did the new leaders possess?
2. How were the school's governance and decision-making structures changed?
3. How are teams organized, purposed, scheduled, and supervised?
4. How were resources allocated to address learning goals?
5. What decision-making structures, including team responsibilities, were established?
6. What data, management, and information systems were employed?

D. Curriculum and Instruction (Interventions other than closure)

1. How are students enrolled or placed in program areas, curricula, or small schools?
2. How are curriculum, instruction, and assessment aligned with standards?
3. What is the curriculum – description, scope, focus, articulation, organization?
4. What formative and periodic assessments of student learning are utilized?
5. What is the nature and quality of instructional delivery (teaching and classroom management)?
6. How is instruction differentiated for students?
7. How is instructional planning by teachers (individual and team) conducted—structures, time, expectations, work products?
8. How much instructional time is provided and how is it organized—school year, school day, and periods within the day?

E. Human Capital (Interventions other than closure)

1. What, if any, performance incentives are provided for personnel?
2. What are the personnel policies and procedures (hiring, placing, evaluating, promoting, retaining, replacing)?
3. What are the professional development processes and procedures?
4. What professional development is provided?

F. Student Support (Interventions other than closure)

1. What programs and services are provided for English language learners?
2. How is extended learning time provided (supplemental educational services, after-school programs, summer school, for example)?
3. What is the nature and quality of parental involvement, school-home communication, and parent options?
4. What programs, services, and procedures are provided for students with disabilities?
5. What student support services are provided (tutoring, counseling, placement, for example)?
6. How are social and emotional learning, school climate, and discipline addressed—policies, practices, procedures?
7. What community-oriented school programs and practices are utilized?

Recommendations for Task 5

The analysis of data described above should take into account:

1. Cost-benefit analysis should be included.
2. Quantitative data must be accompanied by in-depth case studies of a sample of schools.
3. Reports generated from the studies should:
 - a. include practical and procedural guidance,
 - b. be presented in plain language for practitioners and policy makers, and
 - c. be accompanied by trainings and forums to enhance their adoption.
4. Schools outside the Zone that have demonstrated a turnaround, by the same definition applied within the Zone, should also be studied and included in the reports.
5. Studies should continue beyond the time of the turnaround attempt (typically three years) to determine the relative sustainability of the interventions and strategies employed.

Task 6: The amount of funding necessary to accomplish any and all strategies included in the task force's recommendation.

The task force agreed that it would be difficult to determine a dollar amount to fund the task force's recommendations. However, turning around persistently low-achieving schools requires a considerable investment, especially for external partners to provide the expertise sufficient to the task. While the federal government is providing significant funding for this work over the next three years, through programs related to ARRA, the state must consider how it:

1. Efficiently, equitably, and transparently manages and reports the allocation and use of funds for the interventions;
2. Provides support, coordination, and systemic integrity for the districts, CMOs, EMOs, and other external partners in the Illinois Partnership Zone;
3. Sustains the productive work beyond the life of the federal funding;
4. Ensures that ISBE can maintain the quality of service required for all of its functions without being unduly drained in resources and staff to oversee this intensive intervention work.

In addition to new funding, the legislature should consider ways to add new efficiencies to the Illinois education system, including district consolidation and other strategies to reallocate existing resources more efficiently, especially to reorganize districts around feeder patterns for greater curricular and managerial coherence.

The federally prescribed intervention models call for significant replacement of personnel. Illinois must consider where it finds a supply of highly qualified and effective leaders and teachers to restock low-achieving schools with talent. Investment in increasing the supply of teachers and school leaders may be necessary, as well as incentives to attract the best talent to the schools in greatest need of improvement.

Task 7: The identification of any statutory or regulatory changes that would be necessary or helpful to promote successful innovation, intervention, and restructuring.

In order to provide flexibility and local autonomy to implement successful interventions, districts may need relief from statutory and collective bargaining barriers.

Recommendations for Task 7

Currently the General Assembly is considering a resolution (HJR 74) that would create a task force to study existing state mandates and make recommendations as to which mandates could be eliminated. The elimination of unnecessary mandates could lead to a reprioritization of funding to support reforms aimed at improving student achievement.

1. The task force suggests that Illinois consider granting *charter-like* exemptions and waivers of state regulations to persistently low-achieving schools. Louisiana's experience with charter-like schools might provide a model for consideration.
2. The task force suggests that Illinois consider changing state statute relative to persistently low-achieving schools to limit a district's financial burden for staff removal in ways similar to limits now in effect only for Chicago Public Schools.

For schools identified as persistently low-achieving, districts need relief from statute and collective bargaining:

1. To extend the school day and school year without undue financial burden.
2. To not be bound by seniority bumping provisions that limit a principal's ability to determine the staff necessary for rapid school improvement. See California for similar legislation.
3. So that leaders and teachers removed from the school do not maintain contractual rights that add the cost of unnecessary staffing and of legal challenges to the removal.

For all schools in Illinois, the legislature should consider:

1. Requiring teachers to pass the state assessment tests taken by their students as part of teacher certification and recertification.
2. Expanding alternative certification programs to increase the pool of talent for leaders and teachers.

3. Requiring measures of student growth on state standards assessments as a component of leader and teacher evaluation.

Appendix

Minutes of Task Force Meeting – November 23, 2009

Minutes of Task Force Meeting – December 18, 2009

Minutes of Task Force Meeting – December 21, 2009

Illinois Priority Schools – December 2009

Illinois Tier I Schools – December 2009

Illinois Tier II Schools – December 2009

**Illinois State Board of Education
Innovation, Intervention, and Restructuring Task Force**

**November 23, 2009
Minutes**

The first meeting of the Innovation, Intervention, and Restructuring Task Force was called to order at 10:09 a.m. by Dr. Sam Redding of the Center on Innovation and Improvement. One member of the task force was absent and one member was represented by his designee. A list of the task force members in attendance appears on the final page of this document. After welcoming the task force members, Dr. Redding asked the members to introduce themselves. In addition to the appointed task force members, Jonathan Furr was in attendance to support the Illinois State Board of Education. No additional guests arrived at the meeting to participate during the public participation period.

Senator Steans, who introduced the legislation that called for the task force to be created, provided the task force members with some background. Robin Steans, of Advance Illinois, Senator Steans, and the Governor's office worked closely together to draft this legislation to help the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) build capacity and increase flexibility for schools in Illinois. Senator Steans is also the co-chair of the Independent Charter School Authorizing Task Force. She commented that it might be possible for members of this task force to learn from the successes that charter schools have had in Illinois and apply those lessons to improve struggling schools.

Dr. Redding observed that the scope of work for the task force overlaps with efforts that are currently underway at ISBE to prepare for the application for Race to the Top and 1003(g) school improvement grants. Gina Burkhardt mentioned that Illinois is guaranteed to receive funding through 1003(g) grants, but Race to the Top will be a very competitive process. Susie Morrison commented that the recommendations of the task force may help ISBE develop a long-term framework for improving struggling schools that extends beyond the Race to the Top timeline. She then pointed out that the U.S. Department of Education is using similar criteria and goals for all of the federal funds that will be available over the next few years. She anticipates that structure will be helpful for ISBE and the task force as they develop plans to improve struggling schools. Gina Burkhardt urged ISBE to use this opportunity to identify successful strategies for improving struggling schools and then expand those best practices beyond the bottom 5 percent of schools.

Jonathan Furr and Susie Morrison reviewed the process that ISBE is using to identify the lowest-achieving schools in the state. They are basing their process on the federal criteria that outline priorities for three tiers of schools. The first tier, the highest priority schools for intervention, includes those schools in the lowest 5 percent of Title I schools that are currently in some type of NCLB status and high schools with less than a 60 percent graduation rate. Tier II schools are similarly low-achieving secondary schools that are eligible for Title I funds, but do not receive them. Tier III will include any other Title I school in some type of NCLB status. Last year the state received \$12-15 million dollars for 1003(g), but expects to receive approximately \$124 million this year. The schools in the bottom 5 percent will be identified based on the percentage

of all students in the school (not subgroups) who scored below the level of proficiency on state assessments (ISAT or PSAE) during the last three years. ISBE will also include on the final list low-achieving elementary schools that feed into low-achieving high schools in order to strengthen the pipeline in districts that house several low-achieving schools. ISBE will release the final list of schools in the bottom 5 percent within the next month. Resources to support intensive interventions in low-achieving schools will be provided first to the schools in tier one and tier two and then made available to the schools in tier three if federal funding was not depleted after serving schools in the first two tiers.

These low-achieving schools will choose one of the four models identified by the federal government: (1) school closure; (2) turnaround – in which the principal and the majority of staff would be replaced; (3) restart – in which the school is closed and opened again as a charter school or under the leadership of an Education Management Organization (EMO); and (4) the transformational model in which the climate at the school would be transformed by improving the quality of teachers and leaders in the building, strengthening curriculum and instruction, and increasing learning time for both students and adults. Donald Feinstein commented that most districts in the state will opt for the transformational model. In the proposed priorities for the 1003(g) grants, the U.S. Department of Education stated that a district with 9 or more low-achieving schools could not use one of the four models in more than 50% of its schools. In Illinois, the only district with 9 or more schools in the bottom 5 percent statewide will be Chicago – a school district that has used all four models in the past. As a result, ISBE does not anticipate a problem with this federal requirement.

The state education agency recognizes that districts need additional support to intervene in the lowest-achieving schools. The state has never taken over a school for reasons related to performance and ISBE does not currently have the capacity to direct intensive interventions in all of the lowest-achieving schools in the state. Moreover, the regional offices of education in Illinois, that provide some supports to schools in the state, have not historically engaged in efforts to turnaround low-achieving schools in their region. Given the needs of these low-achieving schools and the capacity of the state education agency, ISBE developed the partner zone concept, which is designed to build state capacity to work with the lowest-achieving schools in the state. Districts that house low-achieving schools in the bottom 5 percent statewide will have the opportunity to work with a lead partner organization, which will be funded by ISBE, if they can demonstrate a commitment from their school board, district superintendent, and union leadership. In collaboration with ISBE, school districts will be able to choose lead and supporting partners that will work closely with the district to intervene in the lowest-achieving schools in the district. Accountability for improving these schools will be shared between the school district and the lead partner organization. The partner organizations will help to develop district capacity to support these schools, will structure instructional approaches in the schools, will bring coherence to the programs in the school building, and will continually gather data to determine which programs are having the greatest impact on student achievement. Lead partners will work with ISBE, the district and the school to perform a needs assessment and then to develop and coordinate the implementation of an intervention plan that meets the needs of the school. Supporting partners will provide assistance related to human capital strategies and building district capacity. ISBE's role in this process will be one of oversight, coordination, and

evaluation. If they receive federal funds through the Race to the Top competition, they will create an ISBE office of turnaround schools to supervise intervention efforts statewide.

In the spirit of full disclosure, Gina Burkhardt and Donald Feinstein noted that their organizations had responded to the RFP to become both lead and supporting partner organizations in Illinois. Mr. Furr commented that approximately 60 organizations expressed interest in responding to the RFP and that ISBE expected approximately 40 applications by the due date, the end of the day on November 23, 2009. ISBE plans to review these applications quickly and then select the highest-quality organizations to be part of a pre-qualified talent pool from which districts can choose partners to support improvement efforts in their lowest-achieving schools.

During the task force's discussion of the partnership zone concept, Mr. Furr clarified that the state currently has the statutory authority to replace staff in those schools identified by the state as chronically low-achieving and that authority supersedes collective bargaining agreements. The state intends to pay careful attention to hiring practices in partnership zones. ISBE will encourage districts that house the lowest-achieving schools in the state to work closely with their union leaders to develop collective bargaining agreements that allow for some flexibility in hiring and replacing staff so the state does not have to intervene. For example, Chicago Public Schools has worked with the union to develop contract and performance schools, models that offer more flexibility with staffing than the traditional schools in the district. Ms. Burkhardt urged ISBE to be cautious with the requirement about replacing 50 percent of the staff in the building because although some of the teachers who leave might be better teachers in other environments, the effect might be only to transfer ineffective teachers to other schools.

Dr. Feinstein remarked that the collective bargaining issues with large-scale staff replacements will be challenging. In New York City, for example, schools were allowed to dismiss teachers, but the district must continue to pay those teachers their full salary for some time. In large districts with several low-achieving schools, the costs associated with paying teachers who are dismissed could be substantial. He then reviewed the process utilized by the Academy for Urban School Leadership (AUSL). His organization has contracted with Chicago Public Schools to close and restart 14 schools in Chicago. All of the teachers are dismissed when the school closes, but they can choose to reapply for their jobs. All new applicants and teachers who were formerly at that school are interviewed and observed teaching a class, using an observation tool based on the Charlotte Danielson's framework. These observations are conducted by former principals who completed the evaluation training course as required by the state of Illinois. The district does not currently have the capacity to evaluate teacher effectiveness through value-added analysis, so it is not possible to include student growth data as part of the hiring process. Some of the school's former teachers have been rehired by AUSL. Of the teachers that were dismissed from AUSL restarts, approximately 70% were rehired at some school in the district and the remaining 30% were dismissed. The collective bargaining agreement in Chicago allows all tenured teachers who are dismissed to collect their salary for one year after dismissal. If they are not hired by another school in the district within this time period, they will be terminated.

Representative Roger Eddy commented that these efforts sound much like arguments for charter schools. However, while the number of charter schools has increased dramatically in Illinois,

best practices from those schools have not been replicated in traditional public schools. Part of this is because some of the flexibilities that are available in charters, related to staffing for example, are politically difficult in many districts. Dr. Redding noted that successful charters are often characterized by good instruction, practices that can be replicated in traditional schools with strong teachers and leaders.

Susie Morrison affirmed that ISBE is considering all of these reforms and is committed to systems change, not incremental reform. As one example, ISBE is currently working closely with institutions of higher education in Illinois to strengthen principal preparation programs. These program changes will be supported by legislative or regulatory changes that create new categories for administrators rather than one broad certification. These categories may include instructional leader, dean, school manager, and department head. The task force members further agreed that training for principals of turnaround schools is different than training for principals who work in traditional schools. Dr. Feinstein described AUSL's grow-your-own strategy and their model for training principals in which candidates complete a year-long residency in a turnaround school to prepare them to lead the transformation of another school. Tony Sanders commented that District U-46 has experienced a great deal of success with teacher mentoring programs, but does not have similar programs in place for principals. He encouraged ISBE to consider directing some resources to develop mentoring programs for turnaround principals, particularly in smaller districts that might not have the capacity to design principal preparation programs.

The task force members agreed that developing a statewide longitudinal data system is another essential reform to support school improvement efforts. Senator Steans and Representative Eddy recently co-sponsored longitudinal data legislation that requires a P-20 data system in Illinois. Ms. Burkhardt agreed that such a data system is necessary in Illinois and noted that the development can be funded, in part, through federal dollars. This data system is also likely to be necessary in the near future as the reauthorization of ESEA will probably include student growth rather than proficiency rates. She also urged caution in the implementation of these systems because multiple data points are necessary, assessments must be valid and appropriate for all students (including students with disabilities and English language learners), and 69% of teachers nationally cannot be evaluated using state assessment data that is currently collected.

Dr. Feinstein argued that Illinois must think about a long-term human capital strategy in order to support dramatic changes in education. Part of this larger human capital strategy might include performance incentives for highly effective teachers. Ms. Burkhardt mentioned that Denver and Minneapolis, for example, have tested models that Illinois might want to explore. As the federal government will have a new TIF competition soon, she recommended that Illinois use this opportunity to identify pilot districts that could compete for that funding. Best practices from these pilot sites could then be expanded statewide. This strategy might also help ISBE with their Race to the Top application. She encouraged the task force members to read more about best practices in educator compensation at the website for the Center for Educator Compensation Reform (<http://cecr.ed.gov/>). The task force members agreed that sustaining performance incentive systems long-term could be problematic without reforms to existing systems. Federal funds might be used to help districts start incentive programs, but they cannot be sustained through state funding streams. Dr. Feinstein mentioned that incentives might be used as a short-

term strategy in the lowest-achieving schools to attract teachers, but then those incentives can be discontinued when the school has made strong progress.

Dr. Redding remarked that two school reform strategies that are supported by the federal government will be in conflict with collective bargaining agreements in many districts – selection and retention of teachers and the length of the school day or school year. He urged the task force to address both of these issues in their recommendations to the Governor and the legislature. Senator Steans noted that many charter schools implement these two strategies. In response, Dr. Feinstein commented that AUSL chooses not to open charter schools because they can share best practices within the district more effectively if they are part of the traditional public school system. Ms. Burkhardt also mentioned a study that was recently conducted by Learning Point Associates in which the researchers found that parents often do not utilize options, like charters, because they do not have the information they need to access the options that are available. As a result, rather than expanding the number of choices for parents, it might be better to work with the district leadership to improve the quality of schools within the district. Dr. Feinstein and Ms. Burkhardt also agreed that before expanding learning time, districts need to ensure that time is being used efficiently to maximize high-quality instruction because more time for low-quality instruction will not improve student achievement. Representative Eddy remarked that every change to the number of minutes in a school day would be subject to a collective bargaining agreement. Tony Sanders added a related caution to consider that districts have collective bargaining agreements not only with teachers, but also with staff who provide services related to transportation and nutrition.

Dr. Redding then delivered a presentation to review the research related to turnarounds and the national context. He mentioned that the concept of a turnaround school emerged from business turnarounds in the private sector. However, it is important to note that 70% of those restructured businesses fail. Consequently, it will be important to identify strategies that are successful in turnaround schools. Dr. Redding was a member of a panel sponsored by the Institute of Education Sciences to review the research on turnaround schools. The panel identified four research-based recommendations for turnaround schools. Three of recommendations (strong leadership, committed staff and quick wins) are methods to support the most critical recommendation – maintaining a consistent focus on improving instruction. He then reviewed the options for restructuring under NCLB. Because “other” was the chosen option 96 percent of the time, the U.S. Department of Education is revising those options and providing more structure and guidance about the “other” option, which is being reconceptualized as a transformational model. This model must include a performance evaluation system, a high-quality instructional program, expanded learning time for students and teachers, and autonomies for leaders related to budget, staff, and the calendar. Dr. Redding then highlighted leader actions associated with school improvement and reviewed a model of differentiated supports and interventions for struggling schools. He emphasized that it was essential to perform a good diagnostic review of a struggling school in order to align the needs of the school with the appropriate supports and interventions. He remarked that the school improvement plan process that is currently in place in Illinois may not be the most effective process because schools know what language the state wants to see in the plan, but then they do not necessarily take action to implement those plans. Both states and districts will need to build their capacity to support successful school improvement processes. Finally, he briefly described the Academy of

Pacesetter States – a model designed to build state capacity to improve their statewide systems of supports and incorporate turnarounds and rapid instructional improvement within their systems. Illinois is one of nine state members of the Academy.

In the task force's discussion of Dr. Redding's presentation, Dr. Feinstein noted that one of the key pieces of a successful turnaround will be training the staff. Teachers in turnaround schools must be provided with high-quality, intensive, and job-embedded professional development. The AUSL model is teacher-centered and they have found that a great deal of teacher training makes a difference for kids. Representative Eddy noted that the state should not mandate too broadly and require all districts to change their evaluation systems, for example, particularly if they are already high-performing. Mr. Furr commented that some standardization will be necessary to meet federal requirements. Ms. Burkhardt further noted that this is an equity issue because the state should not create a ceiling for advantaged students, but instead should raise the bar for all students. Dr. Feinstein agreed and noted that districts do not have to give up the qualitative process of teacher evaluation that is already in place, but should add the quantitative information that will be available from the longitudinal data system that links teachers to student outcomes.

After reviewing ISBE's plans for the partnership zone to improve struggling schools in the state, Ms. Morrison provided the task force with additional information about ISBE's plans for the future. Illinois will compete for Race to the Top funds in the first round of the competition. In order to strengthen their application, the state has agreed to adopt the national common core state standards and plan to adopt them in the fall of 2010. The development of these standards began with the design of college and career readiness standards. Soon, focused K-12 standards will be backmapped to prepare students to successfully meet the college and career readiness standards. A team that will develop statewide science standards will begin meeting in January 2010. The state will also join the national consortium that will develop assessments that are linked to the common core standards. Because the state will no longer have the ISAT and the PSAT, they will use the funds that were previously directed to those assessments for formative assessments that teachers can use in the classroom. The state will work with vendors to ensure that products are competitively priced and provide districts with guidance about the appropriate uses of these assessments. ISBE will also use existing and new assessments to develop an early warning system that will help schools to identify struggling students in 8th or 9th grade. This system may involve the administration of the EXPLORE in 8th grade, the PLAN in 10th grade, and another assessment in 9th grade. The use of technology is also being explored to provide professional development, to make data from the longitudinal system available for multiple users, and to help teachers identify student areas of need and then link those needs to instructional resources that have been rated by teachers. She emphasized that ISBE is engaging in comprehensive systems change and views all of the reform elements that have been discussed by the task force as important pieces of the whole picture.

Dr. Redding and the task force adjusted the meeting timeline for the task force. The December 10th meeting will be cancelled and replaced with a conference call on December 18th. The task force will meet for the final time on December 21, 2009 in Bloomington at the Parke Hotel and Conference Center.

Dr. Redding then reviewed the tasks set forth by the legislature and assigned responsibilities to each of the task force members. The first task is associated with recommending ways Illinois can identify schools requiring more intensive intervention. ISBE will take responsibility for this task. Mr. Furr and Ms. Morrison will define low-achieving schools and then present to the task force both the state's methodology for selecting the lowest-achieving 5 percent of schools statewide and the list of schools. They will ask the task force for recommendations to improve the identification process and its transparency.

The second task is to identify strategies for strengthening leadership at struggling schools and district capacity to support these schools. This task is related to the state's development of their Race to the Top application and their partnership zone strategy. Mr. Furr will draft some recommendations for the task force to review at the next meeting based on the work that is already ongoing at ISBE. The members encouraged him to include the leadership competencies identified by Public Impact in its study for the Center on Innovation & Improvement, to define leadership roles to include principals as well as teacher and district leaders, and to recommend teacher and leader preparation models that are designed specifically for staff in turnaround schools.

The third task about strategies related to successful turnaround efforts will be assigned to Gina Burkhardt and Don Feinstein. They will define what a successful turnaround school is and will outline multiple measures that might be included in this definition such as: student achievement outcomes, student growth, the degree to which the achievement gap narrowed, graduation rate, climate measures, student and teacher attendance, parent contact, discipline referrals, and parent and student satisfaction with the schools. Dr. Feinstein remarked that the turnaround process is a dramatic change and there should be dramatic results. Ms. Burkhardt emphasized that the evaluation of the success of the turnaround process should go beyond the student or the school as the unit of change to evaluate the process more generally. Did the costs justify the benefits? Did the reallocation of resources support student achievement? Which strategies were most effective and had the greatest impact on student achievement?

The fourth task about autonomies, resources, and supports for successful turnarounds was not assigned, nor was the sixth task about funding necessary to accomplish the turnaround process. The task force will discuss the draft sections developed by ISBE, Dr. Feinstein and Ms. Burkhardt at the next meeting. It is likely that recommendations for both the fourth and sixth tasks will emerge from that conversation.

The fifth task is related to the dissemination of best practices for turnarounds that can be shared throughout the state. Dr. Redding will take responsibility for this assignment. Senator Steans commented that there should be a role for ISBE in dissemination and the task force should consider the capacity at the state education agency to engage in this type of work.

The seventh task, related to the identification of statutory or regulatory changes, was not assigned. Senator Steans asked for more information about current statutes and regulations so the task force can better understand where changes might need to be made. There is also an existing state-level group that examines these types of issues on a regular basis and proposes

recommendations to ISBE to address their concerns. ISBE will provide more information for the task force at the next meeting.

Finally, ISBE will take responsibility for part (d) to gather input from key stakeholder groups. They host a regular meeting of key stakeholders with whom they will share a draft of the recommendations and solicit feedback.

All members with assignments will send their drafts to Peggie Garcia by December 14, 2009. She will compile the sections and send them to the task force members in advance of the December 18th meeting.

The meeting was adjourned by Dr. Redding at 2:51 p.m.

**Illinois State Board of Education
Innovation, Intervention, and Restructuring Task Force**

Name	Organization	11/23/09
Senator Pam Althoff	Illinois General Assembly	Present
Gina Burkhardt	CEO Learning Point Associates	Present
Representative Roger Eddy	Illinois General Assembly	Present
Donald Feinstein	Executive Director Academy for Urban School Leadership	Present
Susie Morrison	Deputy Superintendent and Chief of Staff Illinois State Board of Education	Present
Dorland Norris	Deputy Superintendent Curriculum Design, Educational Services and Equity Champaign Unit 4 Schools	Absent
<i>Chair</i> - Sam Redding	Director Center on Innovation & Improvement	Present
Senator Heather Steans	Illinois General Assembly	Present
Jose Torres	Superintendent School District U-46	Represented by Tony Sanders

Illinois State Board of Education Innovation, Intervention, and Restructuring Task Force

**December 18, 2009
Minutes**

The second meeting of the Innovation, Intervention, and Restructuring Task Force was called to order at 8:35 a.m. by Dr. Sam Redding of the Center on Innovation and Improvement. Three members of the task force were absent. A list of the task force members in attendance appears on the final page of this document. No additional guests arrived at the meeting to participate during the public participation period. Gina Burkhardt made a motion to approve the minutes from the November meeting. Her motion was seconded by Senator Pam Althoff. The minutes were approved unanimously.

The plan for the meeting was to review the draft recommendations associated with each of the legislative tasks for the task force. However, only two sections were submitted in advance of the meeting. The task force members reviewed those two sections and agreed to wait to comment on the other drafts until the next task force meeting.

The first section that the task force members discussed tackled the third legislative task about strategies related to successful turnaround efforts and a template to evaluate the success of turnaround efforts. This part of the discussion was led by Gina Burkhardt and Don Feinstein. After reviewing the literature, they defined the goal of an effective turnaround effort and outlined a series of indicators for the success of turnaround efforts for students, schools, providers, and the state. They included leading indicators for students, like attendance and engagement, which are necessary conditions to achieve the ultimate goals of improving student achievement, narrowing the achievement gap, and increasing the number of students who are prepared for college. Ms. Burkhardt pointed out that the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) is not currently using a set of common metrics to evaluate the success of all turnarounds in Illinois, but ISBE could use the indicators that she and Dr. Feinstein outlined to develop metrics that could be used in all turnaround schools as well as unique metrics to address specific local or school contexts. She commented that metrics should include progress benchmarks, not just for student achievement, but also for other important factors like recruiting highly qualified teachers and for capturing the bigger picture about how the culture of the school is changing. Dr. Feinstein agreed and added that there might be some metrics that should be specific to elementary schools and others that should be designed for high schools. Dr. Redding observed that in his experience with co-authoring a Practice Guide about turnarounds, the panel selected by the Institute of Education Sciences had to set a relatively low bar for their definition of a turnaround school because of the available evidence. He further commented that turnarounds are very contextual and it is difficult to generalize about best practices for all struggling schools based on successful examples that are associated with very specific local and school contexts. He encouraged the task force to include a recommendation to propose that ISBE develop a definition of turnaround success and firm metrics to measure progress in turnaround schools. A great deal of money and effort will be invested in these turnarounds over the next five years, so these efforts should be evaluated on a number of rigorous and transparent measures. He pointed out that it will also be a

challenge to outline targets for how much the school needs to improve if the turnaround effort is to be characterized as successful. Ms. Burkhardt remarked that the task force should emphasize that the starting point for the school is important and that the task force should charge ISBE with figuring out how to determine success for schools that start in different places. Dr. Redding recommended that the task force either develop a model definition and a set of metrics or offer ISBE a few options in their final recommendations.

Representative Eddy agreed that student achievement was important, but asked about measuring achievement in areas outside of math, reading, and science – the content areas for which there are currently existing state assessments. Dr. Redding and Ms. Burkhardt responded that boosting reading achievement is a critical measure because so many other assessments are essentially tests of reading comprehension. Representative Eddy agreed, but asked that increasing reading achievement be listed explicitly in the definition of turnaround success in the task force’s recommendations. He also noted that it is likely, because of the reauthorization of NCLB and the federal funding for an assessment consortium, that the state test would change during the next three years. If the assessment changes, it will not be possible to measure improvements in reading achievement in turnaround schools on the same measure over the next five years. Ms. Burkhardt and Dr. Redding agreed this was an issue, but observed that it is unlikely that the national consortium will develop and implement new standardized assessments that are linked to the common core standards before 2014. Consequently, 2010 data could serve as the baseline in Illinois and turnarounds could be judged on their performance between 2010 and 2014. Representative Eddy requested that this assumption be explicitly stated in the task force’s recommendations. The task force members agreed that improving student achievement is the ultimate goal for turnaround schools. Dr. Redding argued that the best policy would be for ISBE to set a high bar for the goals to be achieved, but then allow flexibility for schools and districts to determine the best way to meet those goals.

The task force members then discussed additional indicators that might be added to the draft. Dorland Norris agreed that attendance is an important leading indicator and suggested adding an evaluation of the professional development program to the school indicators because it is absolutely essential for teaching practices to change at these low-achieving schools. Representative Eddy also recommended that the task force include not only graduation rates as a student indicator, but also reenrollment of dropouts. He further encouraged the task force to include in the student assessment indicator, not just the state achievement test, but multiple assessment measures that can be used to show growth at the elementary and high school levels. Ms. Burkhardt agreed that the task force can add formative and benchmark assessments to the recommendation for school indicators with a qualification that those assessments meet ISBE guidelines for rigor and quality.

Dr. Redding then shifted the discussion to the fifth legislative task related to the dissemination of best practices for turnarounds that can be shared throughout the state. Dr. Redding shared his draft for this section of the report with the task force members. He recommended that ISBE collect and analyze data to examine a series of questions related to the following topics: school context and selection/implementation of an intervention; school closures and staff dismissals and reassignments; leadership and decision making; curriculum and instruction; human capital; and student support. Representative Eddy asked for clarification about the distinctions between the

turnaround and transformation models for intervention. Ms. Burkhardt commented that the main difference is that 50 percent of the staff must be replaced in the turnaround model and that the transformation model includes a number of specific strategies, such as increasing learning time.

Dr. Redding asked the task force members for comments on the draft. Ms. Burkhardt responded that it would be important to include sustainability as a category because turnaround schools will need to consider how to use unprecedented federal funding over the next few years to build capacity and develop structures that will enable their success to continue beyond this short-term funding stream. Dr. Feinstein recommended that the role and responsibility of the district also be examined because the current expectation in Illinois is that a partner organization working with the district to turn schools around phase out their involvement in year five. Representative Eddy also requested three specific changes for the draft document. First, for the first question under the school closures category, he recommended that the question should be expanded to include prompts about the higher-achieving schools in which students from closed schools enrolled and from which closed schools the higher-achieving schools received students. For the school context section, he had suggested edits for two questions. For question 6, he recommended that the question include a prompt about not just new funding, but also opportunities to reallocate existing resources. For question number 8 he asked for descriptions of the flexibilities that were implemented so best practices related to those specific flexibilities could be applied to public policy.

Ms. Burkhardt and Dr. Feinstein proposed some resources that will be necessary to support successful turnaround efforts in their draft for recommendations related to the third legislative task. However, the task force agreed to hold off on a discussion of the fourth legislative task about autonomies, resources, and supports for successful turnarounds until they discuss all of the draft sections. The task force will review each of the legislative tasks during the final meeting on December 21, 2009.

Gina Burkhardt made a motion to adjourn. That motion was seconded by Dorland Norris. The meeting was adjourned by Dr. Redding at 9:35 a.m.

**Illinois State Board of Education
Innovation, Intervention, and Restructuring Task Force**

Name	Organization	12/18/09
Senator Pam Althoff	Illinois General Assembly	Present
Gina Burkhardt	CEO Learning Point Associates	Present
Representative Roger Eddy	Illinois General Assembly	Present
Donald Feinstein	Executive Director Academy for Urban School Leadership	Present
Susie Morrison	Deputy Superintendent and Chief of Staff Illinois State Board of Education	Absent
Dorland Norris	Deputy Superintendent Curriculum Design, Educational Services and Equity Champaign Unit 4 Schools	Present
<i>Chair</i> - Sam Redding	Director Center on Innovation & Improvement	Present
Senator Heather Steans	Illinois General Assembly	Absent
Jose Torres	Superintendent School District U-46	Absent

Illinois State Board of Education Innovation, Intervention, and Restructuring Task Force

**December 21, 2009
Minutes**

The third and final meeting of the Innovation, Intervention, and Restructuring Task Force was called to order at 10:03 a.m. by Dr. Sam Redding of the Center on Innovation and Improvement. Two members of the task force were absent and one member was represented by her designee. A list of the task force members in attendance appears on the final page of this document. Dr. Chris Koch joined the task force, but no additional guests arrived at the meeting to participate during the public participation period.

Dr. Redding asked Susie Morrison of the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) to begin the discussion with a report on the first legislative task for the task force - ways in which Illinois can identify schools requiring more intensive interventions. She described how the Illinois State Board of Education identified low-achieving schools by using the three-year average performance of the "all students" group on state assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined. ISBE recently released the list of Illinois Priority Schools and notified the superintendents of the districts on the list. These Priority Schools include the lowest achieving five percent of schools statewide and any secondary schools with an average graduation rate of less than 60% over the last three years. When they released the list of Priority Schools, ISBE also released two additional subsets of the longer Priority Schools list - lists of Tier I and Tier II schools. There are 40 Tier I schools. These schools are the lowest-achieving five percent of schools from the Priority Schools list that are Title I schools in federal improvement status. There are fifteen Tier II schools. These schools are the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools from the Priority Schools list that are eligible to receive Title I funding, but are currently not receiving that funding.

Ms. Morrison went on to describe how Illinois is eligible to receive \$200-400 million through the highly competitive Race to the Top grants and guaranteed to receive approximately \$124 million through 1003(g) school improvement grants from the U.S. Department of Education. Illinois must serve Tier I and Tier II schools with the school improvement grants – potentially \$500,000 annually for each school in Tier I and Tier II over three years. The state will encourage districts to frontload the money at the beginning of the intervention in the low-achieving school and then phase out the additional funding over time. If Illinois is successful with the Race to the Top competition, funds from that grant will be used to support interventions in schools from the Priority Schools list that are not Tier I or Tier II schools. With this funding, ISBE could serve schools in 71 districts statewide. Gina Burkhardt asked if new schools could be added to the lists in the future. Ms. Morrison replied that the federal government will get back to ISBE on that question, but it looks like these schools will be ISBE's focus for the next three years. Ms. Burkhardt remarked that this funding provided ISBE with a valuable research and development opportunity. She encouraged ISBE to invest in an evaluation of the interventions that are funded in these schools to learn what works and to identify best practices that Illinois can build on in the future.

In response to questions about interventions in struggling schools, Ms. Morrison noted that districts will have some choice about intervening in these schools, but ISBE will strongly encourage districts to take action to transform these schools. If districts choose not to act, the state has the statutory authority to take over schools. However, as Representative Eddy pointed out, the state does not have the statutory authority to replace teachers. They can be placed elsewhere in the district, but districts must follow state dismissal laws to terminate teachers. Donald Feinstein remarked that the process is somewhat different in Chicago because the 1995 reform legislation allows the district to close schools. If schools are closed in Chicago, tenured teachers are paid their annual salary for one year while they apply for other positions. Approximately 70 percent of the teachers that were dismissed when the Academy for Urban School Leadership (AUSL) restarted a school in Chicago found a position in Chicago and the remaining 30 percent were terminated. Representative Eddy remarked that because of the staffing laws outside of Chicago, staffing will be an issue in Tier I schools if 50 percent or more of the staff has to be replaced – one of the requirements for the turnaround model. As a result, the legislature would need to pass legislation that would supersede collective bargaining agreements statewide. Ms. Morrison agreed but observed that only 3 schools on the Tier I list are from outside Chicago. Dr. Redding pointed out that all of these 3 schools could use the transformation model because guidance from the U.S. Department of Education indicates that districts are only restricted in their use of the transformation model if there are more than nine schools in the district on the Tier I list. Dr. Feinstein noted that the transformation model was more like incremental reform and urged the state to support other intervention models with a more aggressive human capital strategy so that the \$124 million in school improvement grants would not be viewed in hindsight as a missed opportunity.

Dr. Redding asked the task force if they should recommend that the Illinois legislature extend the Chicago law statewide for districts with low-achieving schools. Representative Eddy noted that this would be a big hill to climb, but could be possible if the legislation was limited to low-achieving schools. He remarked that districts will often choose not to dismiss teachers because the dismissal process can cost between \$100 - \$140,000 dollars per teacher. This cost would be prohibitive if districts had to replace 50 percent of their staff. Dr. Redding concluded that the task force should note the financial burden of teacher dismissal on districts outside of Chicago in the task force's final recommendations. Dr. Feinstein commented that in the most persistently low-achieving schools, talent matters. Thus, he encouraged the task force to think about recommending that districts consider the best fit for the school, rather than seniority, to fill vacant positions with the most talented people possible.

Arthur Culver, the designee for Dorland Norris, commented that the transformation model is the most realistic model for most districts, but may not enable the school to make the most dramatic changes possible. As the superintendent in Champaign, he replaced the principal at a struggling school and removed 70 percent of the staff over 3 years. Most of those teachers were redistributed throughout the district, but approximately 20 percent were dismissed. For most of those teachers, litigation was not necessary because the documentation was so strong. Two teachers did bring lawsuits, but the district settled those cases.

Dr. Redding then asked the task force to discuss the seventh legislative task associated with the identification of any statutory or regulatory changes that would be helpful to promote innovation,

intervention, and restructuring of low-achieving schools. Representative Eddy commented that the legislature would be rewriting Article 21 of the School Code, which is focused on teacher certification, in the spring. Dr. Culver mentioned that in Texas he demanded that teachers take the student achievement test. If they could not pass it, they were removed from the classroom and enrolled in strong professional development programs. The task force will consider including this strategy in the certification and recertification process in Illinois. Dr. Koch mentioned that ISBE is currently supporting three legislative changes that are related to the task force's work. These initiatives focus on alternative certification programs, incentives to encourage highly effective teachers to teach in low-achieving schools, and the development of a performance evaluation system that incorporates student growth as part of the evaluation. Dr. Redding added that the task force would recommend two additional changes – that the exemption for Chicago related to teacher dismissals be extended to apply to low-achieving schools statewide and that, as in California, legislation prohibit collective bargaining agreements from including seniority bumping provisions. Representative Eddy recommended that the legislature begin with statutory changes that apply only to low-achieving schools. If these changes are successful, the legislature may consider expanding the new initiatives to all schools statewide.

Dr. Redding then asked the task force members to engage in a discussion of the second legislative task related to strategies for strengthening leadership and struggling schools and the capacity of districts to implement these reforms. The task force members agreed that leadership of turnaround schools is different than leadership in traditional schools. As a result, a different kind of preparation is necessary for these leaders. Dr. Feinstein described how AUSL “incubates” both teachers and principals in training in turnaround schools so they can immerse them in the context of the school. Dr. Redding recommended that the task force include a recommendation for Illinois to require a residency model, like AUSL's, to prepare principals for turnaround schools. Illinois should also require mentoring for these principals and provide them with a network of support. Finally, Representative Eddy and Dr. Culver stressed the importance of principals serving as instructional leaders. In order to free principals from their managerial duties, Representative Eddy recommended that Illinois consider creating an administrative position for school administration managers (SAMs).

Dr. Redding then shifted the discussion to the third legislative task about strategies related to successful turnaround efforts and a template to evaluate the success of turnaround efforts. Dr. Feinstein proposed the following definition of turnaround success – turnaround is a dramatic and comprehensive intervention in a low-performing school that: a) produces significant gains in achievement within 3 years; and b) readies the school for the longer process of transformation into a high-performance organization. Dr. Feinstein described how AUSL took control Harvard elementary school in Chicago, which had been one of the lowest performing in the state. When AUSL began working at Harvard, 30 percent of students were meeting state standards. Two years later, 56 percent of students were proficient. AUSL has had similar results at their other schools, with one exception. Dr. Feinstein also remarked that, in addition to improved student achievement, there is a spirit of renewed hope and opportunity at the school that cannot be quantified, but is an indicator of success.

As part of the definition of turnaround success, the task force agreed that a turnaround school must improve student achievement within three years. Dr. Feinstein commented that the most aggressive definition might require turnarounds to close the achievement gap, not in the school, but statewide, by half or one-third and increase graduation rates in secondary schools. Dr. Koch supported a definition that would include increase the percentage of students meeting state standards at the turnaround school to the majority of students. Dr. Feinstein agreed that the triage phase could end after the majority of students are meeting proficiency. The school would still need to engage in a process of continuous improvement, but the crisis would be over and the school would be headed in the right direction. Representative Eddy asked that the definition include a contextual note to point out that many of these schools are starting quite low. Ms. Burkhardt recommended that ISBE develop a matrix of benchmarks to help turnaround schools understand what type of growth over time is expected and to provide early indicators to demonstrate whether or not transformation efforts are successful in schools. These benchmarks should include leading indicators related to achievement and multiple measures that assess climate and culture. Dr. Koch and Ms. Morrison pointed out that, through the Illinois Partnership Zone competition, the state has a variety of criteria that different vendors proposed to measure turnaround success. They can analyze these criteria and share some of the best metrics with the state legislature. Dr. Redding summarized that the task force would include in their recommendation a 3-year time frame as part of the definition of turnaround success, a goal of at least 50 percent of students in the school meeting proficiency, closing at least half the gap between the school's baseline year performance (percent of students testing proficient or better) on state assessments in reading and math and the performance of non-poverty students in the state, and a set of metrics to measure the progressions of growth over time on multiple indicators.

Ms. Burkhardt asked what type of oversight ISBE was planning for the turnaround schools - if, for example, ISBE would create a turnaround office at the state level. Dr. Koch and Ms. Morrison replied that the monitoring system will be different if Illinois is successful with Race to the Top. At a minimum, they will use the 5 percent from the school improvement grants that the federal government allows the state to use for administrative costs. This funding will be used to fund school improvement centers that will be housed in three RESPRO regional offices throughout the state. Dr. Culver encouraged ISBE to ensure that the school improvement centers are staffed in such a way that mentors, monitors, and coaches can get out to the schools and work with them closely. Ms. Burkhardt and Dr. Redding encouraged the task force to include a recommendation for the state to develop an oversight office whether or not they receive funding through Race to the Top.

Dr. Redding then briefly reviewed the changes he made to the recommendations associated with the fifth legislative task related to the dissemination of best practices for turnarounds that can be shared throughout the state. The task force agreed that this section of the report was complete.

After a short break the task force discussed the final two legislative tasks related to the funding necessary to accomplish the strategies recommended by the task force and about autonomies, resources, and supports for to achieve and sustain successful turnarounds. Dr. Culver noted that it would be important to recommend that increased flexibility for these schools should be linked to increased accountability. He encouraged the task force to recommend that leaders of turnarounds have the power to lengthen the school day. Increasing learning time is beneficial for

students and one of the principles of the transformation model. However, it is difficult to change the length of the school day because unions often want significantly increased salaries for teachers that would not be sustainable in district budgets over time. He remarked that the legislature should consider legislation that would provide turnaround leaders with the ability to go beyond the limits of the school day as they are defined in collective bargaining agreements and to include some resources to fund these increases in learning time. A second key autonomy that Dr. Culver supports is the freedom for turnaround leaders to replace staff - another autonomy that is contested by unions. Finally, he recommended supporting turnarounds with a regional state support system that could provide struggling schools with instructional coaches who could assist with the turnaround effort. These support offices could be regional structures that could target regions of the state with concentrations of struggling schools.

Dr. Redding asked Dr. Koch to provide clarification about the state obligation for turnaround schools. Dr. Koch responded that funds from Race to the Top and school improvement grants could be used to support regional and external partner organizations that could provide critical assistance for turnaround schools and help schools and districts to build their capacity. However, without federal support, the fiscal situation in the state will not allow for an intense injection of state funds into low-achieving schools over the next few years.

Representative Eddy asked the task force to consider a recommendation related to consolidating school districts to increase efficiencies. Another task force made a similar recommendation four years ago that was never enacted. A recommendation from this task force might encourage the legislature to consolidate districts in order to increase efficiency and to reorganize districts around feeder patterns so that schools are implementing aligned curriculum in grades k-12. Dr. Koch agreed and observed that there are a number of high schools on the Priority Schools list, but that it will be difficult to turn around high schools without improvements in feeder schools as well. Representative Eddy agreed and asked ISBE to list the feeder schools with the high schools on the Priority Schools list to make the connections between the schools transparent. Dr. Koch reflected that this overarching theme of K-12 collaboration to improve low-achieving schools should run through all of the recommendations from the task force.

Dr. Feinstein noted that the task force's recommendations should be linked to a broader context and not just to reforms for low-achieving schools. He argued that the key to improving student achievement in all schools is building teacher capacity. AUSL invests their money in teachers because that investment in talent development pays off over the long-term. He also observed that millions of dollars are now going to schools that are not improving student achievement. One way to address this situation is to embed incentives within the turnaround structure and reward those schools that make improvements. These incentives can then be phased out after the school turns around.

The task force agreed that it would be difficult to determine a dollar amount to fund the task force's recommendations, but they could outline the critical pieces and note that significant new funding would be required to support these new initiatives. In addition to new funding, the legislature should also consider district consolidation and other strategies to reallocate existing resources more efficiently.

The task force will review drafts of the final report and make comments via email in order to meet the legislative deadline of December 31, 2009. The meeting was adjourned by Dr. Redding at 1:15 p.m.

**Illinois State Board of Education
Innovation, Intervention, and Restructuring Task Force**

Name	Organization	12/21/09
Senator Pam Althoff	Illinois General Assembly	Present
Gina Burkhardt	CEO Learning Point Associates	Present
Representative Roger Eddy	Illinois General Assembly	Present
Donald Feinstein	Executive Director Academy for Urban School Leadership	Present
Susie Morrison	Deputy Superintendent and Chief of Staff Illinois State Board of Education	Present
Dorland Norris	Deputy Superintendent Curriculum Design, Educational Services and Equity Champaign Unit 4 Schools	Represented by her designee, Dr. Culver
<i>Chair</i> - Sam Redding	Director Center on Innovation & Improvement	Present
Senator Heather Steans	Illinois General Assembly	Absent
Jose Torres	Superintendent School District U-46	Absent

Illinois Priority Schools Designation

Both Title I and non-Title I Schools are included

Lowest Achievement 5 % of schools over the last 3 years (2007-2009)

Schools need to have assessment data over the last 3 years

District Name	School Name
Astoria CUSD 1	Astoria High School
Aurora East USD 131	East High School
Bloom Twp HSD 206	Bloom High School
Bloom Twp HSD 206	Bloom Trail High School
Bremen CHSD 228	Bremen High School
Bremen CHSD 228	Hillcrest High School
Brownstown CUSD 201	Brownstown High School
Cahokia CUSD 187	Cahokia High School
Cairo USD 1	Cairo Jr/Sr High School
Carrier Mills-Stonefort CUSD 2	Carrier Mills-Stonefort H S
Carrollton CUSD 1	Carrollton High School
Chicago Heights SD 170	Dr Charles E Gavin Elem School
Christopher USD 99	Christopher High
CHSD 218	DD Eisenhower High Sch (Campus)
CHSD 218	H L Richards High Sch(Campus)
City of Chicago SD 299	Ace Technical Charter High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Amundsen High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Best Practice High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Bethune Elem School
City of Chicago SD 299	Bogan High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Bowen Environmental Studies HS
City of Chicago SD 299	Carver Military Academy HS
City of Chicago SD 299	Chalmers Elem Specialty School
City of Chicago SD 299	Chicago Academy High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Chicago Discovery Academy HS
City of Chicago SD 299	Chicago Military Academy HS
City of Chicago SD 299	Chicago Vocational Career Acad HS
City of Chicago SD 299	Clemente Community Academy HS
City of Chicago SD 299	Copernicus Elem School
City of Chicago SD 299	Corliss High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Crane Technical Prep High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Curie Metropolitan High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Curtis Elem School
City of Chicago SD 299	Doolittle Elem School
City of Chicago SD 299	Douglass Academy High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Dulles Elem School
City of Chicago SD 299	Dumas Elem School
City of Chicago SD 299	Dunbar Vocational Career Acad HS
City of Chicago SD 299	Dyett High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Earle Elem School
City of Chicago SD 299	Entrepreneurshp High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Farragut Career Academy HS
City of Chicago SD 299	Fenger Academy High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Foreman High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Fuller Elem School
City of Chicago SD 299	Fulton Elem School
City of Chicago SD 299	Gage Park High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Gillespie Elem School
City of Chicago SD 299	Global Visions High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Hancock College Preparatory HS
City of Chicago SD 299	Harlan Community Academy HS
City of Chicago SD 299	Harper High School

Illinois Priority Schools Designation**Both Title I and non-Title I Schools are included****Lowest Achievement 5 % of schools over the last 3 years (2007-2009)****Schools need to have assessment data over the last 3 years****District Name**

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

City of Chicago SD 299

Clay City CUSD 10

Cobden SUD 17

Crete-Monee CUSD 201U

CUSD 300

School Name

Harvard Elem School

Henderson Elem School

Hope College Prep High School

Hubbard High School

Hyde Park Academy High School

Juarez Community Academy HS

Julian High School

Kelly High School

Kelvyn Park High School

Kennedy High School

Kershaw Elem School

Lake View High School

Lavizzo Elem School

Manley Career Academy High School

Marshall Metropolitan High School

Mather High School

McKay Elem School

Medill Elem School

Morton Elem Career Academy

New Millenium Health High School

North Lawndale Charter HS

North-Grand High School

Parkman Elem School

Parkside Elem Community Academy

Phillips Academy High School

Phoenix Military Academy HS

Prosser Career Academy HS

Raby High School

Reed Elem School

Richards Career Academy HS

Robeson High School

Roosevelt High School

Ross Elem School

Schiller Elem School

School Of Leadership High School

School Of Technology High School

School Of The Arts High School

Schurz High School

Senn High School

Sherman Elem School

Simeon Career Academy High School

Steinmetz Academic Centre HS

Sullivan High School

Tilden Career Communty Academy HS

Washington, G High School

Wells Community Academy HS

Yale Elem School

Youth Connections Charter HS

Clay City High School

Cobden High School

Crete-Monee High School

Dundee-Crown High School

Illinois Priority Schools Designation**Both Title I and non-Title I Schools are included****Lowest Achievement 5 % of schools over the last 3 years (2007-2009)****Schools need to have assessment data over the last 3 years**

District Name	School Name
Decatur SD 61	Eisenhower High School
Decatur SD 61	MacArthur High School
DePue USD 103	DePue High School
Dongola USD 66	Dongola High School
Dupo CUSD 196	Dupo High School
East Alton-Wood River CHSD 14	East Alton-Wood River High Sch
East St Louis SD 189	East St Louis Senior High School
East St Louis SD 189	SIU Charter Sch of East St Louis
Egyptian CUSD 5	Egyptian Sr High School
Eldorado CUSD 4	Eldorado High School
Elverado CUSD 196	Elverado High School
Georgetown-Ridge Farm CUD 4	Georgetown-Ridge Farm High School
Granite City CUSD 9	Granite City High School
Griggsville-Perry CUSD 4	Griggsville-Perry High School
Harvard CUSD 50	Harvard High School
Hoopeston Area CUSD 11	Hoopeston Area High School
Iroquois West CUSD 10	Iroquois West High School
J S Morton HSD 201	J Sterling Morton East High Sch
J S Morton HSD 201	J Sterling Morton West High Sch
Joliet Twp HSD 204	Joliet Central High School
Kankakee SD 111	Kankakee High School
Lawrence County CUD 20	Lawrenceville High School
Madison CUSD 12	Madison Senior High School
Meredosia-Chambersburg CUSD 11	Meredosia-Chambersburg High Sch
Meridian CUSD 101	Meridian High School
Mt Vernon Twp HSD 201	Mount Vernon High School
Murphysboro CUSD 186	Murphysboro High School
Norris City-Omaha-Enfield CUSD 3	Norris City-Omaha-Enfield H S
North Chicago SD 187	North Chicago Community High Sch
North Chicago SD 187	North Elementary School
North Greene CUSD 3	North Greene High School
Odin CHSD 700	Odin High School
Ohio CHSD 505	Ohio Community High School
Patoka CUSD 100	Patoka Sr High School
Peoria Heights CUSD 325	Peoria Heights High School
Peoria SD 150	Manual High School
Peoria SD 150	Peoria High School
Peoria SD 150	Trewyn Middle School
Peoria SD 150	Tyng Primary School
Peoria SD 150	Woodruff High School
Plano CUSD 88	Plano High School
Proviso Twp HSD 209	Proviso East High School
Proviso Twp HSD 209	Proviso West High School
Rantoul Township HSD 193	Rantoul Twp High School
Rich Twp HSD 227	Rich Central Campus High School
Rich Twp HSD 227	Rich East Campus High School
Rich Twp HSD 227	Rich South Campus High School
Rockford SD 205	Auburn High School
Rockford SD 205	Guilford High School
Rockford SD 205	Jefferson High School
Rockford SD 205	Rockford East High School
Round Lake CUSD 116	Round Lake Senior High School

Illinois Priority Schools Designation**Both Title I and non-Title I Schools are included****Lowest Achievement 5 % of schools over the last 3 years (2007-2009)****Schools need to have assessment data over the last 3 years****District Name**

Sandoval CUSD 501
Scott-Morgan CUSD 2
SD U-46
SD U-46
SD U-46
South Central CUD 401
Springfield SD 186
Springfield SD 186
St Anne CHSD 302
Thornton Fractional Twp HSD 215
Thornton Fractional Twp HSD 215
Thornton Twp HSD 205
Thornton Twp HSD 205
Thornton Twp HSD 205
Tri Point CUSD 6-J
V I T CUSD 2
Venice CUSD 3
Virginia CUSD 64
Waltonville CUSD 1
Waukegan CUSD 60
Webber Twp HSD 204
West Central CUSD 235
West Richland CUSD 2
Zeigler-Royalton CUSD 188
Zion-Benton Twp HSD 126

School Name

Sandoval Sr High School
Bluffs High School
Elgin High School
Larkin High School
Streamwood High School
South Central High School
Lanphier High School
Springfield Southeast High Sch
St Anne Comm High School
Thornton Fractnl No High School
Thornton Fractnl So High School
Thornridge High School
Thornton Township High School
Thornwood High School
Tri-Point High School
V I T Sr High School
Venice Elem School
Virginia Sr High School
Waltonville High School
Waukegan High School
Webber Twp High School
West Central High School
West Richland High School
Zeigler-Royalton High School
Zion-Benton Twnshp Hi Sch

Tier 1:

Only Title I Schools in Federal Improvement Status are included

Lowest Achievement 5 % of schools over the last 3 years QR secondary school with graduation rate less than 60% over the last 3 years.

Schools need to exist over 3 years

District Name	School Name
City of Chicago SD 299	Ace Technical Charter High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Best Practice High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Bogan High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Bowen Environmental Studies HS
City of Chicago SD 299	Chicago Discovery Academy HS
City of Chicago SD 299	Chicago Vocational Career Acad HS
City of Chicago SD 299	Clemente Community Academy HS
City of Chicago SD 299	Corliss High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Crane Technical Prep High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Dunbar Vocational Career Acad HS
City of Chicago SD 299	Dyett High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Entrepreneurshp High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Farragut Career Academy HS
City of Chicago SD 299	Fenger Academy High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Gage Park High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Global Visions High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Hancock College Preparatory HS
City of Chicago SD 299	Harper High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Juarez Community Academy HS
City of Chicago SD 299	Julian High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Kelvyn Park High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Manley Career Academy High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Marshall Metropolitan High School
City of Chicago SD 299	New Millenium Health High School
City of Chicago SD 299	North-Grand High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Phillips Academy High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Raby High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Richards Career Academy HS
City of Chicago SD 299	Robeson High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Roosevelt High School
City of Chicago SD 299	School Of Leadership High School
City of Chicago SD 299	School Of Technology High School
City of Chicago SD 299	School Of The Arts High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Senn High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Sullivan High School
City of Chicago SD 299	Tilden Career Communtly Academy HS
City of Chicago SD 299	Wells Community Academy HS
East St Louis SD 189	East St Louis Senior High School
East St Louis SD 189	SIU Charter Sch of East St Louis
Madison CUSD 12	Madison Senior High School

Tier 2:

Only include secondary schools that were eligible for, but did not receive, Title I fund

**Lowest Achievement 5 % of Title I eligible (but not receive) secondary schools over the last 3 years
OR secondary school with graduation rate less than 60% over the last 3 years.**

Schools need to exist over 3 years

District Name

ASTORIA COMM UNIT SCH DIST 1
CARRIER MILLS-STONEFORT CUSD 2
DECATUR SD 61
DEPUE USD 103
ELDORADO CUSD 4
KANKAKEE SD 111
PATOKA CUSD 100
PEORIA SD 150
PEORIA SD 150
ROCKFORD SCHOOL DIST 205
ROCKFORD SCHOOL DIST 205
SANDOVAL CUSD 501
SCOTT-MORGAN C U SCHOOL DIST 2
SPRINGFIELD SD 186
WAUKEGAN CUSD 60

School Name

ASTORIA HIGH SCHOOL
CARRIER MILLS-STONEFORT H S
EISENHOWER HIGH SCHOOL
DEPUE HIGH SCHOOL
ELDORADO HIGH SCHOOL
KANKAKEE HIGH SCHOOL
PATOKA SR HIGH SCHOOL
PEORIA HIGH SCHOOL
WOODRUFF HIGH SCHOOL
JEFFERSON HIGH SCHOOL
ROCKFORD EAST HIGH SCHOOL
SANDOVAL SR HIGH SCHOOL
BLUFFS HIGH SCHOOL
LANPHIER HIGH SCHOOL
WAUKEGAN HIGH SCHOOL