

# Consortium for School Improvement Policy Brief



## State Support to Schools in Need of Improvement September 2006

### **Introduction**

Under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, each state education agency (SEA) is required to establish an accountability system and provide supports to districts and schools that miss state-determined adequate yearly progress (AYP) targets for more than two consecutive years.<sup>1</sup> Districts and schools that are labeled in need of improvement are entitled to certain state supports, depending on the number of years that AYP targets are missed. The law aims to hold states accountable for all students' proficiency in mathematics and reading with an emphasis on subgroups of students that are performing below state standards. The 2004 Long-Term Trend reports of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) document long-standing gaps that separate the academic performance of black and Hispanic students from that of their white peers.<sup>2</sup>

To address these pervasive gaps, the law prompted changes in the federal and state roles in school improvement. Building on the standards-based reforms of the 1994 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the federal government now mandates timelines for student proficiency, state assessments, and teacher requirements. While states have long monitored districts and schools to ensure compliance with federal and state policies, they are now required to partner with districts to build the capacity needed to

See [Selected Resources](#) for recent information on state support.

### ***About the Consortium for School Improvement***

In 2004, the Council for Chief State School Officers established the [Consortium for School Improvement](#) in collaboration with the [Center for Data-Driven Reform in Education](#) (CDDRE) at Johns Hopkins University. The Consortium for School Improvement complements and enhances this research center by providing all states with the opportunity to pool their resources and access current research and practice to strengthen state systems of school support.

<sup>1</sup> See U.S. Department of Education, 2005.

<sup>2</sup> See National Center for Education Statistics, 2005.

support both districts and schools in need of improvement. This transition in the state role from oversight to capacity building requires states to redesign existing support systems or create new ways to ensure that districts and schools have the resources needed to bring all students to proficiency.

While NCLB includes regulations regarding a broad cross-section of education issues, the following section of Title I was issued regarding state support to schools:

“Each State shall establish a statewide system of intensive and sustained support and improvement for local educational agencies and schools receiving funds under this part, in order to increase the opportunity for all students served by those agencies and schools to meet the State's academic content standards and student academic achievement standards.”<sup>3</sup>

Now that NCLB has been in effect for five years, states are shifting from developing their systems of support to implementing and refining these systems. In response to this new phase of the law, the Department of Education is expected to offer additional guidance and resources for states in the 2007 reauthorization of NCLB. In the meantime, schools and districts are evidencing the need for different levels of state support, depending on the number of years they have missed AYP targets.

### **Purpose**

The purpose of this policy brief is to describe how the following eight diverse states are organizing service delivery to schools at different levels of school improvement:

- Alabama
- Arizona
- Illinois
- Indiana
- New Mexico
- Ohio
- Pennsylvania
- Virginia

Because of each state's unique context and needs, the information in the state profiles is not meant to be generalized across states. The profiles represent a snapshot of state systems that are being adjusted on an ongoing basis. The policy brief was not developed to endorse any state's system. Rather, since all states are responding to the same federal requirements, this policy brief was developed to foster cross-state sharing about organizing school support effectively to improve the performance of students in low-performing schools. While states are also responsible for delivering services to districts labeled in need of improvement, this report will focus on support to schools. Districts are beginning to be labeled in need of improvement in greater numbers, and this is a subject in need of future research.

---

<sup>3</sup> See U.S. Department of Education.

## **Methodology**

Respondents were recruited through the CCSSO State Support Team Network listserv, which consists of state-level school improvement and Title I staff members.<sup>4</sup> States were asked to contact the author if they were interested in participating in the policy brief. In this way, the study yielded participation from motivated volunteers. State feedback was used to develop a state profile template, guided by two questions:

- What kinds of information do you think are essential for understanding how your state is differentiating services to schools in need of improvement?
- What are you hoping to learn from other states?

The template was developed based on states' interests in order to maximize participant responsiveness and data usefulness. Data were collected from teams of state education agency (SEA) staff members through an iterative process of submissions and revisions.

## **State Profiles**

The respondents agreed to a uniform format for the state profiles. These profiles focus on key cross-cutting issues in developing and implementing state support systems. The components of the profiles are explained below:

### ***Background Information***

- The background information section introduces the state's support system including an overview of the system, the year the system was adopted, and whether or not the state is accommodating a dual accountability system. The basis of the system includes related research and organizational principles along with models from other states that were consulted. There are several measures of the state's capacity to serve schools: funding sources; the number of school improvement staff within and outside of the state education agency; the number of districts; and the number of schools overall, by Title I status and by level of improvement status. Links for finding more information about the state's standards, assessment, accountability systems are also provided.

### ***State Services***

- Needs assessment and goal setting is the first of four basic stages in the reform process, as identified by the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE).<sup>5,6</sup> USDOE indicated that, "The school [in need of improvement] needs to examine itself and see where its problems are, which of those problems are most pressing and/or solvable, and what its specific needs in terms of curriculum, staff, training, outside help, use of time, and other resources are for addressing problems."<sup>7</sup> This section of the profile includes the process, tools and

---

<sup>4</sup>The CCSSO State Support Team Network (SSTN) was launched in 2002 and provided the foundations for the Consortium for School Improvement in its work to help states strengthen their systems of school support. Representatives from over 40 states and several territories are included within the network. Members actively engage in an online forum to discuss promising strategies and share resources designed to support districts and schools in meeting student needs.

<sup>5</sup> See U.S. Department of Education, 2001.

<sup>6</sup> These four phases of school reform were also used to frame a previous report by the Council of Chief State School Officers which was released in April 2002: "State Support to Low-Performing Schools." Please see [Selected Resources](#) for more information.

<sup>7</sup> U.S. Department of Education, 2001.

templates that states use to help schools examine data, identify challenges, prioritize challenges, and explore root causes. The district role and other relevant partnerships are also highlighted.

- The second stage is planning. According to USDOE, “The school must choose reform strategies or models that meet its identified needs and priorities. Jumping in and trying the first reform strategy that comes to hand will not be effective; this means that planners need access to research and information about what has worked for other schools. All parties interested in the school need to be part of the planning in order to create necessary buy-in.”<sup>8</sup> This section of the template includes the process, tools and templates that states use to support the development of district and/or school improvement plans focused on needs identified in the needs assessment. State assistance includes help with developing plans, selecting interventions and identifying resources and training opportunities. The district role and other relevant partnerships are also highlighted.
- Implementation is the third stage. USDOE recommended, “The chosen reform strategy or strategies must be carefully implemented, which means that the school needs access to appropriate resources. These might include staff development for teachers and school leaders, access to useful data on student performance, increased parental involvement, rearrangement of time use, expert advice from outside the school, or a school wide or subject specific model. Above all, the school needs the flexibility to choose and use the kinds of resources that address its specific problem or problems.”<sup>9</sup> Related state support includes human and financial resources for carrying out the improvement plan including additional staff, professional development, information, or additional funds. In addition to information on these aspects of support, this section of the profile includes the length of time support is offered and how states deliver the support. The district role and other relevant partnerships are also highlighted.
- The fourth general stage is evaluation and feedback. Advised USDOE, “At some point, preferably in an ongoing manner, the school must assess the effectiveness of the chosen reform in solving school problems. This evaluation should feed back into the next round of needs assessment and planning so that ineffective programs can be eliminated and replaced. The goal is to use regular and systematic assessment and evaluation to facilitate continuous improvement.”<sup>10</sup> States can support schools through such strategies as ongoing monitoring of the improvement plan, ratings systems, and site visits. The district role and other relevant partnerships are also highlighted, along with any incentives the state devised, major challenges, how the state is working with the school to sustain improvement, and evidence of effectiveness.
- The next section of the profile identifies how schools in the later stages of school improvement—corrective action and restructuring—are prioritized. After missing AYP targets for four consecutive years, schools are labeled in corrective action. Restructuring begins when a school has missed AYP targets for five consecutive years. NCLB

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

stipulates that districts with schools in corrective action are prioritized in the provision of support and assistance.<sup>11</sup>

- The section on differentiating and organizing service delivery provides an opportunity for the state to discuss how all schools in need of improvement are prioritized for service delivery, given the state's capacity.
- Each profile presents only a glimpse of system and is organized to allow readers to follow up with specific states on topics of interest. For more information and to view resources that are not available online, feel free to get in touch with the contact person identified in this final section.

### **Highlights from the Policy Briefs**

States have organized support systems for schools in need of improvement according to their capacity both inside and outside of the SEA as you will see in the profiles below. Illinois, Ohio, and Pennsylvania have devised systems in which services are largely provided by regional organizations that are affiliated with but independent of the state office. In contrast, contractors play a limited though key role in Arizona where most support services for schools in need of improvement are provided by state staff members to alleviate quality concerns about external organizations. Indeed, states with regional partnerships are developing methods to ensure consistently high quality across the state. Technical assistance in Alabama, New Mexico, and Virginia is shared between the SEA and regional or local professionals. Indiana's major service providers are the Indiana-focused American Student Achievement Institute and Learning Point Associates, which works with schools across the nation. In all cases, states have structured guidelines for service provision and are continually improving their capacity to assist struggling schools.

Unique elements of state systems have emerged, and a few are highlighted below:

- In **Alabama**, the Accountability Roundtable structures extensive inter-agency collaboration to support school improvement efforts. This state also provides training on the Pride Survey, student incident reports, and school climate surveys to integrate student behavioral data into school improvement planning.
- School improvement staff members from the **Arizona** Department of Education work out of three regional offices and spend the majority of their time in the field. In partnership with Arizona State University, the state also harnesses the power of technology to offer online professional development and resources through Arizona School Services through Educational Technology (ASSET).
- The Regional Educational Support Providers in **Illinois** extend their services beyond typical school improvement services to include family and community partnerships. This focus includes training and support on using student, family, and community support data to produce comprehensive student, school and neighborhood outcomes.

---

<sup>11</sup> See U.S. Department of Education.

- Many of **Indiana**'s schools have been led through a vision-based school improvement process facilitated by the American Student Achievement Institute. A steering team composed of school staff, parents and a business representative guide shared decision making between all administrators, all teachers, all students, parents, business representatives, and community members. A hallmark of the process is embracing and working through resistance for systemic change.
- To support local data-based decision making, the **New Mexico** Public Education Department is developing a statewide quarterly assessment aligned to the New Mexico Content Standards and Benchmarks, as well as a reporting system with data on all programs, implementation fidelity, and student progress. In addition, the District Audit Tool (DAT) Metric uses state test data to measure the urgency of current and future school needs.
- While school data are essential to analysis, planning and support, **Ohio** Regional School Improvement teams partner with District Leadership Teams, not schools. The state aims to sustain school improvement by building the capacity of district and instructional leaders. Ohio is also working toward credentialing its regional personnel for consistently high quality in service provision.
- **Pennsylvania**'s Governor Institutes host school teams at free week-long summer professional development on university campuses including sessions targeted at schools in need of improvement. In addition, Data Dialogues uniquely involve high school students in analyses of their own state test results along with promoting shared meaning of data between groups.
- Support to schools in need of improvement is guided by the academic review process in **Virginia**. A prescriptive model, the academic review provides data-based technical assistance through a series of site visits, but districts can apply to substitute their own process within limits.

## ALABAMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### *Background Information*

The main goal of Alabama's system of support is to ensure collaboration among all sections of the State Department of Education (SDE) through the **Accountability Roundtable (ART)** and **State Support Team**. The ART is comprised of members of each section within the Instructional Services Division (Classroom Improvement; Federal Programs; Alabama Reading Initiative; Alabama Math, Science, and Technology Initiative; Student Assessment; Special Education Services; Professional Education Personnel Evaluation; and Prevention and Support Services) and also includes Career Technical Services, Technology Initiatives, the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory/Southeast Comprehensive Center, and SERVE. The mission of the Accountability Roundtable is to provide a seamless system of technical assistance and support to schools in the areas of curriculum, instruction, fiscal responsibility, management, and leadership. The goal of this effort is to enable the schools and systems to achieve and maintain annual measurable objectives. The State Support Team is comprised of School Improvement Leaders, Regional School Improvement Coaches, Peer Mentors, and State Department of Education staff each providing leveled technical assistance and support to all schools with focused assistance to local education agencies (LEAs) and schools that do not make AYP. The State Support Team operates under the leadership and guidance of the Accountability Roundtable Guidance Team.

[http://www.alsde.edu/html/sections/section\\_detail.asp?section=88&footer=sections](http://www.alsde.edu/html/sections/section_detail.asp?section=88&footer=sections)

Year system was adopted	1995
Dual accountability system?	No
Basis of the system	Alabama's system of support is based on lessons learned from the review of other state efforts and on the research of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Northwest Regional Education Laboratory (NWREL): <a href="http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/re-engineering/rycu/index.shtml">http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/re-engineering/rycu/index.shtml</a></li> <li>• Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL): <a href="http://www.sedl.org/siss/">http://www.sedl.org/siss/</a></li> <li>• North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL): <a href="http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/engaged.htm">http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/engaged.htm</a></li> <li>• various school reform models: <a href="http://www.aasa.org/issues_and_insights/district_organization/Reform/approach.htm">http://www.aasa.org/issues_and_insights/district_organization/Reform/approach.htm</a></li> <li>• reviews of curriculum reform efforts: <a href="http://www.ed.gov/pubs/SER/CurricReform/index.html">http://www.ed.gov/pubs/SER/CurricReform/index.html</a></li> </ul>
Funding sources	Federal: Reading First, Special Education; state: Alabama Reading Initiative and At-Risk initiative
Number of school improvement staff at the SEA	33
Number of school improvement staff working outside of the SEA but funded by the SEA	54
Number of school improvement staff collaborating with the SEA but not funded by the SEA	67
Number of districts, 05-06	131
Number of schools, 05-06	Total: 1,543 Title I: 878 Non-Title I: 665
Number of schools in need of improvement missing AYP	64

targets for two or three consecutive years, 05-06.	
Number of schools in corrective action, 05-06. These schools missed AYP targets for four consecutive years.	5
Number of schools in restructuring, 05-06. These schools missed AYP targets for at least five consecutive years.	18
State standards system	<a href="http://www.alsde.edu/html/sections/section_detail.asp?section=54&amp;footer=sections">http://www.alsde.edu/html/sections/section_detail.asp?section=54&amp;footer=sections</a> <a href="http://www.alex.state.al.us">http://www.alex.state.al.us</a> Click on Courses of Study
State assessment system	<a href="http://www.alsde.edu/html/sections/section_detail.asp?section=91&amp;footer=sections">http://www.alsde.edu/html/sections/section_detail.asp?section=91&amp;footer=sections</a>
System for determining AYP	<a href="http://www.alsde.edu/Accountability/2006Reports/2006InterpretiveGuide-ChapterFormat.pdf?1stSchoolYear=4&amp;1stReport=2006Reports%2F2006InterpretiveGuide-ChapterFormat.pdf">http://www.alsde.edu/Accountability/2006Reports/2006InterpretiveGuide-ChapterFormat.pdf?1stSchoolYear=4&amp;1stReport=2006Reports%2F2006InterpretiveGuide-ChapterFormat.pdf</a>
Location of report cards	<a href="http://www.alsde.edu/html/reportCardDownloads.asp">http://www.alsde.edu/html/reportCardDownloads.asp</a>

### ***Alabama State Services Provided to Schools in Need of Improvement under NCLB***

<b><i>Component</i></b>	<b><i>Process, tools, and templates</i></b>
Needs assessment and goal setting	<p>The <b>Accountability Roundtable (ART)</b> developed the <b>School Improvement Guidebook</b> to help LEA teams develop strong school improvement plans and supportive LEA plans. The Student Assessment section developed <b>assessment modules</b> for training and assisting LEA personnel on test interpretation and utilization. <b>Regional School Improvement Coaches</b> trained fifty-seven LEAs during the <b>School Improvement Summit</b> in July 2006. The Summit provided training to five-member LEA teams for the development of school and LEA plans and offered ten concurrent sessions focused on NCLB components for improving student achievement. Regional School Improvement Coaches held <b>Regional Summits</b> in August 2006 for LEA teams unable to attend the July session. All training session materials and presentations were shared on a <b>School Improvement Resource Kit CD</b>. In addition to the School Improvement Summit materials, the CD includes data analysis modules, an on-line tutorial for school and LEA plan development, and research-based strategies and tips. Find school Improvement and LEA improvement plan <b>templates and samples</b> at: <a href="http://www.alsde.edu/html/sections/documents.asp?section=88&amp;footer=sections">http://www.alsde.edu/html/sections/documents.asp?section=88&amp;footer=sections</a> . After January 1, 2007, also see Professional Learning, Accountability at <a href="http://alex.state.al.us">http://alex.state.al.us</a> .</p> <p>Regional Coaches conduct <b>School Improvement Checkpoints</b> during the month of September to provide a forum for LEAs to receive feedback on plan development and continued assistance with data analysis and planning. <b>Monthly School Assistance Meetings (SAMs)</b> are held regionally to showcase best practices, provide continued training, and address concerns related to school improvement. The SAMs are planned in collaboration with the 11 <b>Regional Inservice Centers</b> and the federally-funded <b>Southeast Comprehensive Center (SECC)</b>. Preliminary results of this organizational structure show increased collaboration within and among LEAs and a more positive attitude toward receiving assistance. Alabama works closely with the SECC, which provides high-quality technical assistance to School Improvement Specialists and <b>State Support Team</b> members. The goals of the SECC are to build the capacity of states in the southeast to implement NCLB and provide sustained support to high-needs districts and schools.</p> <p>Alabama encourages schools to use multiple data sources as needs assessment tools. Schools are extremely familiar with student learning and demographic data. However, school process and perception data are equally important. The Prevention and Support</p>

	<p>Services Section facilitates the administration of the <b>Pride Survey</b> for students in grades 6-12, and the SDE provides each school and school system an annual state report: <a href="http://www.pridesurveys.com">http://www.pridesurveys.com</a> . The Pride Survey anonymously identifies trends in violent student behaviors and substance use. It also provides insight about risk and protective factors that may affect the behavioral patterns of students. The establishment of a data set in the areas of violent behaviors and substance use has provided a systematic resource for making evidence-based decisions and offering efficient and effective solution-based models for prevention. Training is provided on the analysis and use of these data to improve student achievement. Schools and systems are taught how to use <b>Student Incident Report (SIR)</b> data to evaluate the impact of behavior on student performance. This Prevention and Support Services Section also collects and guides the analysis of drop-out, attendance, and truancy data. Prevention and Support Services will administer a <b>school climate survey</b> for schools in improvement beginning in fall 2006.</p>
Planning	<p>Alabama requires each LEA in improvement to hire a <b>Local School Improvement Specialist</b> whose role is to support schools in making AYP. Regional School Improvement Coaches provide on-site support and technical assistance to Local School Improvement Specialists and guide school and LEA improvement plan development. The <b>Rewards and Sanctions Plan</b> serves as the outline for assisting schools and LEAs: <a href="http://www.alsde.edu/html/sections/doc_download.asp?section=57&amp;id=3222">http://www.alsde.edu/html/sections/doc_download.asp?section=57&amp;id=3222</a> . Each requirement is expected to be implemented each year until the school or LEA has made adequate yearly progress (AYP) for two consecutive years and is therefore no longer in school improvement. Other supports and actions must be continued as long as they result in improved student achievement or until terminated at the State Department of Education’s discretion.</p> <p>The State Support Team provides guidance in the identification of resources and research-based intervention strategies. Members conduct training opportunities and work collaboratively with other entities in the region to provide training that meets school or district needs. The district’s role is to monitor and support implementation in the schools and address barriers to success. Training content for school leadership teams is based on the research of the <b>Southern Regional Education Board</b> and <b>Edvantia</b>. Professional development is designed to allow teams to address school problems, build consensus among team members for solutions, and try solutions in a job-embedded format.</p> <p>Each academic year LEAs report data on the <b>Career/Technical Program Improvement Plan</b> for the system career/technical education program and each program area offered: <a href="http://www.alcareertech.org/pdf/schools/methods_of_admin_2005.doc">http://www.alcareertech.org/pdf/schools/methods_of_admin_2005.doc</a> . LEAs must identify improvement strategies to meet or to exceed the targeted Standards of Performance in reading, math, language, science and social studies and respond with possible reasons for unmet standards. A Career/Technical Education Annual Report is compiled by the state each year that identifies the system’s performance level in meeting the Standards of Performance required in the improvement plan.</p> <p>The Technology Initiatives (TI) section sponsors the <b>Alabama Educational Technology Conference (AETC)</b> that features concurrent and hands-on sessions specifically designed to improve student achievement. These sessions are flagged in the AETC conference program so that schools striving to improve achievement can attend these sessions and learn how to use technology for school improvement. Additionally, each year, LEAs report data on their <b>District Technology Plan</b> for each school that includes measurements of benchmarks aligned to the State Technology Plan. LEAs must collect and report data on the availability and use of technology. An annual report is prepared by the TI section that identifies statewide progress and needs that LEAs can use in analyzing their data and writing improvement strategies for the integration of technology to improve student achievement.</p>

	<p>Special Education Services, in collaboration with higher education representatives, has developed <b>Elementary and Secondary Tiered Instruction models</b> to more effectively address the needs of students with various levels of ability. The models are designed to assist districts in varying the level of support based on a student's individual performance. The support systems offered within the models are fluid, allowing teachers to individualize the options based on student needs. Key principles of the models are empirically based instructional design, evidence-based instructional strategies, teacher collaboration, and individualized response to student needs.</p>
Implementation	<p>Shared leadership training is required of schools on the state assistance list. School leadership teams receive professional development through the <b>Alabama Leadership Academy</b> and <b>Teacher Leader Network</b>. Because of the increased turnover in leadership, new principals will be provided new principal support and training in both face-to-face and online formats. Online professional development for school leadership teams will be offered for the first time during 2006-07. Each 21-person cohort will be led by a trained moderator and include the principal, two teacher leaders, and other staff members from schools at different levels of development.</p> <p>The <b>Alabama Reading Initiative (ARI)</b> provides on-site assistance to schools through <b>Regional Principal Coaches (RPC)</b>, <b>Technical Assistance Coaches (TAC)</b>, and <b>Reading Coach Trainers (RCT)</b>. RPCs collaborate on planning and conducting data meetings and walk-throughs with principals. RCTs assist local coaches in building school capacity to develop intervention plans and schedules by providing side-by-side coaching and shadowing. Also, the Student Assessment staff is conducting regional workshops throughout the state in fall 2006 on utilizing test data to make instructional and curricular decisions and tackling open-ended/short-response questions. The SDE continues to develop collaborative partnerships with the Regional Inservice Center, the Southeast Comprehensive Center, and SERVE.</p> <p>Low-performing schools may voluntarily join the <b>Alabama Math, Science, and Technology Initiative (AMSTI)</b>, which currently serves eight of the 11 regional inservice districts. Math and science teachers in these schools receive up to 120 hours of high-quality, subject- and grade-specific professional development. The two-week summer training equips the teachers with both skills and materials. Schools that participate in the training also receive on-site teacher mentoring and subject-related teacher coaching from AMSTI-trained leaders. Universities that host the Regional Inservice Centers provide access to a cadre of regional mathematicians and scientists to coach participating teachers in their classrooms and deepen content knowledge.</p> <p>The Technology Initiatives section also offers support and professional development resources to the LEAs and State Support Team in the following topic areas: data-driven decision-making; Access, and Interactive Internet Content aligned with the Alabama Course of Study Standards. After January 1, 2007, the TI section will provide web space and support to the Accountability Roundtable on ALEX, Alabama's web portal, in order to provide professional development and instructional resources for LEAs in school improvement.</p> <p>Staff members from the state Prevention and Support Services department provide technical assistance and special sessions on <b>Drop-Out Prevention</b> and <b>Behavior Management</b>, as requested by individual school systems. Materials, support, and training on the <b>Success in Stages Bullying Program</b> will be provided to 43 schools in school improvement during the 2006-07 school year: <a href="http://www.channing-bete.com">http://www.channing-bete.com</a>. The program was piloted in one school during 2005-06 with a 70% decrease in bullying incidents. <b>Discovering Health Connections</b> is an online resource for health and prevention programs that is provided to one</p>

	school per district. Through the Perkins legislation, the Career/Technical Education state staff provides technical assistance and professional development opportunities to assist LEAs in meeting and exceeding Standards of Performance as reflected in the Career/Technical Education Improvement Plan.
Evaluation and feedback	LEA teams monitor each school improvement plan through the <b>SIP Monitoring and Review Cycle</b> . Upon the release of data and with assistance from State Support Team staff, LEA teams guide schools through data analysis, plan development, and ongoing evaluation. Review 1 is an <b>Amendment Review</b> . Following plan development, Regional School Improvement Coaches and Peer Mentors hold regional SIP Checkpoints as a forum for providing feedback to LEA teams on draft plans, with support from members of the Accountability Roundtable and various other content specialists and section representatives. Reviews 2 through 6 are <b>Implementation Reviews</b> . LEA teams require schools to document results. Plans are modified and refined based on the results. The final <b>Projections and Reflections Review</b> takes place after state assessments are administered and requires the school team to reflect on the past year’s plan and project possible strategies to be continued, refined, or rejected for the next year’s plan. It is at this time that a draft plan is developed for consideration. SDE conducts comprehensive monitoring in all systems on a three year cycle. All programs are evaluated based on established criteria. The Alabama Reading Initiative RCTs and RPCs provide feedback through collaborative data and support meetings at the school and LEA levels as they work with local principals and reading coaches on-site. Next steps are determined and a plan of action is formulated.
Prioritizing schools in corrective action and restructuring	Schools in corrective action and restructuring receive a variety of intensive supports. In the earlier stages of school improvement, the districts direct supports to schools. When schools enter corrective action, the state increases direction and oversight. Schools in corrective action and restructuring are assigned a <b>Peer Mentor</b> to provide focused support on the identified needs of the school. The Peer Mentor identifies areas of weakness within the school and brokers service through the School Improvement Leaders and Accountability Roundtable. Peer Mentors provide model lessons and professional development opportunities for teachers who are not highly qualified, along with implementing and monitoring school improvement efforts. In addition, <b>Regional School Improvement Coaches</b> provide on-site support to local School Improvement Specialists and guide them in focusing intense assistance on these schools. These schools also participate in the <b>Essential Elements for Guiding School Improvement</b> instructional review program with support from the district: <a href="http://www.alsde.edu/html/sections/doc_download.asp?section=88&amp;id=5296&amp;sort=">http://www.alsde.edu/html/sections/doc_download.asp?section=88&amp;id=5296&amp;sort=</a> . Team members conduct reviews, provide feedback, and suggest strategies for making improvements. State Support Team members serve as part of the review team. The <b>Alabama Reading Initiative</b> gives top priority to schools in corrective action and restructuring. Once the school reaches restructuring, the state directs the district in selecting and implementing an alternative governance structure at the school. If the school stays in restructuring status, the LEA must enter into an agreement with the SDE-approved “ <b>turn-around specialist</b> ” entity that has a proven track record for improving student achievement.
Differentiating service delivery at all levels	Achievement data are utilized to ascertain the type of support offered to each principal, reading coach, or school. New ARI schools receive high amounts of support through monthly training and follow-up. ARI school personnel receive monthly training and follow-up. The most challenging ARI schools receive bi-monthly support from technical assistance coaches.
Contact person	Deann K. Stone Accountability Roundtable Coordinator Alabama State Department of Education (334) 353-5190 <a href="mailto:dstone@alsde.edu">dstone@alsde.edu</a>

<b>ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION</b>	
<b><i>Background Information</i></b>	
Arizona's State System of School Support was developed to ensure the SEA provides three tiers of support to all schools, based on performance: Prevention, School Improvement Assistance, and School Improvement Intervention. <a href="http://www.ade.az.gov/schooleffectiveness/schoolimprovement/">http://www.ade.az.gov/schooleffectiveness/schoolimprovement/</a>	
Year system was adopted	2004
Dual accountability system?	Yes. AZ LEARNS is the state system, with such improvement categories as Excelling, Highly Performing, Performing, Underperforming Years 1-3, and Intervention: <a href="http://www.ade.state.az.us/azlearns/AccountabilitySystems/2006/">http://www.ade.state.az.us/azlearns/AccountabilitySystems/2006/</a>
Basis of the system	Arizona staff members looked closely at other states but developed a unique system given the state's dual accountability. The main concern was differentiating support through a proactive model to prevent schools from entering the system.
Funding sources	Federal: Title I; state: Proposition 301; county: ESA
Number of school improvement staff at the SEA	11
Number of school improvement staff working outside of the SEA but funded by the SEA	0
Number of school improvement staff collaborating with the SEA but not funded by the SEA	0
Number of districts, 05-06	574
Number of schools, 05-06	Total: 1,919 Title I: 1,144 Non-Title I: 775
Number of schools in need of improvement missing AYP targets for two or three consecutive years, 05-06.	98
Number of schools in corrective action, 05-06. These schools missed AYP targets for four consecutive years.	27
Number of schools in restructuring, 05-06. These schools missed AYP targets for at least five consecutive years.	24
State standards system	<a href="http://www.ade.az.gov/sbtl/sdi">http://www.ade.az.gov/sbtl/sdi</a>
State assessment system	<a href="http://www.ade.az.gov/standards">http://www.ade.az.gov/standards</a>
System for determining AYP	<a href="http://www.ade.az.gov/azlearns/2005NCLBTechManualWorking.pdf">http://www.ade.az.gov/azlearns/2005NCLBTechManualWorking.pdf</a>
Location of report cards	<a href="http://www.ade.az.gov/edd/">http://www.ade.az.gov/edd/</a>
<b><i>Arizona State Services Provided to Schools in Need of Improvement under NCLB</i></b>	
<b><i>Component</i></b>	<b><i>Process, tools, and templates</i></b>
Needs assessment and goal setting	Integrated Data to Enhance Arizona's Learning (IDEAL), a free statewide portal, has been established for Arizona stakeholders to access individual state assessment data, student and teacher instructional resources, professional development opportunities, and the <b>Arizona School Improvement Plan (ASIP)</b> : <a href="https://www.ideal.azed.gov/cas/">https://www.ideal.azed.gov/cas/</a> . Schools and districts also have access to the secure SEA <b>data retrieval system</b> , which includes school improvement memos, accountability timelines, and district and school assessment data. Over the next few years, some of this system's functions will be transitioned to IDEAL as the state data

	<p>warehouse is developed. This will allow schools and districts to verify their AYP data early and online. All Title I schools and districts receive training from the SEA on the state accountability workbook. Training is provided by state staff members in three regional offices to ensure quality and consistency:  <a href="http://www.ade.az.gov/azlearns/AccountabilitySystems/2006/default.asp">http://www.ade.az.gov/azlearns/AccountabilitySystems/2006/default.asp</a> and <a href="http://www.ade.az.gov/AIMS/default.asp">http://www.ade.az.gov/AIMS/default.asp</a> .</p> <p>All schools in school improvement attend the <b>Fall Process Workshop</b> provided by SEA staff. School principals and district staff receive training on federal accountability requirements for schools identified in improvement. Schools in improvement status are trained on conducting a comprehensive needs assessment to gather evidence, assess strengths and limitations of their instructional and organizational conditions, and prioritize areas for improvement. The comprehensive needs assessment is the SEA’s <b>Standards and Rubrics for School Improvement</b> (based on Kentucky’s Standards &amp; Indicators for School Improvement): <a href="http://www.ade.az.gov/schooleffectiveness/STDSRUBRIC.pdf">http://www.ade.az.gov/schooleffectiveness/STDSRUBRIC.pdf</a> . The SEA also has a web-based <b>Resource Guide for the Standards and Rubrics for School Improvement</b>:  <a href="http://www.schoolsmovingup.net/cs/az/print/htdocs/az/home.htm">http://www.schoolsmovingup.net/cs/az/print/htdocs/az/home.htm</a> .</p> <p>Districts complete and submit an <b>LEA Commitment to Provide Support</b> which is aligned with the targeted goals of each school’s ASIP. Districts commit to providing support in developing and revising each school’s ASIP. Support may include leadership mentoring; high-quality ongoing professional development; facilities management; adopting research-based interventions; and coordinating instructional staff, non-instructional staff, and state and federal funding.</p> <p>Arizona is moving toward focusing proactively on all schools, instead of only those that are identified as in need of improvement. Beginning in fall 2006, any school will be able to request a visit from a <b>Solutions Team</b>. These teams are composed of Arizona educators and are trained on the use of the Standards and Rubrics for School Improvement: <a href="http://www.ade.az.gov/schooleffectiveness/schoolimprovement/solutionsteams/default.asp">http://www.ade.az.gov/schooleffectiveness/schoolimprovement/solutionsteams/default.asp</a> . A Solutions Team is assigned to conduct an on-site evidence-based inquiry to provide recommendations and findings to assist the school in identifying and prioritizing challenges.</p>
Planning	<p>The Arizona School Improvement Plan is a dynamic online document that addresses the needs identified in the comprehensive needs assessment (Standards and Rubrics for School Improvement). Schools and districts are assigned an SEA coach to review the ASIP using the Review Guidelines for the Arizona School Improvement Plan. If the plan is not viable, state staff works with the school to revise the plan. All schools are provided a parent notification template to ensure that parents are informed about required components of schools identified in need of improvement.</p> <p>State staff members coach all schools identified for improvement in examining data, identifying and prioritizing challenges, and writing goals to address AYP weaknesses. SEA staff guides schools and districts in selecting research-based interventions and identifying resources by working with the school principal and the school improvement team. Districts support the school-based vision for reform, manage decision-making, and involve all stakeholders. Their role also includes guiding schools in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan; the coordination of staff, professional development, and fiscal resources; and approving parent notification letters and school improvement grant applications.</p>
Implementation	<p>Schools identified for improvement are assigned an SEA coach who supports schools by coordinating resources and aligning state and federal programs with the ASIP. Schools are eligible for Improvement Grants to implement their ASIP. The School</p>

	<p>Improvement Grants may also fund professional development to support implementation of research-based strategies and reform models. Professional Development provided by the SEA includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Best Practices Academies:</b> <a href="http://www.ade.az.gov/onlineregistration/SelectEvent.asp?viewall=" yes"&amp;groupid='49"'>http://www.ade.az.gov/onlineregistration/SelectEvent.asp?viewall="yes"&amp;GroupID=49</a></li> <li>• <b>AZ READS Leadership Academies</b> for leadership teams from K-3 elementary schools to improve early reading. The academies address leadership, change, and the components of a school-wide reading improvement effort with a focus on practical implementation: <a href="http://www.ade.state.az.us/azreads/prodev.asp">http://www.ade.state.az.us/azreads/prodev.asp</a> .</li> <li>• <b>Arizona School Services through Educational Technology (ASSET)</b> in partnership with Arizona State University: <a href="http://www.asset.asu.edu/">http://www.asset.asu.edu/</a> (Guest User ID: testuser19; Password: Poplin19)</li> <li>• <b>School Effectiveness Professional Development/Technical Assistance Catalog:</b> <a href="http://www.ade.az.gov/schooleffectiveness/schooleffectcatalog.pdf">http://www.ade.az.gov/schooleffectiveness/schooleffectcatalog.pdf</a></li> <li>• Annual <b>Leading Change Institute</b> based on the four Standards and Rubrics for School Improvement: <a href="http://www.ade.state.az.us/schooleffectiveness/LeadingChange/">http://www.ade.state.az.us/schooleffectiveness/LeadingChange/</a></li> <li>• ADE collaborates with a variety of regional organizations and nationally recognized experts in the field of school improvement to provide focused research-based assistance and strengthen state support. For example, the SEA has partnered with the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and Dr. Robert Marzano to work with schools to determine needs, greatest impact, and least resistance: <a href="http://www.whatworksinschools.org/">http://www.whatworksinschools.org/</a> . The state also partners with WestEd on the <b>Teach for Success</b> walkthrough observation protocol: <a href="http://www.wested.org/cs/we/view/serv/78">http://www.wested.org/cs/we/view/serv/78</a> .</li> </ul>
Evaluation and feedback	<p>If the ASIP is not viable, state staff works with the school to revise the plan. The SEA provides support and technical assistance to schools and districts throughout the year in the form of onsite visits and direct assistance to determine the effectiveness of school programs.</p>
Prioritizing schools in corrective action and restructuring	<p>Schools at these levels attend a Fall Process Workshop that is designed to provide administrators with detailed information regarding the options suggested for school reform under NCLB regulations. These schools are provided with tools for informing the parent community and the public about their status in school improvement. The schools are provided a parent notification letter template that guides them as they inform parents regarding Supplemental Educational Services and Public School Choice. Schools in corrective action are asked to provide the SEA intervention coach with a timeline for selecting and implementing the selected corrective action. The schools in planning for restructuring are asked to provide the SEA state intervention coach with a timeline for working with the district, school staff, and school community as the restructuring option is selected. Schools in restructuring are provided a template to assist them in identifying academic achievement gaps and/or other causes for not making AYP. This template guides them in selecting priorities, writing goals, and developing an action plan for implementing the selected restructuring plan. The SEA state intervention coach collaborates with the district to provide technical assistance to the school in writing, revising and implementing the plan; coordinating resources (staff, professional development, and fiscal); and approving school improvement grant applications. The schools are asked to submit NCLB progress reports describing progress made implementing their plans.</p>
Differentiating service delivery at all levels	<p>Arizona’s State System of School Support was developed to ensure the SEA provides differentiated support to all schools, based on performance. There are three tiers to the School Support Grid: Prevention, School Improvement Assistance, and School Improvement Intervention. Fall Process workshops are differentiated according to the status in school improvement. Schools that have missed AYP targets for more than one year are required to bring their ASIP in order to make revisions based on current data. Title I School Improvement Grant amounts vary according to the county in which a school resides and the status of</p>

	Title I of School Improvement.
Contact person	Dale Parcell Deputy Associate Superintendent School Effectiveness Division Arizona Department of Education (602) 364-2279 <a href="mailto:Dale.Parcell@azed.gov">Dale.Parcell@azed.gov</a>

## **ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION (ISBE)**

### ***Background Information***

**Regional Educational Support Providers (RESPROs)** establish School Support Teams for schools in corrective action (first) and schools in school improvement (as possible), with the following goals:

- focus on the school improvement plan (SIP) and district improvement plan (DIP)
- target proven approaches and standardized processes to specific improvement components
- customize services to differences among regions, districts, and schools
- coordinate programs, services, and funding
- deploy state, regional, and local staff and resources efficiently and effectively
- use AYP, defined by state and federal law, as the “bottom line” measure of effectiveness in helping schools and districts

<http://www.isbe.net/sos/pdf/respro.pdf>

Year system was adopted	2003
Dual accountability system?	Yes. The state accountability system identifies schools in Academic Early Warning Status and Academic Watch Status: <a href="http://www.isbe.state.il.us/ayp/faq.htm">http://www.isbe.state.il.us/ayp/faq.htm</a> .
Basis of the system	The RESPRO system evolved from a system that relied heavily on Educators in Residence. Educators in Residence were teachers given leave to work with schools in their region, coordinated through SEA regional liaisons. RESPRO was created to address the need for more service providers, charged with serving low performing schools in school improvement planning and data analysis, the Illinois Learning Standards, professional development, and building partnerships with families and communities to serve “the whole child.” Research foundations for these aspects of the RESPRO system are consistent with the work of Richard DuFour and Mike Schmoker on data analysis and Rick Stiggins on curriculum alignment.
Funding sources	Federal: \$20 million from Title I (school improvement, CSR, 21st Century), Title IIA (technology), \$500,000 from Title V (innovative programs), Reading First; state: \$3 million from Extended Learning
Number of school improvement staff at the SEA	11
Number of school improvement staff working outside of the SEA but funded by the SEA	80-100 staff at 45 Regional Offices of Education and 10 Regional Educational Support Providers and their contractors (depending on school needs)
Number of school improvement staff collaborating with the SEA but not funded by the SEA	Unknown
Number of districts, 05-06	873
Number of schools, 05-06	Total: 4,280 Title I: 2,099 Non-Title I: 2,181
Number of schools in need of improvement missing AYP targets for two or three consecutive years, 05-06.	Federal system: 247 State system: 435 (includes non-Title I schools)
Number of schools in corrective action, 05-06. These schools	Federal system: 151 State system: 0

missed AYP targets for four consecutive years.	
Number of schools in restructuring, 05-06. These schools missed AYP targets for at least five consecutive years.	Federal system: 231 State system: 0
State standards system	<a href="http://www.isbe.net/ils">http://www.isbe.net/ils</a>
State assessment system	<a href="http://www.isbe.net/assessment/default.htm">http://www.isbe.net/assessment/default.htm</a>
System for determining AYP	<a href="http://www.isbe.net/ayp/default.htm">http://www.isbe.net/ayp/default.htm</a>
Location of report cards	<a href="http://webprod1.isbe.net/ereportcard/publicsite/getSearchCriteria.aspx">http://webprod1.isbe.net/ereportcard/publicsite/getSearchCriteria.aspx</a>
<b><i>Illinois State Services Provided to Schools in Need of Improvement under NCLB</i></b>	
<b><i>Component</i></b>	<b><i>Process, tools, and templates</i></b>
Needs assessment and goal setting	Districts contract with RESPROs for services, but schools determine the intensity of the services. RESPROs lead school teams in one- to three-day <b>data retreats</b> to build school capacity, identify trends and determine goals within RESPRO’s four improvement components: (1) data analysis and SIP and DIP development, (2) standards-aligned curriculum, instruction, and classroom assessment, (3) teacher and administrator enhancement, and (4) student, family, and community support services. Northern Illinois University (NIU) provides online state, district, and school-level data through the <b>Illinois e-Plans</b> : <a href="http://iirc.niu.edu">http://iirc.niu.edu</a> . NIU data analyses identify school needs with the greatest likelihood of improving student performance. RESPROs also assist schools in identifying and coordinating their programs, services, and funding.
Planning	RESPROs provide training and resources to support the development of school improvement plans, based on needs identified in the data analysis. Plans must emphasize reading and math improvement as needed. Resources include the School Improvement Plan <b>template, guide, peer review tool, and approval checklist</b> , available in individual school profiles. To access these resources, select a school at <a href="http://iirc.niu.edu/scripts/searchmain.asp">http://iirc.niu.edu/scripts/searchmain.asp</a> , enter the school’s profile, select the AYP/School Improvement tab, then enter the School Improvement tab for all tools.
Implementation	With the help of state staff, RESPROs align and coordinate all state, regional, and local technical assistance. RESPRO school support teams help schools implement their school plans through one-year commitments, in order to accommodate changing school needs. The Regional Offices of Education, the Illinois Principals Association, and the Illinois Association of School Administrators collaborate on <b>Administrator Academies</b> for training and mentoring to school and district administrators. Teacher training includes new teacher mentoring and induction, as well as methods and materials for veteran teachers. Regional Offices of Education provide awareness and support regarding National Board Certification, and the state pays fees for interested teachers. RESPROs also train and support schools to improve student behavior, school climate, health services, and the interaction between schools, families, and communities.
Evaluation and feedback	RESPRO school support teams assist in evaluating and providing ongoing feedback to schools. ISBE uses a <b>consultative process</b> to review school improvement plans with district staff and RESPROs. ISBE evaluates the RESPRO system and the effectiveness of each RESPRO based on data submitted regarding RESPRO activities; number of contacts; contact time and number served; and student achievement. ISBE also holds monthly trainings with RESPROs to coordinate their work. Challenges include improving RESPRO attendance at trainings and improving the consistency of expertise in statistics, pedagogy, and data analysis across RESPROs.
Prioritizing schools in corrective action and restructuring	All RESPRO services give priority to schools in corrective action and restructuring, but schools determine RESPRO involvement.
Differentiating	ISBE plans to implement <b>online submission of school improvement plans</b> in order to facilitate closer monitoring of three aspects of

service delivery at all levels	the plans: (1) alignment between school improvement status and goals, (2) alignment between goals and data, and (3) the strength of the research evidence behind intervention strategies. School improvement plans with problems in these areas will be targeted for assistance.
Contact person	Myron Mason Division Administrator, Acting Federal Grants and Programs Illinois State Board of Education (217) 524-4832 <a href="mailto:mmason@isbe.net">mmason@isbe.net</a>

## **INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (IDOE)**

### ***Background Information***

Indiana works with both the American Student Achievement Institute (ASAI) and Learning Point Associates (LPA) to provide school support teams that assist schools in need of improvement.

<http://www.doe.state.in.us/eSEA/welcome.html>

<http://www.asainstitute.org/index.html>

<http://www.learningpt.org/>

Year system was adopted	2005
Dual accountability system?	Yes. The state accountability system, Public Law 221, is operated through a separate office with separate funding: <a href="http://www.doe.state.in.us/pl221/welcome.html">http://www.doe.state.in.us/pl221/welcome.html</a>
Basis of the system	ASAI's work is based on the research of Peter Senge and Parker Palmer. The LPA research base is from the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL).
Funding sources	Federal: Title I
Number of school improvement staff at the SEA	8 staff with the following estimated time allocations: 1-80%, 1-50%, 6-30%
Number of school improvement staff working outside of the SEA but funded by the SEA	Varies
Number of school improvement staff collaborating with the SEA but not funded by the SEA	Varies
Number of districts, 05-06	316
Number of schools, 05-06	1,867 Title: 787 Non-Title I: 1,080
Number of schools in need of improvement missing AYP targets for two or three consecutive years, 05-06.	61
Number of schools in corrective action, 05-06. These schools missed AYP targets for four consecutive years.	10
Number of schools in restructuring, 05-06. These schools missed AYP targets for at least five consecutive years.	14
State standards system	<a href="http://www.doe.state.in.us/asap/academicstandards.html">http://www.doe.state.in.us/asap/academicstandards.html</a>
State assessment system	<a href="http://www.doe.state.in.us/istep/welcome.html">http://www.doe.state.in.us/istep/welcome.html</a>
System for determining AYP	<a href="http://www.doe.state.in.us/ayp/welcome.html">http://www.doe.state.in.us/ayp/welcome.html</a>
Location of report cards	<a href="http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/AP/ayp2005state.cfm?">http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/AP/ayp2005state.cfm?</a>

### ***Indiana State Services Provided to Schools in Need of Improvement under NCLB***

<b><i>Component</i></b>	<b><i>Process, tools, and templates</i></b>
Needs assessment and goal setting	The Division of Compensatory Education has developed <b>numerous templates and guides</b> for schools and districts including a <b>Resource Book for School and District Improvement</b> : <a href="http://www.doe.state.in.us/TitleI/bulletin/2006-02/resource_book_contents.html">http://www.doe.state.in.us/TitleI/bulletin/2006-02/resource_book_contents.html</a> . A resource list of <b>technical assistance providers</b> is available on the Title I website: <a href="http://www.doe.state.in.us/TitleI/welcome.html">http://www.doe.state.in.us/TitleI/welcome.html</a> .

The Department's **ASAP (Accountability System for Academic Progress)** website contains information on academic standards, accountability, accreditation, best practices, professional development, school improvement plans, and school data: <http://www.doe.state.in.us/asap/welcome.html> .

The **American Student Achievement Institute (ASAI)** works primarily with schools that need a planning process, providing school support teams and technical assistance for school wide planning and school improvement planning. ASAI facilitates training sessions at a regional site with multiple schools. Additional support is provided via phone and site visits.

Through the **ASAI Vision-to Action** change process, school faculty and the community work together to develop a common vision for students, learning, and education. The visioning process helps the faculty and community identify and live by **core convictions**. The Vision-to-Action change process employs a **force field analysis** to help schools bridge the gap between student achievement data and strategies. Schools and communities examine sixteen force fields in the areas of guidance, teaching, learning environment, and expectations of students. Each force field is analyzed using a variety of data including a perceptions survey for faculty, students, and the community and a faculty-community discussion. The school and community identify key force fields most likely to impact students not meeting standards. The faculty and community begin by identifying ideal outcomes and then conduct a **Student Achievement Self Study** to examine data. Data are disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, economic level, and high school curriculum pathway. Each school and community identifies one data field for focus and establishes a data target that answers the question, "Realistically and with hard work, where would we like these data to be two years from now?" Decision making is shared with all administrators, teachers, students, and parents, and some business representatives and community members. School and community leaders use vision to bring diverse stakeholders to creative dissatisfaction with the status quo and energy for change based on disaggregated data, establishing collegiality, asking tough questions, and embracing resistance. ASAI staff work with schools for at least two years, using the turnkey model to train school improvement teams monthly.

School support teams from **Learning Point Associates** work with schools on-site. Through the **Comprehensive School Review** process, school and staff members focus the year's work on a selection of 12 research-based quality indicators of effective and high-quality schools:

- teacher training and support
- effective instructional programs and methods
- leadership that facilitates student learning
- school-based data collection and analysis as the basis for instructional programs
- parent and community influence on school functioning and programs
- student readiness to learn
- safe school environments that are conducive to learning
- teacher professional development focused on improving student learning
- student connection to school and engagement in academic and extracurricular programs
- teacher efficacy
- organizational adaptability
- district policies that support high expectations, accountability, curriculum alignment, and maximum allocation of resources to

	<p>teaching/learning</p> <p>LPA staff members interview teachers, students, and parents, along with observing classrooms to gather data on the chosen indicators. Data are analyzed and shared with district and school staff for interpretation, and the teams work with school staff to prioritize areas of concern and develop hypotheses.</p>
Planning	<p>The Division of Compensatory Education collaborates with other Divisions at IDOE to ensure that all schools identified for improvement receive the technical assistance needed.</p> <p>For schools working with the American Student Achievement Institute, once the targeted force fields are identified, the school and community select strategies to impact those force fields. <b>Strategy research</b> is conducted to help the school and community discover or develop strategies with the highest degree of leverage. A <b>strategy plan</b> is developed including an implementation plan, professional development plan, resistance plan, and evaluation plan. One example of effectiveness is the increasing percentages of ASAI schools making gains on the Indiana state assessment compared to non-ASAI schools in Indiana.</p> <p>Support team members from Learning Point Associates formulate <b>actionable recommendations</b> for each school based on data findings in collaboration with school and district staff. Recommendations may also be made for additional assistance. The school support team meets with the school improvement team to discuss and incorporate recommendations into the school improvement plan.</p>
Implementation	<p>The Division of Compensatory Education continues to provide school improvement grant funds and follows up with districts and schools regarding implementation.</p> <p>As the strategy plans are implemented for schools working with ASAI, the Vision-to-Action process evolves from the Planning Phase to the Implementation Phase. The Implementation Phase turns vision to action, and if the plans are sound and sufficiently implemented, student achievement improves.</p> <p>For schools working with Learning Point Associates, the actionable recommendations determine whether schools continue to work with LPA or other providers and/or district and school staff as appropriate during implementation.</p>
Evaluation and feedback	<p>The Division of Compensatory Education monitors improvement plans as part of desktop and on-site monitoring visits. Improvement strategies are also reviewed from school improvement grant applications. Technical assistance is provided in the review and revision of plans.</p> <p>As soon as ASAI schools begin implementing their strategy plans, they begin collecting follow-up data to determine if (1) the strategies are having the desired impact on targeted attitudes and behaviors and (2) the new attitudes and behaviors are having the desired impact on student achievement. Informed by their new data, teams re-establish their achievement data targets, strategies, and strategy data targets on an annual basis. ASAI schools use an online improvement process management system which includes managing and analyzing data and rubrics for each component of the school improvement plan, including feedback from ASAI staff.</p> <p>For schools working with Learning Point Associates, evaluation and feedback are provided during co-interpretation of their findings with the district and school as well as in the final version of recommendations to be acted upon.</p>

<p>Prioritizing schools in corrective action and restructuring</p>	<p>Schools in corrective action and restructuring receive additional oversight by Title I staff and are given priority for being assigned a school support team from ASAI or LPA. The system for allocating school improvement grants is characterized by Need Indices of poverty, school improvement level, and number of areas not making adequate yearly progress. Schools in restructuring receive site visits from the Title I office during the fall and spring to discuss the restructuring plan and implementation of alternative governance.</p>
<p>Differentiating service delivery at all levels</p>	<p>Title I Fall and Spring Administrative Workshops are held annually and include information targeted at schools and districts in improvement. All schools in need of improvement receive a School Improvement Grant. School support teams from LPA and ASAI are assigned to schools based on school improvement status, along with data from surveys and interviews with principals and teachers. Districts with schools that need further review according to the results of the surveys and interviews receive an on-site visit to clarify the need for a school support team.</p>
<p>Contact person</p>	<p>Jamie Miller  Associate Director  Division of Compensatory Education (Title I)  Indiana Department of Education  (317) 232-0540  <a href="mailto:jmiller@doe.state.in.us">jmiller@doe.state.in.us</a></p>

**NEW MEXICO PUBLIC EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (PED)**

***Background Information***

The Priority Schools Bureau in New Mexico provides leadership, technical assistance and quality assurance to improve performance for all students and close the achievement gap. PED staff and regional and local trainers are the primary service providers. The School Improvement Framework is the fundamental description of improvement activities and requirements and is based on three overarching strategies: (1) building capacity and prevention; (2) monitoring and sanctions; and (3) rewards and advocacy. Each strategy includes initiatives that are based on research or on the successful experiences of other states. For example, the strategy of building capacity includes a multi-year statewide implementation of aligned systems and continuous improvement processes beginning at the district and school level and moving into the classroom and into the individual student’s academic plan.  
<http://www.ped.state.nm.us/div/psb/index.html>

Year system was adopted	2004
Dual accountability system?	No
Basis of the system	<p>The conceptual framework of school improvement activities at the Public Education Department is to develop capacity at the district, school and classroom levels for aligned, research-based improvement activities. These activities include professional development for teachers and administrators; development of expertise in the collection and use of data to drive both instruction and administrative decision-making; development of the skills needed to create the alignment of goals, strategies and resources throughout the system; creation of regional resources to drive systems development and improvement; and financial support for implementation of improvement activities.</p> <p>Research indicates that alignment of state, district, school, classroom, and student goals and activities; careful analysis of data to inform improvement strategies and classroom instruction; the clarification of learning objectives; and the increases in parental involvement brought about by well-implemented continuous improvement strategies will lead to improved student outcomes. The successful experiences of schools in Statesville, North Carolina and Vandalia, Ohio provide experiential support for this research.</p> <p>The effective use of data has been shown to be a vital ingredient in effective systems. The PED has developed an <b>Education Plan for Student Success (EPSS)</b> in which needs, goals and strategies are identified through data analysis, and success is measured using data as well. All schools are required to have and use an EPSS, and PED further supports this process in 100 Priority Schools by providing <b>Diagnostic Assessment Reports (DAR)</b> that help the school examine their data and by providing next-step recommendations. Both the EPSS and the DAR are tracked throughout the year as PED representatives visit school sites for implementation reviews and as PED gathers results data from districts and schools.</p> <p>Research indicates that teachers retain and implement best practices with more fidelity and</p>

	<p>effect when such practices are learned in a sustained program rather than in “one-shot” trainings. Based on this, the PED will fund a series of professional development institutes in mathematics across the state. Each institute extends throughout the year in three two-day sessions at multiple sites.</p> <p>Another initiative based on this research is the placement of full-time instructional coaches at 100 schools across the state. The mission of the coaches will be to work intensively with selected teachers (both new and experienced) who are struggling to teach effectively.</p>
Funding sources	Federal: \$4 million from Title I; state: \$8 million from legislature for school improvement
Number of school improvement staff at the SEA	13
Number of school improvement staff working outside of the SEA but funded by the SEA	Approximately 130: 38 positions within the New Mexico Partnership for School Improvement (NMPSI) will be working as part of the Instructional Coaches initiative; 82 additional instructional coaches will be hired through Title 1 and trained by NMPSI; 10 Distinguished Educators will be hired with PED funds and trained by NMPSI
Number of school improvement staff collaborating with the SEA but not funded by the SEA	Unknown: Regional Educational Technology Assistance (RETA), Strengthening Quality in Schools (SQS), Governor’s Board of Executives for Education (GBEE), Center for Education and Study of Diverse Population (CESDP)
Number of districts, 05-06	89
Number of schools, 05-06	Total: 788 Title I: 570 Non-Title I: 218
Number of schools in need of improvement missing AYP targets for two or three consecutive years, 05-06.	235
Number of schools in corrective action, 05-06. These schools missed AYP targets for four consecutive years.	18
Number of schools in restructuring, 05-06. These schools missed AYP targets for at least five consecutive years.	60
State standards system	<a href="http://www.ped.state.nm.us/standards/index.html">http://www.ped.state.nm.us/standards/index.html</a>
State assessment system	<a href="http://www.ped.state.nm.us/div/acc.assess/accountability/index.html">http://www.ped.state.nm.us/div/acc.assess/accountability/index.html</a>
System for determining AYP	<a href="http://www.ped.state.nm.us/div/acc.assess/accountability/dl/ayp.q.and.a.8.29.2004.pdf">http://www.ped.state.nm.us/div/acc.assess/accountability/dl/ayp.q.and.a.8.29.2004.pdf</a>
Location of report cards	<a href="http://ped.state.nm.us/div/acc.assess/accountability/DistrictReportCard.html">http://ped.state.nm.us/div/acc.assess/accountability/DistrictReportCard.html</a>
<b><i>New Mexico State Services Provided to Schools in Need of Improvement under NCLB</i></b>	
<b><i>Component</i></b>	<b><i>Process, tools, and templates</i></b>
Needs assessment and goal setting	As a first step, all districts and schools in New Mexico are provided with comprehensive details of the results of the <b>New Mexico Standards Based Assessment (NMSBA)</b> , including subgroup data for racial/ethnic subgroups, English language learners, students eligible for free/reduced price lunch, and special education students. Using these data, all schools in New Mexico are required to develop an <b>Educational Plan for School Success (EPSS)</b> that details specific data-based goals and strategies to drive school improvement: <a href="http://www.ped.state.nm.us/div/psb/downloads/eps/EPSS%20Template.doc">http://www.ped.state.nm.us/div/psb/downloads/eps/EPSS%20Template.doc</a> . In addition, all school and district administrators are invited to receive six days of training at <b>regional training sites</b> in systems alignment and continuous improvement with an emphasis on the use of data to drive improvement. The Public Education Department also provides best

	<p>practices resource guides for schools and districts:  <a href="http://www.ped.state.nm.us/div/psb/downloads/BEST%20PRACTICES%20RESOURCE%20GUIDE.doc">http://www.ped.state.nm.us/div/psb/downloads/BEST%20PRACTICES%20RESOURCE%20GUIDE.doc</a> .</p> <p>The Public Education Department has identified 142 schools as Priority Schools. Each Priority School is identified as a “Monitoring” school, a “Targeted Assistance” school, or both. Each classification is accompanied by a specified set of interventions, described later in this document. One hundred schools identified as Priority Schools (Targeted Assistance) are assigned a coordinator from the Public Education Department to conduct a <b>Diagnostic Evaluation</b>, to assist the school in developing their EPSS based on the results of the evaluation and to specify definite action steps to be taken immediately. EPSS Coordinators maintain regular contact with their schools and spend ten days onsite during the year for monitoring and assistance, including evaluation of implementation of the <b>Diagnostic Assessment Report (DAR)</b> recommendations, evaluation of the implementation of the EPSS, and technical assistance as needed. Additional information about this process and about the EPSS is located at <a href="http://www.ped.state.nm.us/div/psb/downloads/EPSS%20Procedures.pdf">http://www.ped.state.nm.us/div/psb/downloads/EPSS%20Procedures.pdf</a> . Teachers and administrators at Targeted Assistance Priority Schools also receive six days of onsite training in systems alignment and continuous improvement with a strong emphasis on the uses of data both to drive instruction and to drive school improvement.</p>
Planning	<p>The New Mexico Public Education Department emphasizes the need for aligned planning at the classroom, school and district levels. Every district is required to create and submit a <b>District EPSS</b> that aligns priorities and resources with the EPSS developed by the schools in that district. The <b>school EPSS coordinators</b> also function as <b>district-level EPSS coordinators</b> in the development and monitoring of the district plan. As mentioned above, district administrators are invited to attend six days of training at regional sites to enhance their understanding of systems alignment and continuous improvement planning. When creating the EPSS, schools and districts must include all stakeholders in the planning process. The <b>Advisory School Council</b>, required in all schools, must include not only school personnel, but also parents and members of the community. This council plays an important role in planning for improvement. The importance of the EPSS is based on research showing that aligned, coherent, systematic planning generates more efficient and effective improvement efforts.</p> <p>Twelve Priority Districts receive the services of <b>Accomplished Educational Administrators</b> for several weeks throughout the year. These administrators, whose previous careers have demonstrated their abilities in school improvement and systems alignment, work with the districts to assess and improve their planning for improvement. One hundred schools identified as Priority Schools (Monitoring) are provided with funding for a <b>full time instructional coach</b> who is not to be assigned any duties other than classroom coaching of selected individual teachers and developing training for all teachers in the school on basic planning, assessing, curriculum and systems alignment. Forty-two Priority Schools not receiving instructional coach funding receive enhanced training and periodic onsite coaching in the implementation of continuous improvement planning practices. The use of experienced administrators as advisors, of instructional coaches, and of periodic onsite coaching is based on research showing that consistent, prolonged training is significantly more effective <i>in terms of fidelity of implementation and therefore of final outcomes</i> than one or two group trainings with no coaching or follow-up. General information about these programs is available in the <b>School Improvement Framework</b>: <a href="http://www.ped.state.nm.us/div/psb/index.html">http://www.ped.state.nm.us/div/psb/index.html</a> . More detailed information about the programs will be posted as they are finalized and approved.</p>
Implementation	<p>In addition to the support and training described above, PED is funding <b>extended day programs</b> for approximately 2,400 students within selected Priority Districts. The funding, which will be awarded through application by the district, requires the use of research-proven effective supplementary and intervention curricula (<i>Math Navigator</i> for math and <i>Voyager</i> for reading).</p>

	<p>Although early research in extended day programs showed mixed results, more recent research shows that such programs, when properly implemented and supported, are effective in improving student learning.</p> <p>The PED has created another resource called the <b>Regional Professional Development Institutes for Educators</b>. This year’s area of focus will be on mathematics and particularly on curriculum and differentiated instruction. Teachers from Priority Schools are required to attend these Institutes (three per year, two days each) and instructional coaches are also required to attend in order to support effective implementation of the best practices learned at the Institutes.</p> <p>The PED also presents an <b>annual “All Kids Can” Conference</b> for educators, featuring workshops in best practices, using data for classroom instruction, information on such diverse topics as Reading Instruction, Native American Education, Special Education, and more. The conferences provide a venue for teachers and school leaders to come together and exchange ideas with their colleagues. In addition, the PED provides financial support for selected districts to become <b>Regional Quality Centers</b>. In that capacity, districts model the use of continuous improvement systems planning, aligned professional development, data use, and other practices proven to be effective.</p>
Evaluation and feedback	<p>Although the NMSBA is an important tool in measuring overall improvement, it is not a good measure of the effectiveness of individual programs and initiatives. Recognizing this, the PED has developed <b>guidelines for short-cycle assessments</b> and is working toward <b>development of a statewide short cycle assessment</b> aligned to New Mexico Content Standards and Benchmarks. In the meantime schools may refer to a list of short cycle assessments currently in use across the state in order to contact other schools and districts and schools to discuss how they are used, their value and appropriateness:  <a href="http://www.ped.state.nm.us/div/psb/downloads/SHORT%20CYCLE%20ASSESSMENTS%20USED%20BY%20NM%20SCHOOL%20DISTRICTS.doc">http://www.ped.state.nm.us/div/psb/downloads/SHORT%20CYCLE%20ASSESSMENTS%20USED%20BY%20NM%20SCHOOL%20DISTRICTS.doc</a> .</p> <p>The PED also recognizes that quarterly short cycle assessments do not provide data frequently enough to judge student and program progress in a way that is useful for classroom or program adjustments. With this in mind, the Priority Schools Bureau is <b>developing a universal reporting system</b> that will encompass all initiatives and will include data on program delivery, fidelity of implementation, and student progress within the program. At the classroom, program and school levels, the Priority Schools Bureau emphasizes the use of ongoing assessments to evaluate student learning and progress. This emphasis is present in the requirements for the EPSS, in trainings for continuous improvement, in the service delivery requirements for instructional coaches and accomplished educational administrators, and in all Priority Schools Bureau conferences and workshops.</p>
Prioritizing schools in corrective action and restructuring	<p>Districts with the most schools in corrective action and restructuring receive priority assignment for <b>Accomplished Educational Administrators</b>, which work with the districts to assess and improve their planning for improvement for several weeks throughout the year. All Restructuring-2 schools are Priority Schools and receive the intensive services provided to Priority Schools. Services to Restructuring-1 and Corrective Action schools are prioritized using the <b>District Audit Tool (DAT) Metric</b> to determine their degree of need. The DAT Metric uses data from the NMSBA to evaluate not only a school’s current situation but also the school’s direction over time. It also uses more than just score data; by evaluating subgroup performance and the number of reported subgroups, the metric takes into account school diversity and generates a number expressing the degree to which the school fell short in making AYP. This number can be thought of as an expression of the urgency of a school’s need.</p>
Differentiating service delivery at	<p>New Mexico combines several methods to prioritize service delivery. These include the length of time a school has had an NCLB designation, the professional judgment of members of the PED, and the District Audit Tool (DAT) Metric. By combining all</p>

all levels	three ways of measuring the school's situation (length of time with designation, professional judgment, DAT Metric information), the PED is able to assign resources appropriately.
Contact person	MaryRose Ce D Baca Deputy Secretary New Mexico Public Education Department (505) 827-6571 <a href="mailto:maryrose.cedbaka@state.nm.us">maryrose.cedbaka@state.nm.us</a>

## **OHIO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (ODE)**

### ***Background Information***

The Office of Field Relations collaborates with offices throughout the Ohio Department of Education and regional providers to coordinate a **Statewide System of School Improvement Support** founded on the principle of building a district’s capacity to plan and implement school improvement processes. By working with district and instructional leaders, the system assists districts in learning how to work better with school leadership to increase student achievement for all students while closing achievement gaps. Using a **Tri-Tiered service delivery model**, ODE provides aligned resources, information, tools, professional development and technical assistance to all districts, with greater intensity focused on the lowest-performing districts. Rather than providing services as part of the district’s team, members of the state’s 12 **Regional School Improvement Teams (RSITs)** act as partners to improve and leverage existing services in support of the district’s improvement plan. RSIT members are selected based on experience, demonstrated success with school improvement support, and knowledge about the six key elements of academic improvement: data analysis; research-based best practices; focused planning; implementation and monitoring; resource management; and high-quality professional development.

Through the Tri-Tiered model, the RSITs help districts close achievement gaps in reading, math and sub-group performance by providing High Quality Technical Assistance to district and instructional leaders based on district data. Tier 1 -- Intensive Services -- coaches districts with schools and districts in improvement status to develop the capacity for planning and implementing school improvement. Tier 2 -- Targeted Services -- develops district capacity to plan and implement school improvement for districts and schools in “At Risk” status. Tier 3 -- Universal Access -- provides access to select products and programs to build regional capacity.

**Note: The Ohio Department of Education website is being updated. You may access information about school improvement at [www.ode.state.oh.us](http://www.ode.state.oh.us) . Click “School Improvement Support,” followed by “Ohio’s Statewide System of School Improvement Support” for a list of links.**

Year system was adopted	1999 with recent significant revisions
Dual accountability system?	Yes. The state system uses a comprehensive performance index to identify schools and districts in the following categories: Excellent, Effective, Continuous Improvement, Academic Watch and Academic Emergency.
Basis of the system	See “What Matters: Research that Guides Our Work”
Funding sources	Federal: Title I, Special Education Regional Resource Centers; state: general revenue targeted at lowest-performing districts
Number of school improvement staff at the SEA	Approximately 15-25
Number of staff working outside of the SEA but funded by the SEA	Approximately 100-200
Number of staff collaborating with the SEA but not funded by the SEA	Approximately 100+
Number of districts, 05-06	610
Number of schools, 05-06	Total: 3,786 Title I: 2,046 Non-Title I: 1,740

Number of schools in need of improvement missing AYP targets for two or three consecutive years, 05-06.	108
Number of schools in corrective action, 05-06. These schools missed AYP targets for four consecutive years.	22
Number of schools in restructuring, 05-06. These schools missed AYP targets for at least five consecutive years.	34
State standards system	See “Academic Content Standards”
State assessment system	See “Achievement Tests”
System for determining AYP	See “Local Report Card,” then “2005-06 Ohio School District Rating Definitions”
Location of report cards	See “State Report Card”

***Ohio State Services Provided to Schools in Need of Improvement under NCLB***

<i>Component</i>	<i>Process and tools</i>
Needs assessment and goal setting	<p>Prior to meeting with the RSIT members, the <b>District Leadership Team</b> (including school/district administrators and teachers acting on behalf of the district as instructional leaders) analyzes multiple sources of data across multiple years, develops hypotheses for areas of low performance, identifies goals and strategies for impacting performance, and formulates an initial plan. When plans are too broad, contain little specificity, lack high quality strategies, or are not connected to solid data sources, RSIT members engage District Leadership Teams in <b>data dialogues</b> regarding district and school data using an integrated framework for aligning data and planning and a <b>cognitive coaching</b> approach: <a href="http://www.cognitivecoaching.com/overview.htm">http://www.cognitivecoaching.com/overview.htm</a>. The RSIT and the District Leadership Team start by looking at several years of student achievement, demographic, perception and school process data to identify, narrow down, and prioritize concerns. Root causes are identified using school and student level data, such as formative assessments, interactive local report cards, and item analysis. In addition, the RSIT engages the District Leadership Team in identifying current practice and areas for improvement, based on identified goals. RSIT members act as presenters, consultants, coaches, and/or facilitators. These roles are determined by and in response to the district’s level of sophistication with school improvement planning and implementation. In some cases, the RSIT member presents district data and acts as a consultant to guide the district through the process of analysis, root cause identification and goal setting. In districts with more expertise and familiarity, the RSIT member uses the cognitive coaching model to ask probing questions, provide observations, and allow the District Leadership Team to develop hypotheses, goals, strategies and action steps. RSIT members involve various partners in the review of data and identification of needs, based on existing relationships or content/process knowledge expertise, including <b>institutes of higher education, Educational Services Centers, Special Education Regional Resource Centers, and Information Technology Centers.</b></p> <p><b>Ohio’s Aligning Data and Planning for Achievement Framework</b> overviews key components of collaboratively analyzing district and school data, prioritizing needs, identifying strategies, collecting data to inform decisions, and developing action plans to address root causes for low performance. <b>District and Building Profiles</b> provide a snapshot of selected data at both district and school levels for RSITs to use in data dialogues. The <b>Local Report Card</b> drills down to focus on all performance indicators. Ohio’s <b>Interactive Local Report Card</b> provides disaggregated longitudinal and snapshot data at the school and district levels. Data dialogues are prompted by the password-protected <b>Accountability Workbooks</b>, which allow districts to cleanse their data</p>

	<p>from April through June and also create a sense of urgency among districts that are meeting AYP, by projecting student performance several years into the future. <b>District Partnership Agreement Rubrics</b> provide a focused look at the most important systems within five critical areas -- curriculum, instruction, assessment, conditions/climate, and leadership -- to assist District Leadership Teams in identifying goals that are most likely to positively impact student achievement.</p>
Planning	<p>During the planning phase, the RSIT members facilitate deeper examinations of data, research-based best practices, and existing practices to arrive at multiple strategies that can be leveraged across goals. All sources of district and school funding are aligned to support identified goals. RSIT members assist District Leadership Teams in understanding that there are no silver bullets and no one strategy will respond to an identified concern. RSIT members also ensure that District Leadership Teams identify potential evidence of implementation and impact. Finally, they assist districts in mapping out the action steps necessary to enact the strategies and collect evidence of both implementation and impact. Tools include the <b>Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP)</b>, an electronic template for submitting school and district improvement plans and the <b>District Partnership Agreement</b> which outlines the goals, intended outcomes, action steps, personnel, timeline, evidence of implementation, and evidence of impact for the RSIT's work.</p> <p>RSIT members do not select interventions, but they engage district and instructional leaders in conversations about sound, research-based practice and will challenge strategies that lack evidence of improving achievement. Conversations about resource management help districts think differently about implementing proven practices with existing funds. RSIT members also periodically involve SEA-funded <b>Area Finance Coordinators</b> for school finance expertise. RSIT members leverage existing state training to assist districts in developing their capacity to plan and implement school improvement. In some cases, the RSITs may sub-contract with regional service providers to allow districts to access needed expertise. All professional development provided by the RSITs is tracked through the <b>System to Achieve Results for Students (STARS)</b>. The RSIT members also broker access to needed products, programs and services.</p>
Implementation	<p>During implementation, the RSIT builds the District Leadership Team's capacity to monitor school implementation of the improvement plan. <b>High Quality Professional Development (HQPDP)</b> opportunities are aligned with district capacity building, free to teachers and targeted to Tier 1 districts. RSITs work with District Leadership Teams to involve a majority of teachers in a particular content area and/or grade level. The Office of Field Relations provides several resources for implementation assistance including a bi-weekly <b>School Improvement e-newsletter</b> with research-based practices, suggestions for implementation, and HQPD resources along with other <b>tools, templates and resources</b>.</p>
Evaluation and feedback	<p>RSIT members meet regularly with District Leadership Teams to discuss evidence of progress based on the District Partnership Agreement Rubric. These meetings reduce pressure on districts and facilitate collaborative relationships rather than compliance. RSIT members collect and review evidence of implementation and impact, seeking clarification when necessary and challenging districts to increase the quality of their evidence as appropriate. District Leadership Teams guide RSIT members through a review of their progress and provide formative and summative data to demonstrate the impact of their efforts and their progress in improving their school improvement planning and implementation processes. Regional School Improvement Facilitators complete weekly progress updates through the STARS system. For Tier 1 districts, RSIT members also provide quarterly progress updates on the District Partnership Agreements and summarize technical assistance and its impact on the district in June to capture district efforts and change in practice. This guides ongoing work and documents RSIT history and progress.</p> <p>Ohio students have made great gains in academic achievement over the past seven years. Overall, average student scores on state</p>

	<p>tests have increased by more than 19 points, from 73.7 to 92.9, including all tested students, not just those at and above proficiency. This year, almost 97 percent of school districts improved their performance index scores over last year; more than 200 districts moved up at least one state designation. Eight of 10 districts are Excellent or Effective. Ohio no longer has any districts in Academic Emergency, and only seven districts remain in Academic Watch. Individual schools also continue to improve, with 88 percent of schools rated in the top three categories, compared to 85 percent last year. Additionally, graduation rates continue to rise for the eighth year in a row.</p> <p>The main challenge is turnover in district leadership, which leads to changes in initiatives and reorganization among staff and makes integration and alignment of programs difficult. Often RSITs assist district and instructional leaders in developing exit strategies for programs that are not aligned to their goals and strategies. The expanding role of unions and restrictions on union contracts also complicate school improvement planning and implementation. Developing strategies to partner with teacher unions is essential to future success.</p> <p>The state is working to build a <b>credentialing system for regional personnel</b> regarding proficiency in providing services. Assessment rubrics have been developed and staff members are in the process of developing authentic assessment items through which RSIT members will demonstrate effectiveness in writing goals, strategies, and performance measures, as well as competency in the core areas of focus for school improvement planning and implementation. The system will be piloted January through March 2007 with current providers and March through July 2007 with new hires.</p>
<p>Prioritizing schools in corrective action and restructuring</p>	<p>Support for improvement does not begin or end; rather it ramps up and becomes more intensive if performance is low. Districts with continued low performance receive greater intensity, and support becomes more directive as longevity increases. Therefore, schools and districts in corrective action receive greater intensity of services and more direction regarding strategies and areas of focus. Specifically, districts that move into corrective action receive more contact from SEA staff which is added to existing supports from the Regional School Improvement Teams. This coordinated effort provides more direction to the school improvement efforts and meets the federal requirements for state action while continuing to provide technical assistance to support the districts' improvement efforts. This is the balance between challenge and support - a balance that is critical if real gains in improvement are to be attained. Similarly, districts with large performance gaps receive additional support, follow up, and contact from the SEA. Closing the gaps in these districts will significantly impact the statewide gaps in achievement, and the SEA is proportionately applying resources to address this issue.</p>
<p>Differentiating service delivery at all levels</p>	<p>To determine service intensity for Tier 1 districts, state staff members consider the number of performance indicators missed, the size and density of the district, subgroup data, and the number of subgroups missing AYP. School data are used to determine district need, but services are delivered to the district. Regional funding allocations are based upon the performance of schools and districts in the region as indicated above, and the time spent in a particular district is proportionate to the school improvement status, size of student population, and evidence of a quality plan and implementation and impact of that plan on student achievement.</p> <p>The Tri-Tier Model demonstrates how time is allocated to districts: 80% of our efforts of support are concentrated on the lowest performing districts (Tier 1), 15% is spent on those at risk (Tier 2), and the remainder on providing all districts with access to quality products, programs, services, and information (Tier 3).</p>

	<p><b>Tri Tier Model of School Improvement Support</b></p>
<p>Contact person</p>	<p>B. Keith Speers          Director          Office of Field Relations          Ohio Department of Education          (614) 466-5460  <a href="mailto:Keith.Speers@ode.state.oh.us">Keith.Speers@ode.state.oh.us</a></p>

**PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (PDE)**

***Background Information***

Pennsylvania’s state system of support is standards-based and aligns clear standards to curriculum, instruction, assessments, interventions, and resources. Data inform school improvement planning, and research-based strategies and professional development are used to produce high student achievement, close achievement gaps, and build capacity for schools, districts, and the state. As a strategic system, Pennsylvania’s model is effective for all schools and all students. The state’s 29 **intermediate units (IUs)** are the major technical assistance service providers.

<http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/site/default.asp>

Year system was adopted	2002
Dual accountability system?	No
Basis of the system	The following state systems were referenced in the development of Pennsylvania’s system: North Carolina regarding value-added assessment; Kentucky regarding the Distinguished Educators program, instructional audit, local self-study, and Standards and Indicators for School Improvement. Performance Fact Inc. was consulted regarding the development of tools, and 4Sight Benchmarks is the formative assessment partner under the Center for Data-Driven Reform in Education at Johns Hopkins University. In the past year, the Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center at the Center for Educational Equity and Excellence at George Washington University has provided research-based articles for implementing Corrective Action Strategies. Though not the basis of the Pennsylvania system, the systems in Maryland and Illinois are reviewed on an ongoing basis due to their effective work.
Funding sources	Federal: Title I; state: \$250 million from Accountability Block Grants, Annenberg Foundation coaching grant, 4Sight research, National Institute for School Leadership training, high school Project 720, and appropriations for intermediate units
Number of school improvement staff at the SEA	Approximately 15 (The Division of District & School Improvement has a staff of four, but there are many cross-bureau efforts involved with operational and strategic processes in both the Division of District & School Improvement and the Office of Federal Programs.)
Number of school improvement staff working outside of the SEA but funded by the SEA	10+ (consultants and contractors for specific project work such as setting up video training modules for DE professional development or providing professional development data retreats).
Number of school improvement staff collaborating with the SEA but not funded by the SEA	120 (curriculum coordinators at the intermediate units, Distinguished Educators, specialists at the PaTTAN centers)
Number of districts, 05-06	501
Number of schools, 05-06	Total: 3,121 Title I: 1,823 Non-Title I: 1,298
Number of schools in need of improvement missing AYP targets for two or three consecutive years, 05-06.	242
Number of schools in corrective action, 05-06. These schools missed AYP targets for four consecutive years.	81
Number of schools in restructuring, 05-06. These schools missed AYP targets for at least five consecutive years.	27

State standards system	<a href="http://www.pde.state.pa.us/stateboard_ed/cwp/view.asp?a=3&amp;Q=76716&amp;stateboard_edNav= 5467 &amp;stateboard_edNav= ">http://www.pde.state.pa.us/stateboard_ed/cwp/view.asp?a=3&amp;Q=76716&amp;stateboard_edNav= 5467 &amp;stateboard_edNav= </a>
State assessment system	<a href="http://www.pde.state.pa.us/a_and_t/site/default.asp?g=0&amp;a_and_tNav= 630 &amp;k12Nav= 1141 ">http://www.pde.state.pa.us/a_and_t/site/default.asp?g=0&amp;a_and_tNav= 630 &amp;k12Nav= 1141 </a>
System for determining AYP	<a href="http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/cwp/view.asp?a=3&amp;Q=111765&amp;pasNav= 6326 ">http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/cwp/view.asp?a=3&amp;Q=111765&amp;pasNav= 6326 </a>
Location of report cards	<a href="http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/cwp/view.asp?a=3&amp;Q=95497&amp;pasNav= 6150 &amp;pasNav= ">http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/cwp/view.asp?a=3&amp;Q=95497&amp;pasNav= 6150 &amp;pasNav= </a>
<b><i>Pennsylvania State Services Provided to Schools in Need of Improvement under NCLB</i></b>	
<b><i>Component</i></b>	<b><i>Process, tools, and templates</i></b>
Needs assessment and goal setting	<p>Data is central to Pennsylvania’s system for continuous school improvement. PDE works in partnership with its 29 <b>intermediate units (IUs)</b> to provide technical assistance to schools and school support teams in assembling and analyzing data to identify root causes and possible solutions. Several tools are available for these analyses. <b>eMetric</b> is available to all districts and IUs, allowing queries of state test data by all students, by subgroups and by reporting categories (assessment anchors/content): <a href="http://pssa.emetric.net/">http://pssa.emetric.net/</a> . The <b>Pennsylvania Valued Added Assessment System (PVAAS)</b> allows for data analysis and is available to all schools for all students. Schools can plot the progress of each student to determine growth made by year and can project potential performance levels over time: <a href="http://www.pde.state.pa.us/a_and_t/cwp/view.asp?a=108&amp;Q=108916&amp;a_and_tNav= 6429 &amp;a_and_tNav= ">http://www.pde.state.pa.us/a_and_t/cwp/view.asp?a=108&amp;Q=108916&amp;a_and_tNav= 6429 &amp;a_and_tNav= </a> . <b>Context Counts</b> allows schools to assess their schedules and determine how best to use their time to cover the essential assessment anchors in reading and math: <a href="http://www.pde.state.pa.us/a_and_t/cwp/view.asp?A=108&amp;Q=108454">http://www.pde.state.pa.us/a_and_t/cwp/view.asp?A=108&amp;Q=108454</a> . <b>Data Dialogue</b> initiates discussion of data among stakeholders, explores root causes, and allows older students to explore and analyze their own PSSA results: <a href="http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/cwp/view.asp?a=3&amp;q=107467">http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/cwp/view.asp?a=3&amp;q=107467</a> .</p> <p>Districts drive the school improvement process, but real improvement in academic achievement takes place at the school level. The <b>Local Self-Study</b> is a voluntary instructional audit of school processes and data to establish a system for continuous school improvement: <a href="http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/cwp/view.asp?A=3&amp;Q=121579">http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/cwp/view.asp?A=3&amp;Q=121579</a> . The <b>Pennsylvania Inspired Leadership</b> initiative works in partnership with the IUs to update experienced administrators and train new administrators in the state system for school improvement. Essential to that training is a unit on data analysis, setting up a data council for the district/school, and how to use data to inform instruction: <a href="http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/cwp/view.asp?a=3&amp;Q=119829&amp;pasNav= 10411 &amp;pasNav= 10411 ">http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/cwp/view.asp?a=3&amp;Q=119829&amp;pasNav= 10411 &amp;pasNav= 10411 </a> .</p>
Planning	<p>Pennsylvania, working with Performance Fact, Inc. developed <b>Getting Results!</b>, a template for school improvement planning that is aligned with all planning documents required by the state. It is now in its third generation and emphasizes data collection; analysis and discovery; and solutions based on root cause and best practice. The Division of District &amp; School Improvement and the Office of Federal Programs at PDE collaborate to review plans and ensure that all schools in need of improvement receive the technical assistance needed. School improvement plans are developed and reviewed for quality and assurance that the plan has a high probability of success. The 29 intermediate units take part in the initial writing and review of the plans using the PDE <b>template for school improvement planning</b>: <a href="http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/cwp/view.asp?a=3&amp;q=118716">http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/cwp/view.asp?a=3&amp;q=118716</a> . A rubric has been designed for review of plans by PDE and its partners. A cross-bureau review of plans is conducted annually to ensure compliance and to assess quality of plans and planning process. PDE notifies all schools of the results of the Departmental review by letter.</p>
Implementation	<p>The first line of support to schools in need of improvement comes from the 29 intermediate units. The state supports the IUs financially and provides periodic training and updates to the curriculum directors through the <b>IU Capacity Building Initiative</b>. Additional monies are made available for the IUs to work with all their districts and schools in enhancing school improvement services. IUs also review plans and offer services linked to plans. The <b>Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN)</b> located in three</p>

	<p>regional centers across PA provides technical support with particular strength in delivering solutions for linking subgroup needs to effective instructional practice. The state offers free, week-long <b>Governor’s Institutes</b> with academic or continuing education credit to teams of educators, in partnership with the university system. Schools in need of improvement are invited to attend the <i>Getting Results!</i> Institute, and other sessions address a variety of instructional strategies, with particular emphasis on reading and math delivery and school improvement. University housing is also offered for the week:  <a href="http://www.teaching.state.pa.us/teaching/cwp/view.asp?a=11&amp;Q=102406">http://www.teaching.state.pa.us/teaching/cwp/view.asp?a=11&amp;Q=102406</a> . The state conducts regional data retreats for all districts and schools (regardless of AYP status) in order to establish a continuous school improvement planning model using data throughout Pennsylvania. The <b>Inspired Leadership Initiative</b> strengthens the leadership skills of existing principals and future leaders through the National Institute for School Leadership:  <a href="http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/cwp/view.asp?a=3&amp;Q=119829&amp;pasNav= 10411 &amp;pasNav= 10411 ">http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/cwp/view.asp?a=3&amp;Q=119829&amp;pasNav= 10411 &amp;pasNav= 10411 </a> . PDE offers <b>4Sight</b> benchmark assessments through the Center for Data-Driven Reform in Education at Johns Hopkins University, which are aligned directly with the state assessment and made available to schools that qualify for state tutoring based on economically disadvantaged status: <a href="http://www.cddre.org">http://www.cddre.org</a> . Additional formative assessments are reviewed periodically by PDE also to ensure test development criteria match Pennsylvania standards. PDE also sponsors the <b>Distinguished Educator (DE)</b> program that places teams into seriously struggling districts and schools for two years to help turn around practice. It is one of the Department’s most intensive strategies for improving districts and schools and is designed to build capacity by (1) assisting schools in identifying instructional or systemic barriers and critical gaps to improving student achievement and (2) working alongside district and school staff to overcome those barriers and fill the gaps: <a href="http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/cwp/view.asp?a=3&amp;Q=109084&amp;pasNav= 6430 &amp;pasNav= 6430 ">http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/cwp/view.asp?a=3&amp;Q=109084&amp;pasNav= 6430 &amp;pasNav= 6430 </a> . The Pennsylvania State Board of Education spearheaded a three-year effort called <b>Page 1</b> to address the achievement gap for subgroups in Pennsylvania: <a href="http://www.page1inpa.k12.pa.us">http://www.page1inpa.k12.pa.us</a> . Also, the state legislature has allocated \$250 million in <b>Accountability Block Grant</b> funding to districts to be used in specified areas that have the potential for improving student achievement including full day kindergarten, narrowing the achievement gap for subgroups, and tutoring services:  <a href="http://www.pde.state.pa.us/svcs_students/cwp/view.asp?a=175&amp;q=111226">http://www.pde.state.pa.us/svcs_students/cwp/view.asp?a=175&amp;q=111226</a> .</p>
Evaluation and feedback	<p>The intermediate units perform the first level of review and feedback for school improvement plans. PDE conducts a second round of review annually using the same <b>rubric</b> used by intermediate units:  <a href="http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/cwp/view.asp?a=3&amp;Q=121334&amp;pasNav= 10429 &amp;pasNav= ">http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/cwp/view.asp?a=3&amp;Q=121334&amp;pasNav= 10429 &amp;pasNav= </a> . The state Division of District &amp; School Improvement Schools notifies districts whether their plan exceeds, meets, or does not meet planning requirements. Periodic monitoring is conducted by PDE staff for various reasons and particularly as part of the <b>PDE Quality Review</b> for struggling schools and districts. As part of their process, the state provides written feedback to the district. While IUs provide invaluable service as a long-standing network of providers, the state is working to improve capacity in some regions through partnerships with higher education. The executive directors and curriculum directors of each IU meet regularly, and the state facilitates ongoing communication across regions through electronic messaging. The state legislature has allocated funds to build the <b>PA EdPort portal</b> that will become the comprehensive “one stop shop” source for Pre K-12 education and will link the districts to each other and PDE, enabling all to share resources, improve communications, access best practices and leverage collective purchasing power:  <a href="http://www.pde.state.pa.us/ed_tech/cwp/view.asp?A=169&amp;Q=110939&amp;pp=12&amp;n=1">http://www.pde.state.pa.us/ed_tech/cwp/view.asp?A=169&amp;Q=110939&amp;pp=12&amp;n=1</a></p>
Prioritizing schools in corrective action and restructuring	<p>All schools in need of improvement receive technical assistance from PDE, but corrective action schools receive the most intensive and direct interventions and are eligible to receive <b>Distinguished Educators</b>. However, there must be an agreement between the district and PDE before DE teams are assigned to ensure cooperation among the parties. DE teams are monitored by regional coordinators, and they receive support from the intermediate units in their service area.</p>

Differentiating service delivery at all levels	<p>Pennsylvania has a three-tiered approach to technical assistance. Most <b>Foundation Assistance</b> is available to all districts and schools and in some cases available to sites through a selection and screening process. <b>Project 720</b>, Pennsylvania’s high school reform program is an example of foundation assistance through a selection process: <a href="http://www.project720.org/">http://www.project720.org/</a>. The middle tier called <b>Field-Based Assistance</b> shifts the focus to those districts and schools “in need of improvement”. <b>Targeted Assistance</b>, on the third tier, allows for direct service to be provided by <b>Distinguished Educators</b>. The state has developed a new system to flag schools in the early stages of school improvement, with a focus on data analysis guided by the eMetric system and PVAAS.</p>
Contact person	<p>Sally Chamberlain  Division Chief  Division of District &amp; School Improvement  Bureau of Assessment &amp; Accountability  Pennsylvania Department of Education  (717) 705-0863  <a href="mailto:schamberla@state.pa.us">schamberla@state.pa.us</a></p>

<b>VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION</b>	
<b><i>Background Information</i></b>	
Virginia has taken a comprehensive approach to meeting the NCLB requirement for a statewide system of support. Virginia’s approach is best described as a toolkit in which each school division and school works with the state to choose the resources and intervention(s) that best fit their needs. Included in the toolkit are a variety of options. The toolkit approach allows the state to match resources to school divisions and schools based on an analysis of student achievement and other factors that contribute to quality educational programs. <a href="http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/nclb/statewidesupport.pdf">http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/nclb/statewidesupport.pdf</a> <a href="http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/nclb/statewidesupport.ppt">http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/nclb/statewidesupport.ppt</a>	
Year system was adopted	1998 with continual enhancements
Dual accountability system?	No
Basis of the system	The current system was developed by closely examining previous state initiatives and applying a comprehensive structure to them.
Funding sources	Federal: Title I School Improvement and Comprehensive School Reform; federal and state: Partnership for Achieving Successful Schools; state: Academic Review Process and Virginia Turnaround Specialist Program
Number of school improvement staff at the SEA	13
Number of school improvement staff working outside of the SEA but funded by the SEA	200
Number of school improvement staff collaborating with the SEA but not funded by the SEA	Unknown
Number of districts, 05-06	132
Number of schools, 05-06	Total: 1,962 Title I: 751 Non-Title: 1,211
Number of schools in need of improvement missing AYP targets for two or three consecutive years, 05-06.	96
Number of schools in corrective action, 05-06. These schools missed AYP targets for four consecutive years.	9
Number of schools in restructuring, 05-06. These schools missed AYP targets for at least five consecutive years.	3
State standards system	<a href="http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/Superintendent/Sols/home.shtml">http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/Superintendent/Sols/home.shtml</a>
State assessment system	<a href="http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/Assessment/soltests/">http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/Assessment/soltests/</a>
System for determining AYP	<a href="http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/nclb/VA-AcctWkbk.pdf">http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/nclb/VA-AcctWkbk.pdf</a>
Location of report cards	<a href="http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/src/">http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/src/</a>
<b><i>Virginia State Services Provided to Schools in Need of Improvement under NCLB</i></b>	
<b><i>Component</i></b>	<b><i>Process, tools, and templates</i></b>
Needs assessment	The <b>school-level academic review</b> helps schools identify and analyze instructional and organizational factors affecting student

and goal setting	<p>achievement: <a href="http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/Accountability/ARprocessoverview.pdf">http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/Accountability/ARprocessoverview.pdf</a> . The focus of the review process is on the systems, processes, and practices that are being implemented at the school and division level. Information is gathered that relates to alignment of curriculum, use of time and scheduling practices to maximize instruction, use of data to make decisions, effective professional development, designing and implementing a school improvement plan to address identified areas of weakness, implementation of research-based instructional interventions, and improving organizational systems and processes. The academic review team, either state or locally directed, conducts on-site reviews and assists the school in identifying areas of need and writing an effective three-year improvement plan based on state and federal regulations and effective research-based practices. The academic review team collects and analyzes data and provides the school and division with information that can be used to develop or revise and implement the school’s three-year school improvement plan, as required by the <b>Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia</b>: <a href="http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/Accountability/soa.html">http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/Accountability/soa.html</a> . Districts can apply to the state to implement their own academic review process within the parameters of the state model. Tools include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>School Level Academic Review Process Guidelines</b>: <a href="http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/suptsmemos/2005/inf202a.pdf">http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/suptsmemos/2005/inf202a.pdf</a></li> <li>• <b>School improvement resources</b>: <a href="http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/SchoolImprovement/">http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/SchoolImprovement/</a></li> <li>• <b>School Support Team process</b>: <a href="http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/SchoolImprovement/sstprocess.pdf">http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/SchoolImprovement/sstprocess.pdf</a></li> <li>• <b>Academic Review Coordinator and Team Leader responsibilities</b>: <a href="http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/SchoolImprovement/sstleaders.doc">http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/SchoolImprovement/sstleaders.doc</a></li> </ul>
Planning	<p><b>School Support Teams (SSTs)</b> are a part of the Department of Education’s academic review process. The SST consists of Department of Education staff and/or independent contractors trained in developing, implementing, and monitoring the school improvement plan. For those schools that were warned in the previous year and received an onsite academic review, the School Support Team reviews the current plan and provides technical assistance to the school to update the school improvement plan based on new accountability data. The team provides focused technical assistance and monitors the school improvement plan throughout the year as prescribed by the level of assistance assigned. To assist schools in selecting interventions, the Department of Education has prepared an updated <b>Technical Assistance Resource Document</b> that contains the board-approved recommended list and background information on recommended models, board-approved selection criteria, and disclaimers: <a href="http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/suptsmemos/2004/inf235a.pdf">http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/suptsmemos/2004/inf235a.pdf</a> . <b>School improvement plan requirements</b> for the state Standards of Accreditation and NCLB systems are available here: <a href="http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/SchoolImprovement/SOAandNCLB-SIPrequirements.doc">http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/SchoolImprovement/SOAandNCLB-SIPrequirements.doc</a> and <a href="http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/SchoolImprovement/acr14.pdf">http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/SchoolImprovement/acr14.pdf</a> .</p>
Implementation	<p>Technical assistance, staff development as requested, regular monitoring of the implementation of the school improvement plan, and follow-up assistance by the academic review team coordinator or leader are provided in a joint effort to improve student achievement. Information on <b>braiding and blending funding</b> is available here: <a href="http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/SchoolImprovement/schoolimprovement111405.ppt">http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/SchoolImprovement/schoolimprovement111405.ppt</a></p>
Evaluation and feedback	<p>The school-level academic review is a continuous process. The focus of the academic review is on the development, monitoring, and implementation of the school improvement plan. Schools not rated as “Fully Accredited” must submit a School Improvement Plan to the Office of School Improvement. (See descriptions of school ratings at: <a href="http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/src/accred-descriptions.shtml">http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/src/accred-descriptions.shtml</a> .) By October 1 of each year, each school must report the status of implementation of the school’s three-year school improvement plan and progress toward meeting the goals of the plan. The first year that a school is rated “Accredited with Warning,” an academic review team conducts a comprehensive review of the areas related to the systems, processes, and practices</p>

	<p>that are being implemented at the school and division levels as indicated above. Throughout the school’s continued status in warning, the academic review process is designed to monitor the implementation of the school improvement plan and provide technical assistance to support the school’s improvement efforts. There are three tiers of assistance in the first year of warning and a School Support Team to provide technical assistance until the school is rated “Fully Accredited.” Tools include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Academic Review Technical Assistance Report:</b> <a href="http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/SchoolImprovement/sstleaders.doc">http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/SchoolImprovement/sstleaders.doc</a></li> <li>• <b>Academic Review Preliminary Report – Principal Questions:</b> <a href="http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/SchoolImprovement/sstprincipal.doc">http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/SchoolImprovement/sstprincipal.doc</a></li> </ul>
Prioritizing schools in corrective action and restructuring	Assistance is targeted to schools depending on the school’s number of years in improvement. Therefore, schools in corrective action and restructuring receive priority services.
Differentiating service delivery at all levels	The school-level academic review is tailored to meet the unique needs and circumstances presented by the school, within the limits of the statewide school improvement process. Services are targeted to schools according to their level of school improvement and accreditation status.
Contact person	<p>Kathleen M. Smith  Director  Office of School Improvement  Virginia Department of Education  (804) 786-5819  <a href="mailto:Kathleen.Smith@doe.virginia.gov">Kathleen.Smith@doe.virginia.gov</a></p>

## **Implications**

This policy brief was developed to describe how eight diverse states are maximizing their human and fiscal resources to support schools in need of improvement by assisting with data analysis, plan development, implementation, and ongoing evaluation. The brief is a result of collaboration between CCSSO State Support Network Team members to ensure that the data are useful. We hope that the brief will facilitate cross-state discussions about organizing state support systems.

A look into these systems demonstrates both similarities and differences between large-scale approaches to school improvement in terms of state capacity, conceptual frameworks, and service delivery. State capacity differs according to the number of districts, schools and Title I schools. The system is framed by the state's dual accountability status as well as its research base and organizational models, including those based on other states. Service delivery varies in intensity, duration, and provision, and providers include regional and nonprofit organizations, as well as state, local, and higher education staff members.

Understanding how states are organizing their systems is important, but the goal of school reform is raising student achievement. Determining how each state can effectively support increased performance for specific students is beyond the scope of this brief but is an important next step. Further research is needed to identify the most effective ways that states can use their capacity to support struggling districts and schools.

*This policy brief was written by Alyssa Alston under the direction of Julia Lara and Ayeola Fortune.*

## **Works Cited**

National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). Long-term trend: Trends in student groups. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved July 12, 2006, from <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/lt/results2004/natsubgroups.asp>

U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I Part A Subpart 1 Section 1117 (a)(1). Retrieved July 12, 2006, from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg2.html#sec1117>

U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *School improvement report: Executive order on actions for turning around low-performing schools: First annual report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved July 12, 2006, from <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OUS/PES/lpschools.pdf>

U.S. Department of Education. (2005, November 10). *No Child Left Behind: A road map for state implementation*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved July 12, 2006, from <http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/roadmap/roadmap.pdf>

*The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) is a nonpartisan, nationwide, nonprofit organization of public officials who head departments of elementary and secondary education in the states, the District of Columbia, the Department of Defense Education Activity, and five U.S. extra-state jurisdictions. CCSSO provides leadership, advocacy, and technical assistance on major educational issues. The Council seeks member consensus on major educational issues and expresses their views to civic and professional organizations, federal agencies, Congress, and the public.*

*Our mission statement: The Council of Chief State School Officers, through Leadership, Advocacy, and Service, assists chief state school officers and their organizations in achieving the vision of an American education system that enables all children to succeed in school, work, and life.*

**Council of Chief State School Officers**  
One Massachusetts Avenue, NW • Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20001-1431  
voice: 202.336.7000 • fax: 202.408.8072  
<http://www.ccsso.org/>

Copyright 2006 © by the Council of Chief State School Officers