



DRAFT -- Features of a Turnaround System of Support

This resource was built upon input from the School Improvement Spoke External Advisory Committee (8/17/16 meeting), School Improvement Internal Advisory Committee, Hub Committee (9/12/16 presentation), State Board of Education (9/15/16 presentation), ESEA Committee of Practitioners (9/21/16), and comments from the ESSA Listening Tour (summer 2016).

Category	Indicators
Philosophy/ Mindset	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide/ensure equitable access and opportunity for all students • Systems that support and reflect all students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Get specific ○ Bring lens of teach disaggregated group • Student centered • Address health barriers/educationally relevant health disparities of students • Long term capacity development is kept in mind • Building flexibility – staffing, budget, pilot/innovation type status • Take a systemic approach – not piecemeal • Comprehensive – connected to each other, not independent unrelated strategies • Loose, but tight • Carrot as opposed to stick – incentives not punishment • Honor cultural and linguistic diversity in tangible ways (incentives) • Partners should have a sense of urgency with a focus on high expectations for systems, leaders, teachers and students. • Partners should meet the system where they are and move them forward efficiently and effectively. Time matters for our students! • A balanced, dynamic mix of flexibility/autonomy matched with direction as needed. A set of tight expectations matched with loose expectations all with underlying support. • Provide clarity of expectations that is differentiated for small districts and large districts • Don't make assumptions about district capacity (e.g., large districts don't always have district staff



	<p>available to provide supports, staff in small districts often wear multiple hats)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State needs to help districts become critical of their own systems – it’s the only way to own the issues. • System needs to be proactive rather than reactive (e.g., why wait until schools are identified or at the end of the clock to do anything?) • Focus on building capacity and leadership
<p>Curriculum and Instruction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curriculum development and alignment • Focus on instructional core – curriculum, assessment and instructional supports • Built on solid core instructional practices and systems – not only interventions • Direct, intensive services to students • Approved provider list for various supports (Relay, UVA, etc) • Professional Learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence Based Practice ○ High Leverage ○ Practice • Curriculum/Resource Supports • Clear, school-wide commitment to GVC and common resources • Focused literacy intervention
<p>Resource Alignment (funds, time, people, flexibility)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial support to seek professional development that would not have otherwise been available • Leadership/coaching <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Focused on improved student outcomes ○ Vision of “each and every student” • Incentives beyond student achievement – results matter • Intentional alignment of strategy and resources (funds) • Time for teachers to collaborate • Strategic use of time for kids and teachers • Social/emotional supports (e.g., counselors, curriculum) • CDE must be flexible on funding to be able to pull funding or hold funding until ready • CDE must have Czar for all programs in targeted schools • Need CDE Turnaround Scorecard <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How much funding provided to school



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ What intervention○ What leading/trailing results● Allocating amounts not based the same<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Rural should be larger○ Harder for sources● Would like CDE to function more like an investor/ more flexibility● It seem that the units in the department work sporadically with the districts would be nice to have some more cohesive support● Is there a possibility for things(funding, reporting, services) to look differently based on the size of the distract (rural/ urban)● Alignment of budget cycles● Foundations can offer access to innovative practices as well as financial resources.● Communities can be engaged to become partners in the school turnaround process.● What type of leadership training would you need to support these efforts?● For formula allocations, district reporting while maintaining transparency● Concentrate resources into programs that work.● Identify a pool of mentors in the field (not CDE employees) that have expertise in turnaround work● Provide supports for grant writing (if funds are distributed competitively)● Assign accessible contacts to participants● Family connection to turnaround work is important. They need to be brought in as partners.
Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Networking with similar districts who have achieved successful turnarounds● Models of best practice in schools matter● Seeing and experiencing what works● Turnaround Learning Academy<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ District review with recommendations○ HR/Staffing revisions○ Differentiated resource allocation● Turnaround Network<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Monthly visit protocols○ DDI○ Teach Like a Champion



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Relay observations/feedback training • Models of exemplary work should be based on and in schools that are having actual success. Sometimes research takes time to catch up with best practices and research sometimes may not even recognize best practice because of old biases. Evidenced-based can be a more effective, timely standard. • The Turnaround Network is very successful at supporting schools/districts because they ensure that any supports provided to school have demonstrated success before they get access to schools. It is difficult for schools/districts that are already struggling to try to vet potential partners. The Turnaround Network has ensured that schools/districts have been able to engage high-quality partners. • What are the best ways to leverage grants? • Relay GSE offers great support for school and district leaders. • Menu of supports • CDE provide a capacity analysis (e.g., what works? What can we do?) • Provide diagnostic reviews at the district and the school levels (e.g., SST, CADI) • Provide success stories and best practices around Title I and SIG/TIG programs • Provide success criteria that provides clear expectations and with a constant target. • Create tools or resources to identify “like” districts/schools that have improved. • Resource bank for turnaround – what has worked? Where?
<p>Research, Planning and Evaluation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Third party – school needs assessment and community engagement • Adequate ramp-up/planning • Learning time before implementation – “Year Zero” • Differentiated and specific to the needs in the school • Based on deep needs analysis • Legitimate time (for planning) and supplemental funding (for increased demands and duties) • High performing, high poverty research • Implementation science – solves the knowing, doing gap • Align supports • Ensure they meet student needs • Be evaluated to ensure improvement • Evaluate usefulness/value/implementation effectiveness of supports • Use data (all data available) to drive action



- Give guidance beyond test scores – including non-academic such as mobility, discipline, attendance, climate, etc.
- Informed by experts/research – divorced from political ideology
- Accountability and resources to implement supports
- There must be support for new school option
- Transparency and accountability at the state level as well as the local level
- Ensure that they are aligned to effective practices and grantees are held accountable for implementing those best practices within a system of support.
- Rubric for needs assessment