SIG Cohort Data: Lessons to be Learned in Shaping Federal, State and Local School Turnaround Efforts

Housekeeping

Pause for reflection and discussion
Type messages into chat area
Polls: Quick Polling
You can also send content-related questions to eventquestion@wested.org
Welcome from the Center on School Turnaround

- **Carlas McCauley**: Director, Center on School Turnaround
- **Julie Duffield**: Senior Research Associate, WestEd
- **Mark Williams**: Vice President for Institutional Advancement, Academic Development Institute

Chat Area

Please type in an introduction with your role, affiliation, and one thing you’d like learn or contribute on today’s webinar.

Type your comments here and press “send”
CENTER OBJECTIVES

• Create Pro-Turnaround Environment
• Administer and Manage Programs Effectively
• Provide TA to LEAs and Schools
• Advocate and Lead

http://centeronschoolturnaround.org/

Today’s Presenter

• Lauren Morando Rhim
  ○ Strategic Partner, Center on School Turnaround at WestEd
Today’s Reflectors

- **George Hancock**
  - School Improvement Grants Coordinator, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction

Participants

Introductions
Getting to Learn and Share with Each Other

Webinar Overview

Part 1
- School Improvement Grant (SIG) Cohort I & II data
- Data trends
- SIG Implementation research
  
  *Pause for any questions or comments*

Part II
- Making sense of the data: Considering implications at federal, state, and local level
  
  *Reflections*

Part III
- Applying the data to inform local practice looking forward
  
  *Reflections and discussion*
“Under the Obama Administration, the SIG program has invested up to $2 million per school at more than 1,500 of the country’s lowest-performing schools. Early findings show positive momentum and progress in many SIG schools. Findings also show that many schools receiving SIG grants are improving, and some of the greatest gains have been in small towns and rural communities.”

SIG Cohort Profiles

- **Cohort 1: 2009-2010 Baseline Reading (N=549)**
  - Turnaround (n=107)
  - Transformation (n=415)
  - Restart (n=27)

- **Cohort 2: 2010-2011 Baseline Reading (N=375)**
  - Turnaround (n=49)
  - Transformation (n=305)
  - Restart (n=21)

Understanding the Data

- DOE commissioned analysis of progress on state assessments for Cohort 1 (2009-2010) and Cohort II (2010-2011) schools.
- Analysis examines changes in mathematics and reading proficiency levels
- Roughly 40% of Cohort 1 SIG schools and roughly 30% of Cohort 2 SIG Schools could not be included in the analyses due to:
  1. Significant state assessment or cut score changes during the grant years
  2. More than one tested grade added or subtracted
  3. No tested grades
  4. School split or merger
  5. Missing proficiency rates
  6. School closure
  7. Data quality concerns
Cohort #1 Context

- Average total grant = $2.54 million
  - Per pupil, average $1,330, high $7,000, low $500
- SIG fund vary in terms of overall impact
  - 4 state, SIG = 6% increase
  - 11 states, SIG = 30% increase
- Distribution
  - Kentucky, 105 of 108 eligible received SIG $
  - Illinois, 10 of 738 eligible received SIG $
- State monitoring of implementation varied significantly

SIG Outcomes...

[Image: Deviation = 1.0]
SIG Cohort I Headline

What does it tell us?

• 2/3 SIG schools showed gains
• Gains similar to schools without SIG dollars

SIG Cohort I & II Research

What does it tell us?

• SIG schools making gains in both math and reading
• SIG I improving in second year and improvements greater than average
• SIG II improving but only exceed average in reading
What does it tell us?

- Across both cohorts, gains demonstrated for turnaround, transformation and restart
- Exception Cohort II transformation schools constant in math
- Closure option utilization rate (Cohort 1 = 17 and Cohort II = 1) precludes analysis

SIG schools making relatively modest gains
- Cohort I math, 39% show gains of 10% or more
- Cohort II math, 20% show gains of 10% or more
- Cohort I reading, 30% show gains of 10% or more
- Cohort II reading, 18% show gains of 10% or more

More schools show gains than declines
Practically significant number show declines (i.e., 6-7% in both cohorts show declines of 10% or more in both math and reading)
Gains According to SIG Model

- **Cohort I Math gains**
  - Transformation- average 6%
  - Turnaround-average 10%
  - Restart-average 9%

- **Cohort I Reading gains**
  - Transformation- average 3%
  - Turnaround-average 6%
  - Restart-average 6%

- **Cohort II Math gains**
  - Transformation- average 0%
  - Turnaround-average 4%
  - Restart-average 4%

- **Cohort II Reading gains**
  - Transformation- average 2%
  - Turnaround-average 2%
  - Restart-average 1%

Gains According to Grade/Location

- Elementary schools demonstrated greater gains
- Schools located in “small towns” and “rural” areas on average demonstrated greater gains

Data Trend Headlines

- Data/Methodological limitations
- Analysis limitations
  - Outcomes by state?
  - Outcomes by external/lead partners?
  - Outcomes by district?
- Many schools showing growth but many stagnant and some losing ground
- Full evaluation due to be released by ED/AIR in 2015

Implementation Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kitchen sink</th>
<th>Scattershot</th>
<th>Laser focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New on top of old</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>Prioritized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of coherence</td>
<td>Peripheral</td>
<td>Data driven</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Yatsko et al. 2012
Implementation Challenges

- Fidelity to the model given local contextual issues (e.g., collective bargaining agreements, leader and teacher talent pipeline, resistance to change).
- Limited will and skill to implement aspects of model (e.g., use of data)
- Inadequate planning time
- Leveraging increased learning time
- State oversight and accountability
- Navigating federal compliance requirements

Source: Center on Education Policy, 2012; INSTLL, 2012; Rhim & Redding, 2012; Yatsko 2012

Reflections

Reflectors:
Do these trends reflect what is happening in your state? What’s similar? What are some different strategies?

Participants, please share your reflections, comments & questions
Lessons to be Learned in Shaping Federal, State and Local School Turnaround Efforts

One universal truth

No magic bullet
Looking Forward: Federal Implications

- Prescriptive v. flexible models
- Compliance v. outcome orientation
- Role of SEA
- Role of LEA
- Meaningful evaluation that can inform practice

Looking Forward: Local Implications

- Balancing capacity with need?
- Award selectivity?
- Monitoring implementation?
- Consequences for failure to implement with fidelity?
- Investment in evaluation?
Local Implications

Takeaways?
What can YOU do at the SEA level to move districts and schools forward to meet their goals?

Questions

- What can your SEA do to leverage SIG application process in order to optimize return on investment?

- What resources can your SEA allocate to support effective and sustainable school turnaround?

- What role can your SEA plan to leverage emerging lessons to benefit all schools in the state?

- What is your SEA’s strategy to deal with persistent low-performance?
Reflections

Participants share reflections, comments & questions

Contact Information
Dr. Lauren Morando Rhim
lauren_rhim@lmrconsulting.us
(301)655-1992

Additional Resources:
- The Center on School Turnaround
  - http://centeronschoolturnaround.org/
- The State Role in School Turnaround: Emerging Best Practices
  - http://centeronschoolturnaround.org/staterole/
Thank You

Your Feedback

- Survey Feedback
  https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/cst_sigcohortdata

- Webinar Archive
  http://centeronschoolturnaround.org/networks-professional-development/sig-cohort-data/