

ASSISTANCE *plus*

Jim Warford
K-12 Chancellor

Presented to State Board of
Education June 21, 2005

ASSISTANCE *plus*

Governing Principles

- The District shall be held accountable for providing necessary resources to have all students performing at acceptable levels.
- The State shall provide expectations and necessary resources to enable districts to have all students performing at acceptable levels.
- The State Board of Education shall be prepared to take action in the event that districts are unsuccessful at having all students performing at acceptable levels.

What Happened in 2004-2005

Presented to State Board of
Education June 21, 2005

ASSISTANCE
plus

State Board of Education

Actions

2004-2005

- Dedicated school improvement facilitators
- Reading and Mathematics coaches
- School improvement resources
- Technology support
- College Board Partnership
- Alignment of state funding - **\$8,269,000**

State Board of Education

Actions

2004-2005

- Continuous Improvement Model (CIM)
 - Intensive tutorials during regular school hours
- Quarterly Reporting of student progress
- School Match
- Conference calls between Department and Superintendents and Principals

District School Board

(Sec. 1001.42 (16)(a), F.S.)

Requirements

2004-2005

- Declare an Emergency
 - Locate and hire quality staff
 - Fill all positions by first day of school
 - Adopt an incentive system to retain high quality staff
- School Board adopted budget with special category for F schools
- Adopt policies for feeder schools that minimize social promotion
- Choice
- Community Oversight Committees
- Individual Student Success Plans
- District and school action plans
- Close double F charter schools

How successful were we in 2004-2005?

Presented to State Board of
Education June 21, 2005

ASSISTANCE
plus

What the Data Tells Us

Presented to State Board of
Education June 21, 2005

ASSISTANCE
plus

Repeating F School Improvement

	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>±</u>	<u>05 Grade</u>
Holmes Elementary	265	277	12	F
West Little River Elementary	224	337	113	D
Miami Edison High	259	254	-5	F
Miami Jackson High	270	289	19	D
Jean Ribault High	270	295	25	D
Mathew Gilbert Middle	278	317	39	D
William Raines High	279	311	32	D
Eugene Butler Middle	250	297	47	D
Jean Ribault Middle	250	301	51	D
Paxon Middle	273	312	39	D
Chattahoochee Elementary	273	343	70	C
Jefferson High	276	286	10	D
Evans High	275	299	24	D
Oak Ridge High	253	278	25	F
Jones High	271	255	-16	F

Single F School Improvement

	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>±</u>	<u>05 Grade</u>
Arthur Ashe Middle	269	270	1	F
Chancellor Charter	265	346	81	C
Niblack Elementary	260	349	89	C
Downtown Miami Charter	279	356	77	C
Allapattah Middle	279	295	16	D
Charles Drew Middle	276	314	38	D
Madison Middle	269	301	32	D
Miami Edison Middle	269	318	49	D
Vankara Academy Charter	244	310	66	D
Miami Central High	268	264	-4	F
School For Applied Tech	265	301	36	D
School For Success Academy (M)	248	308	60	D
School For Success Academy (H)	251	285	34	<90% T F

Single F School Improvement

	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>±</u>	<u>05 Grade</u>
East Gadsden High	249	284	37	D
Havana Elementary	255	332	77	D
James Shanks Middle	269	294	25	D
Crossroad Academy	264	399	135	B
Mount Pleasant Charter	232	395	163	B
Madison County High	262	301	39	D
Madison County Excel School	123	177	54	F
Delray Beach Academy	257	276	19	F
Survivors Charter	254	209	-45	NG(S)
Riviera Beach Academy	238	269	31	F
Bartow Charter School	242	256	14	F
Compass Middle	235	302	67	D
Roosevelt Academy	228	325	97	D

2004-2005 F School Improvement

Average Gains While Raising the Bar

- A down 9 points
- B down 1 point
- C up 7 points
- D up 18 points
- **F up 43 points !**

2004-2005 Results

49 Schools Identified as F

- 6 schools closed (5 charter)
- 2 charters were reconstituted
(1 – became C, 1 – became F)
 - 2 – became B
 - 4 – became C
 - 22 – became D
 - 11 – are repeating F
- 2 – No Grade, too small

What Worked

What Did Not

What Principals said was most successful:

- “Continuous Improvement Model (CIM)” 62%
- “Increased Instruction in Reading and Mathematics” 23%
- “Extended Learning Time, Saturdays and After School” 19%
- “Coaches” 15%
- “School Improvement Facilitator” 15%
- “Quarterly Reporting” 12%
- “Professional Development” 12%

Evidence of CIM Working

Jefferson High Principal, “We didn’t really do a good job of implementing CIM. We asked Madison High for help, since they are doing it really well and now we’ve got it right.”

- Jefferson High improved 10 points
- Madison High improved 39 points

Evidence of CIM Working

When school improvement facilitators were asked which schools were doing the best job implementing CIM:

- Niblack Elementary 89 point gain
- Crossroad Academy 135 point gain

What Worked?

“School Improvement Facilitator, Quarterly Reports, CIM”

Downtown Miami Charter, improved 77 school grade points

“90-minute reading period and a 60-minute increased math period; monitoring of lesson plans, reading records and assessment materials, CIM school wide, continuous assessments and re-evaluations, math coach”

Havana Elementary, improved 93 school grade points

What Districts said was most needed:

- Financial support for an incentive system to obtain and retain high quality staff.
- Assessment tools (Progress Monitoring)
- Personnel for Reading

What didn't work?

1. CIM formative mini-assessments were not uniform or properly aligned statewide.
2. Assistance Plus teams lacked process and uniform progress monitoring instruments for school visits.
3. There was not full buy-in from all K-12 bureaus and staff.

Assistance Plus

2005-2006

Presented to State Board of
Education June 21, 2005

ASSISTANCE *plus* 21

State Board of Education

(Sec. 1008.33 (2), F.S.)

The State Board may recommend one or more of the following actions...

- (a) Provide additional resources, change certain practices, and provide additional assistance....
- (b) Implement a plan to resolve equity issues
- (c) Contract for educational services or reorganize...
- (d) School Choice
- (e) Other appropriate action

The Assistance Plus District Action Plan for 2005-2006 directs districts to:

1. Provide quality instructors and resources to the schools in a timely manner;
2. Close, restructure, charter, or contract out repeat failing schools;
3. Provide more rigor and relevance grades 6-12;
4. Develop stronger policies ending social promotion; **and**
5. Close F charter schools previously reconstituted

Declare an Emergency!

Although provided in Florida Statute, districts have not taken advantage of, implemented in a timely manner, or implemented completely the declaration of an emergency to restaff failing schools with high quality instructors. Districts shall begin this process today, have quality staff in place by the first day of school and assure quality staff are in place yearlong.

District Required Compliance

Districts shall submit to the State Board of Education a written agreement to comply with the Action Plan by July 19.

Close, Restructure, Charter, or Contract Out

Districts shall determine prior to July 19, whether repeating F schools will be closed, restructured, chartered or contracted out. Districts shall submit to the SBE by July 19 the determination and the action plan being implemented.

Restructure

- Replace all or most of the school staff relevant to the failure
- Contract with private management company to run school
- Reopen as a public charter school
- Or, other restructuring of the school's governance arrangement that....

Restructure....

- Makes fundamental reforms, such as significant changes in the school's staffing and governance, to improve student academic achievement in the school
 - Career academies
 - Small schools within a school
 - High Schools That Work
 - Middle Schools That Work

Special Budget Category for F Schools

District School Boards shall adopt a district budget that includes a special category to support school improvement efforts at F schools. Additionally, state appropriated Supplemental Academic Instruction, **Perkins Funds, and Tech Prep** categorical funds shall be prioritized to serve students at these schools.

Policies Ending Social Promotion

Although the State Legislature has provided direction to end social promotion at the third and high school levels, level 1 students continue to be promoted at other grade levels. Districts shall put into place policies that deter social promotion at all levels **with strict policies at the transition grade level.**

Individual Student Success Plans

Each student shall take an active part in contributing to the success of his/her future. School staff, parents, and students shall agree on individual success plans, written as contracts to facilitate promotion to the next school level.

Closing Repeating F Charter Schools

Charter schools are one very important school choice for Florida parents and students. It is our responsibility to monitor the quality of education being provided at these schools. Districts shall take emergency action to close charter schools that continue to fail.

Former repeating F charter schools that have been previously restructured and again earn a grade F must be closed.

OCPS Blue Ribbon Task Force Recommendations

- Increase enrollment in Advance Placement Courses
- Establish additional subject matter or themed magnets
- Develop smaller learning communities
- Implement career academies
- Train staff in Florida's Continuous Improvement Model

Continuous Improvement

1. DOE will provide uniform, aligned mini-assessments statewide.
2. Better training and a uniform progress monitoring instrument will be provided.
3. Every member of the K-12 Student Achievement bureaus will be personally linked to a failing school.
 - Modeled after the hurricane disaster “buddy system”

State Dedicated Funding

- College Board Partnership
- Priority for Career Academy funding
- \$1 Million: Florida's Continuous Improvement Model staff development (PAEC)
- \$1 Million: Mini-lessons (NEFEC)
- \$1 Million: Mini-Assessments (Florida Achieves!)
- \$1 Million: Assistance Plus, Reading and Mathematic Coaches
- \$1.7 Million: Comprehensive School Reform
- Title I School Improvement funding

Dedicated Staff

- DOE K-12 School Leaders
- Assistance Plus Teams
- School Improvement Facilitators
- Regional Service Providers
- Area Consortia

Governing Principles

- The District shall be held accountable for providing necessary resources to have all students performing at acceptable levels.
- The State shall provide expectations and necessary resources to enable districts to have all students performing at acceptable levels.
- The State Board of Education shall be prepared to take action in the event that districts are unsuccessful at having all students performing at acceptable levels.

Florida's System of School Accountability

Rewarding Excellence

School Recognition

Implementing Sanctions

ASSISTANCE
plus