

Recommendation on Indiana's Turnaround Academies

SBOE Turnaround Committee Meeting

November 17, 2014

Tim Field, Senior Consultant, Public Impact

PUBLIC IMPACT





About Public Impact

Mission: dramatically improve learning outcomes for all children in the U.S., with a special focus on underserved students by:

- Expanding access to great [teachers and leaders](#)
- Equipping states and districts with tools to implement [turnarounds](#) in failing schools
- Expanding supply of high-quality [charter schools](#)
- Influencing policy and management practices that serve as important levers for school reform



Our Work for Indiana

1. Identify promising practices from other states related to state intervention in chronically failing schools
2. Collect and analyze select performance and enrollment data to describe progress at the state's seven turnaround academies
3. Interview state and district leaders and external partners to identify successes and challenges at the state's seven turnaround academies



Guidance to SBOE Turnaround Committee

1. October 22 Committee Meeting

- Highlight promising practices for state intervention; insights from state practices, research, and Public

2. November 17 Committee Meeting

- Recommendations for Turnaround Academy model refinement
- Recommendations on immediate SBOE decisions on turnaround academies

3. December 3 SBOE Meeting

- Present final analysis and recommendations to SBOE

Scope of Public Impact Recommendations

Focus	Scope of Recommendations
Refinements to SBOE intervention model under P.L. 221	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Key challenges and successes of current SBOE intervention model• Lessons learned from other states• Range of options that SBOE should consider for adapting state intervention model
Transition strategy for existing Turnaround Academies	<p>Analyze pros and cons of transition strategy options, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Extend current contract• Convert to a charter school• Return school to school corporation governance/management• Implement a new state intervention model



Agenda

- Key Findings from Interviews and Performance Analysis
- Priority Recommendations
- School-Level Recommendations



Key Findings

1. Many of the turnaround academies serve a markedly different student population than the schools served before state intervention.
2. Performance has been uneven with modest gains on some indicators, but only based on two years of data
3. Due to level of student enrollment change and TSO-school corporation transition challenges, data should be viewed as descriptive, not evaluative



Key Findings (cont)

4. Evidence suggests that state intervention has motivated some school corporations to implement new, bolder reform plans.
5. Interviewees largely agreed on the importance of a number of key factors



Agenda

- Findings from Interviews and Performance Analysis

- Priority Recommendations

- School-Level Recommendations



Eight Priority Recommendations for Model Refinement

1. Articulate a clear set of transition options and criteria for current and future turnaround academies
2. Increase state capacity to manage the scope of state directed-turnaround interventions
3. Establish avenues for local, community-based councils to be informed of and involved in for the change process
4. Build a deeper bench of partner organizations and education talent

Eight Priority Recommendations

(continued)

5. Formalize the Transformation Zone model for state intervention
6. Re-purpose the “Lead Partner” model as an opportunity to pre-empt state intervention
7. More clearly define roles and responsibilities within MOUs and contracts
8. Reset performance goals for all turnaround academies to inform transition options.



1. Transition Options and Criteria

Problem: Law does not specify criteria for choosing among transition options or how the SBOE could proceed in implementing them

Recommendation: Articulate a clear set of transition options and criteria for current and future turnaround academies

1. Transition Options and Criteria

Key Elements

		School Demonstrates Success	
		Yes	No
School Corporation Demonstrates Capacity	YES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transition school back to the school corporation • Convert to charter school <i>(if supported by school staff and local community)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transition school back to the school corporation • Close or consolidate school*
	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convert to charter school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remain under state intervention <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Select new provider, or ○ Implement Transformation Zone, or ○ Other model TBD • Close or consolidate school*

* Decision should happen in conjunction with school corporation and school community. Facility would return to the school corporation.



2. Increasing state capacity

Problem: P.L. 211 requires the state to assume new roles and responsibilities to support failing schools, but has not yet created an infrastructure to support that work

Recommendation: Increase state capacity to manage scope of state-directed turnaround interventions



2. Increase state capacity

Key Elements

1. Increase the level of resources dedicated to execute key responsibilities of the state intervention process, including:
 - Cultivating supply of high-quality partner organizations
 - Managing MOUs with school corps. and partner orgzs.
 - Setting and monitoring rigorous performance goals
 - Engaging local communities
 - Proactively communicating with stakeholders
 - Managing the transition process as schools move in and out of state intervention status



2. Increase state capacity

Key Elements

2. Establish an organizational and governance model that provides sufficient authority to manage the process, and clear accountability to the SBOE for implementing policies
 - Independent state turnaround unit
 - State takeover district (LEA)

2. Increasing state capacity

Key Elements (con.)

3. Grant the state the authority to take over failing school corporations

– Use as option of last resort, if:

- High percentage of schools in school corp. subject to individual takeover
- State determines that tools for individual school turnaround are not best approach

– Avoid implementing “triggers” that require the state to intervene and overextend itself



3. Avenues for Community Involvement

Problem: Current process for determining state intervention did not include meaningful or intentional community engagement

Recommendation: State should take a lead role to ensure that local, community-based advisory councils are actively involved in the turnaround process

3. Avenues for community involvement

Key Elements

State role might include:

- Establishing local councils with clearly defined roles and responsibilities that include input on the intervention to be implemented, ongoing monitoring and accountability, and transition decisions
- Assign dedicated, state-level community engagement coordinators to work with turnaround academy school communities



4. Building a Bench

Problem: Current intervention models hinge on the availability of a ready supply of high-quality partners and education talent, but in practice, they are lacking

Recommendation: Build a deeper bench of partner organizations and education talent to support turnaround efforts

4. Building a Bench

Key Elements – Partner Organization

Actively recruit external partners with a proven track record of success:

- Incubate local, high-performing charter schools and school leaders
- Ensure that partner organizations have the autonomy they need to implement their turnaround plan
- Ensure that the schools in which partner organizations operate receive adequate resources
- Offer successful partner organizations the opportunity and incentives to continue their work in the state beyond their contract (e.g. access to unused or under-utilized facilities in which to operate a new charter)

4. Building a Bench

Key Elements – Talent Pipeline

Actively build a pipeline of effective teachers and leaders by:

- Aligning incentives for university partners and teacher prep programs to train teachers and leaders to succeed in a turnaround setting
- Partnering with existing talent organizations
- Encouraging use of staffing models that expand impact of high-quality leaders to more schools and high-quality teachers to more students
- Provide financial incentives for talented educators to teach and lead in turnaround schools



5. Formalizing Transformation Zone

Problem: Transformation Zone model is currently being used as state intervention model, but key aspects have not been formalized

Recommendation: Formalize Transformation Zone model as a state intervention model

5. Formalizing Transformation Zone

Key Elements

- School corp. must submit a bold plan for improving student performance within 3 years
- The state works with school corp. to revise plan
- State approves the plan
- The state enters into an MOU with school corp. clearly defining operating expectations and performance benchmarks
- *(If school corporation identifies an external partner)* State contracts with the external partner as a transformation partner

6. Re-purposing Lead Partner Model

Problem: The original Lead Partner model offered partner organizations limited authority that inhibited their ability to be effective

Recommendation: Cease using the Lead Partner model as a state intervention and re-purpose it as an opportunity for school corporations to pursue dramatic change and potentially avoid state intervention

6. Re-purposing Lead Partner Model

Key Elements

- Encourage school corps. to *voluntarily* identify and work with a lead partner to develop and implement a bold plan for school turnaround before becoming eligible for state takeover
- Threat of state takeover offers an incentive for school corps. to implement more meaningful and bolder reform
- State to provide technical assistance and set conditions and accountability for the relationship through an MOU with the school corporation



7. Roles and Responsibilities

Problem: Existing MOUs largely fail to clarify key roles and responsibilities

Recommendation: More clearly define roles and responsibilities of state, school corporation, and partners with an MOU that includes all three parties, and all partner contracts

7. Roles and Responsibilities

Key Elements

At a minimum, the MOU should clarify the following:

- **Operations:** What operational support will the district and state continue to provide and at what cost?
- **Student enrollment and transition:** What are the parameters for student recruitment, enrollment, and records transfer that will guide school corporation and partner actions?
- **Finances:** What funds will the school operator receive over the course of turnaround contract, and what terms will dictate the ongoing services provided by school corporations?

7. Roles and Responsibilities

Key Elements (con.)

- **Materials and equipment:** Who “owns” the materials within the building?
- **Community engagement:** How will school, district, and state leaders coordinate communication and engagement with local communities?
- **Autonomy:** Which autonomies will the school and / or external partner have?
- **Conflict resolution:** If any of the parties involved does not abide by the MOU, how will the conflict be resolved?
- **Lines of authority:** To whom and how must external partners and the school corp. report?

8. Performance Goals

Problem: Performance goals and benchmarks in partner contracts fall short in key ways, including:

- Not adjusted to reflect dramatic changes in student enrollment
- Lack clear link between performance and transition options
- Inconsistent scope across partner contracts

Recommendation: Reset performance goals for present and future turnaround academies to inform transition options

8. Performance Goals

Key Elements

Partner goals should meet at least two criteria:

1. Reflect the school's current status and priorities as identified through a comprehensive needs assessment
2. Reflect the entirety of goals for the turnaround
For example:
 - Student academic growth and achievement
 - School culture and climate
 - Student retention and enrollment
 - Special education services
 - Student discipline
 - Financial and organizational sustainability

8. Performance Goals

Key Elements (con.)

In addition, the state should set goals to signal a school corporation's capacity to receive a school back from state intervention:

- Significant improvement in its other priority and focus schools (from P.L. 221)
- Appropriate district-level changes in staffing and structure to support low-performing schools (from P.L. 221)
- Examples of the school corporation providing school leaders autonomy to operate differently
- Evidence of an ongoing dialogue and cooperation between the external partner and the school corporation to facilitate a smooth transition



Agenda

- Findings from Interviews and Performance Analysis
- Priority Recommendations
- School-Level Recommendations



State Intervention Models

Lead Partner

- The state contracts with an external partner to work with the school corporation in a limited capacity to operate the school together
- The school corporation employs staff
- Recommend eliminating as an option for state-assigned intervention beyond 2014-15



State Intervention Models

Turnaround School Operator

- The state contracts with an external partner to operate the school independently, similar to a charter school
- The school corporation continues to provide limited operational services
- The TSO employs staff

State Intervention Models

Transformation Zone

- The school corporation develops a bold plan for turning around its failing school(s)
- The state and school corporation enter into an MOU outlining the roles and responsibilities of each to implement the plan
- The school corporation may choose to engage an external partner, in which case the partner contracts with the state and employs staff
- If there is no external partner, the school corporation employs staff

Emma Donnan, Emmerich Manual, & Carr Howe (IPS)

- **Decision Point:** CSUSA (the TSO) has asked for a five-year extension on its current contract
- **Recommendation:**
 - Extend current contract by two years (June 2018)
 - Set clear and explicit performance benchmarks in new contract
 - Establish an MOU between the state and IPS
 - Clear expectations for IPS's continued role and responsibilities at schools
 - Clear benchmarks by which to assess IPS's capacity

Emma Donnan & Emmerich Manual, (IPS)

- **Decision Point:** CSUSA has requested to expand Emma Donnan – a 7/8 middle school –to serve grades K-8 to create a K-12 pipeline and improve operating efficiency
- **Recommendation:**
 - State does not have legal authority to grant this request
 - State to mediate decision with IPS, CSUSA, and the school communities to transfer Emma Donnan students to Emmerich Manual
 - Return Emma Donnan facility to IPS



Emma Donnan

- **Decision Point:** If Emma Donnan does not expand to serve K-8, CSUSA has requested the ability to place a K-6 charter in the facility
- **Recommendation:**
 - State does not have legal authority to grant this request, and CSUSA has not been hired by a non-profit with a charter from an Indiana authorizer to operate a charter school
 - No decision required – outside of SBOE discretion

Arlington (IPS)

- **Decision point:** Arlington requires a new , sustainable intervention plan because Ed Power is withdrawing as TSO at end of school year
- **Recommendation:**
 - Incorporate Arlington into a new IPS Transformation Zone under SBOE oversight
 - IPS will assume direct management of the school
 - The Mayor’s Office could potentially oversee the transition



Arlington

Transformation Zone

- IPS must submit a bold plan for improving student performance within 3 years
- The state approves the plan
- The state enters into an MOU with IPS clearly defining operating expectations and performance benchmarks
- The state extends school intervention status for three years (June 2018)
- If IPS identifies an external partner, the state contracts with partner as Turnaround Operator



Broad Ripple, Marshall, Washington (IPS)

- **Decision point:** These schools require a new intervention plan because external partner withdrew
- **Recommendation:**
 - Incorporate schools into a new IPS Transformation Zone under SBOE oversight
 - IPS will assume direct management of the school
 - The Mayor's Office could potentially oversee the transition

Glenwood (EVSC)

- **Decision point:** EVSC's Transformation Zone has not been formalized as the state intervention at Glenwood
- **Recommendation:** Formalize the Transformation Zone as an approved state intervention model
 - Enter into MOU with EVSC
 - Enter into a formal contract with Mass Insight as Turnaround Operator

Lincoln (EVSC)

- **Decision point:** Lincoln is newly eligible for state intervention and requires a model
- **Recommendation:**
 - Identify inclusion in EVSC's Transformation Zone as the state intervention model at Lincoln
 - Enter into an MOU with EVSC to guide EVSC's work at Lincoln
 - Enter into a formal contract with Mass Insight as Turnaround Operator



Roosevelt

- **Decision point:** Current contract lacks clear and explicit performance benchmarks
- **Recommendation:**
 - Re-negotiate contract to set clear and explicit benchmarks
 - Establish an MOU between the state and GCSC
 - Clear expectations for GCSC's continued role and responsibilities at schools
 - Clear benchmarks by which to assess GCSC's capacity

Roosevelt (continued)

- Based on needs assessment of GCSC and evaluation of provider options for Dunbar-Polaski, consider:
 - Extending Edison’s contract by two years (June 2018)
 - Mediating a decision with GCSC, Edison, and the school communities to transfer Dunbar-Polaski students to Roosevelt to improve operating conditions



Dunbar-Pulaski (GCSC)

- **Decision point:** Dunbar-Pulaski is newly eligible for state intervention
- **Recommendation:**
 - Conduct a needs assessment of GCSC and evaluate state intervention options and potential partners by February 2015
 - Convene local community council to inform next steps with GCSC
 - Postpone decision until the above is complete



Structure of State Turnaround Unit

Key Elements

- **Decision point:** Establish a state organizational and governance model that provides sufficient authority, capacity, and accountability to implement SBOE policies
- **Recommendation**
 - Independent state turnaround unit, OR
 - State takeover district (LEA)

2. Increasing state capacity

Key Elements (con.)

Characteristic	Ind. State Turnaround Unit	State Takeover District
LEA for Turnaround Academies	School or operator	Takeover district
Funding flow	Direct to schools	Through takeover district
Chartering authority	No	Yes
Ability to direct-run schools	No	Yes
Directly accountable to SBOE	Yes	Yes (like all LEAs)
Ability to manage state and federal funds	Yes	Yes
Additional funds to build talent bench	Yes	Yes
Authority to take over failing school corp <i>(if corresponding legislation passes)</i>	Yes	Yes

2. Increasing state capacity

Key Elements (con.)

Characteristic	Indiana State Turnaround Unit	State Takeover District
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct accountability to the SBOE • Governance / operational policies can be tailored to specific needs • Flexible solution, with option to become takeover district/LEA in the future 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Autonomy from state policies, (e.g. staffing, decision making) • Reporting / accountability structure can be based on existing LEA model • Direct charter authorizing authority
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit staffing subject to existing state policies and restrictions • No direct charter authorizing authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA designation may not always fit with role of a state-wide turnaround authority • Requires appointment of separate governing board, adding layer between SBOE and turnaround operators