



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

TO: STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
FROM: COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL TURNAROUNDS
DATE: DECEMBER 3, 2014
SUBJECT: COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SBOE – ACTION ITEM

Actions and Policies to Refine the SBOE School Intervention Model

It is instructive to remember the historical context in which Indiana's school turnaround decisions have been made, as well as the guiding principles articulated by the SBOE when making intervention decisions. First, the SBOE has stated that the focus of the state, district and communities impacted by these decisions must be upon what is best for the students who are enrolled in a chronically underperforming school. Second, the SBOE supports the principle of subsidiarity, which means that – whenever possible – actions should be taken at the local level if the capacity and willingness to act is evident. Third, when years of unsuccessful attempts and the investment of millions of dollars have not resulted in significant and sustained improvements for the schools in question, the state is legally charged with direct intervention. It is in the best interest of students to ensure that, whatever intervention is selected, that intervention is supported by the state and community to allow the maximum chance for success.

It is evident from the Turnaround Committee's work that the SBOE model for state intervention can be strengthened to better support successful outcomes for students, schools and communities.

In order to implement Public Impact's recommendations, the SBOE Committee on School Turnarounds has identified a range of new legislation, management practices, investments, and advocacy efforts. These actions provide a roadmap for SBOE policy reforms that will improve the state intervention model, and are recommended by the Committee for the SBOE's approval on December 3, 2014.

Topic Area	SBOE Actions	Action Type
HUMAN CAPITAL / TALENT	• Seek support from the Indiana Commission for Higher Education to emphasize turnaround skills development in teacher preparation programs	Advocacy
	• Recommend creation of turnaround talent acquisition and retention fund to be administered by	Investment /

Topic Area	SBOE Actions	Action Type
	SBOE	Legislation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish partnerships with existing talent development organizations (e.g., TFA, The Mind Trust) to increase supply of talented educators for turnaround schools 	Practice
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and disseminate innovate staffing models to guide turnaround efforts, and potentially use new funding to encourage a shift to these new models 	Practice / Investment
SBOE TURNAROUND UNIT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish the SBOE Turnaround Unit to manage state intervention activities with direct reporting accountability to the SBOE 	Practice / Investment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SBOE Turnaround Unit to establish avenues for local, community-based councils to be informed of and involved in the change process at turnaround academies 	Practice
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct the SBOE Turnaround Unit to establish MOUs or contracts between the SBOE and school corporations and/or external partners that clarify operating conditions and stakeholder responsibilities, including issues related to feeder patterns and student recruitment, enrollment, and records transfer. These could include three-way MOUs or contracts between SBOE, school corporations, and external partners. 	Practice
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify statute to ensure that the SBOE and the Turnaround Unit have access to all financial resources and data necessary to conduct this work effectively 	Legislation
FACILITIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require districts with turnaround schools under SBOE oversight to conduct a district-wide assessment of facilities utilization and prepare a facilities master plan to (1) ensure optimal use of facilities and (2) identify which schools should be closed, repurposed, or renovated. 	Practice
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend creation of school turnaround facilities fund (revolving loan fund) to be administered by the SBOE Turnaround Unit 	Investment / Legislation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SBOE to recommend eliminating IC 20-31-9.5-2(a), which directs a TSO to occupy a facility and the school corporation to provide transportation and maintain the facility. In its place, the SBOE would acquire the statutory authority to transfer funding for facilities maintenance and transportation pursuant to an agreement between the SBOE, school corporation, and TSO on how best to provide these services. This would likely vary across each location and in relation to unique circumstances, and providing the SBOE with flexibility to select the best solution to serve students well is optimal. 	Legislation

Topic Area	SBOE Actions	Action Type
FUNDING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend creation of state turnaround fund to supplement SIG 1003 dollars and provide adequate, predictable, and tapered funding levels for TSOs and Transformation Zone partners during the five year turnaround intervention period 	Investment / Legislation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transfer administration of SIG 1003 to the SBOE Turnaround Unit. 	Legislation/ Practice
FLEXIBILITY FOR SCHOOL CORPORATIONS AND EXTERNAL PARTNERS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish the Transformation Zone as an approved turnaround strategy. • No longer use the Lead Partner model as a state intervention. Instead, re-purpose it as an opportunity for school corporations to voluntarily pursue dramatic change earlier on – for example, after 2 years as an “F” – that can potentially allow the school corporation to avoid state intervention. • Modify existing statute to increase flexibility for both TSOs and school corporations to implement a systemic approach to turnaround academy operations, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Grant school corporations that create a Transformation Zone under SBOE authority staffing and scheduling flexibility ○ Allow TSOs (with SBOE approval) to enroll students in lower grades to ensure earlier interventions are occurring ○ Allow charter schools operated by the TSO to be co-located within the turnaround facility (with SBOE approval) ○ Expand scope of HEA 1321 to apply to every district in the state with one or more school under state intervention, and allow SBOE authority to oversee application of HEA 1321 as a turnaround strategy ○ Grant SBOE authority to assume management oversight of a failing school corporation as a last resort • Modify existing statute to facilitate options for earlier state intervention and support by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Expanding SBOE’s ability to implement turnaround strategies for schools that are both a D and an F; allows greater flexibility for the SBOE to support a school corporation’s implementation of a systemic approach to turnaround but does not require the SBOE to proceed with formal state intervention ○ Move up the timeline from 6 years as an F to 4 years as an F. The 6-year timeline in practical terms results in a solution being implemented only in Year 8 or 9, given the need to identify a turnaround solution and the time involved to begin implementation. 	Legislation

Topic Area	SBOE Actions	Action Type
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilize existing statutory authority to allow students from more than one school to be served in the same facility 	Practice
PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Articulate a clear set of transition options and criteria for current and future turnaround academies The SBOE should take action now to reset performance goals and targets for current TSO contracts and to guide its future evaluation of and response to TSO performance. 	Practice

SBOE Turnaround Academy Decision Points

Additionally, the Committee recommends the following next steps to address the CSUSA petition for relief, the Arlington transition, the recommended modifications to the GCSC/Edison contract for Roosevelt, and the new required SBOE interventions at Lincoln School (EVSC) and Dunbar-Pulaski (GCSC).

School(s)	Decision Point	Recommendation	Rationale
Emma Donnan Emmerich Manual Carr Howe (IPS)	CSUSA (the TSO) has asked for a five-year extension on its current contract	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend current contract by two years (through June 2018) Ensure that new contract sets clear and explicit performance benchmarks to inform later transition options, which could include either a return to IPS or operation as a charter school. Establish a three-way MOU between SBOE, IPS and CSUSA that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sets clear expectations regarding IPS's continued role at these school, including: facilities maintenance, student enrollment / feeder patterns, district resources to which the school is entitled (e.g., coaches) Includes benchmarks by which to assess IPS's capacity to sustain turnaround efforts if the school returns to the school corporation in the future 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although there have been some indicators of improvement, two schools continue to earn Fs in the state's accountability system A number of transitional and operational challenges have stalled the turnaround effort, making more time a reasonable request Extending CSUSA's contract through 2018 will provide three more years of performance data aligned with clear performance goals and more stable operating conditions to evaluate success and inform transition decisions The ultimate goal is for a successful outcome for students to occur and to be sustained

School(s)	Decision Point	Recommendation	Rationale
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Includes benchmarks by which to assess granting the schools charter school status if IPS does not meet performance criteria 	
Emma Donnan Emmerich Manual (IPS)	CSUSA (the TSO) has requested to expand Emma Donnan to serve grades K-8 (v. 7-8) to support financial sustainability and create a K-12 feeder pattern in the CSUSA schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SBOE does not have statutory authority to allow turnaround academies to expand and serve additional grades ● Therefore, to address financial sustainability concerns, SBOE should mediate decision with IPS, CSUSA and the school communities to either (1) transfer Emma Donnan students to Emmerich Manual and return the Emma Donnan facility to IPS, or (2) allow CSUSA to withdraw or modify its petition for relief if an alternate solution is determined ● CSUSA and IPS are preparing a plan to present to the SBOE on December 3rd. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Manual has the capacity to incorporate Emma Donnan students because enrollment at both schools has dropped dramatically since intervention and consolidating the schools improves operational efficiency ● Emma Donnan is one of only two 7/8 middle school in IPS, and does not benefit from a natural feeder pattern ● Current statute does not allow a turnaround academy under state intervention to expand into additional grades ● Additional input from CSUSA, school community and school corporation needed to make final decision
Emma Donnan (IPS)	Alternatively, CSUSA has requested the ability to place a charter K-6 school in the Donnan facility.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No decision required at this time – outside of SBOE authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CSUSA is a for-profit operator, and under state law, it cannot receive a charter. Instead, a non-profit organization must apply for a charter from an Indiana authorizer and select CSUSA as its management company. This has not yet occurred. ● Additionally, even if the above conditions are met, IPS still owns the Emma Donnan facility. It would have to agree to sell or lease it to the non-profit board described above

School(s)	Decision Point	Recommendation	Rationale
Arlington (IPS)	Arlington requires a new intervention plan since Tindley is withdrawing as the TSO at the end of the 2014-15 school year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate Arlington into a new IPS Transformation Zone: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ IPS must submit a bold plan to the SBOE in advance of the February 2015 SBOE meeting for improving student performance at Arlington within 3 years ○ The SBOE either approves the plan or works with IPS to revise it until it meets the state’s standards. A draft plan must be submitted for review to the SBOE for the January 2015 meeting. ○ The SBOE enters into an MOU with IPS that sets clear performance benchmarks and consequences, expectations for operating conditions within the Zone, oversight by the SBOE, student enrollment patterns, and how the state and IPS will work together ○ The state extends school intervention status for three years (through June 2018) ○ If IPS identifies a “Managing Partner”, the SBOE will enter into a three-way contract or MOU with IPS and the partner. • IPS will assume direct management of the school reporting directly to the SBOE. The Mayor’s Office (OEI) has agreed to help oversee the orderly and efficient transition of school management from Tindley back to IPS, including transfer of all school equipment and student records. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Another high-quality TSO is not available to operate Arlington • Several major changes have happened at IPS since the state intervened at Arlington, signaling a new opportunity for dramatic reform, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Leadership changes at the superintendent and board levels ○ Passage of HEA 1321 authorizing IPS to create innovation network schools ○ Corporation grade improved from “F” to “D” under state accountability system • Extending state intervention status for three years with clear performance goals and stable operating conditions provides the time and conditions to evaluate success and inform transition decisions • The Mayor’s Office has provided oversight of turnaround academies within IPS and has experience with charter schools and closure. As a result, it has the best vantage point for facilitating the transition.
Washington Marshall	These schools require a new intervention plan in the absence of a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate the schools into a new IPS Transformation Zone: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ IPS must submit a bold plan to the SBOE in advance of the February 2015 SBOE meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Another high-quality TSO is not available to operate the schools • Several major changes have happened at IPS since the state intervened at Arlington,

School(s)	Decision Point	Recommendation	Rationale
Broad Ripple (IPS)	sustainable external partner	<p>for improving student performance at each of the schools within three years (through the 2017-18 school year)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The SBOE either approves the plan or works with IPS to revise it until it meets the state’s standards. A draft plan must be submitted for review to the SBOE for the January 2015 meeting. ○ The SBOE enters into an MOU with IPS that sets clear performance benchmarks and consequences, expectations for operating conditions within the Zone, oversight by the SBOE, student enrollment patterns, and how the state and IPS will work together ○ Extend school intervention status for three years (through June 2018) ○ If IPS identifies a “Managing Partner”, the SBOE will enter into a three-way contract or MOU with IPS and the partner. 	<p>signaling a new opportunity for dramatic reform, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Leadership changes at the superintendent and board levels ○ Passage of HEA 1321 authorizing IPS to create innovation network schools ○ Corporation grade improved from “F” to “D” under state accountability system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Extending state intervention status for three years with clear performance goals and stable operating conditions provides the time and conditions to evaluate success and inform transition decisions
Glenwood (EVSC)	EVSC’s Transformation Zone has not been formalized as the state intervention at Glenwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Formalize EVSC’s Transformation Zone as the state intervention at Glenwood ● Enter into an MOU with EVSC that sets clear performance benchmarks and consequences, expectations for operating conditions within the Zone, oversight by the SBOE, student enrollment patterns, how EVSC will work with Mass Insight (including autonomies), and how the state and EVSC will work together 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There have been early indicators of success for some schools in the EVSC Transformation Zone, but the lack of measureable academic progress for Glenwood in Year 1 emphasizes importance of clear operating conditions and performance goals in an MOU
Lincoln <i>Pending Turnaround</i>	Lincoln is eligible for state intervention and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identify inclusion in EVSC’s Transformation Zone as the state intervention model at Lincoln <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Enter into an MOU with EVSC that sets clear performance benchmarks and consequences, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There have been early indicators of success for some EVSC Transformation Zone schools

School(s)	Decision Point	Recommendation	Rationale
Academy (EVSC)	requires a model	expectations for operating conditions within the Zone, oversight by the SBOE, student enrollment patterns, how EVSC will work with Mass Insight (including autonomies), and how the state and EVSC will work together	
Roosevelt (GCSC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current contract lacks clear and explicit performance benchmarks • Edison has recently communicated its concerns about the financial sustainability of its efforts in Gary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-negotiate contract to set clear and explicit benchmarks • Establish an MOU between the SBOE and GCSC to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sets clear expectations regarding its continued role at the school, including: facilities maintenance, student enrollment / feeder patterns, district resources to which the school is entitled (e.g., coaches). ○ Includes benchmarks by which to assess GCSC’s capacity to sustain turnaround efforts if the school returns to the school corporation in the future • Based on the analysis of GCSC financial and operating conditions and a decision on Dunbar-Pulaski (below), SBOE to consider recommendations for Roosevelt to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Extend current contract by two years (through June 2018) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New financial concerns have arisen in Gary in recent days, requiring further evaluation of the situation and possible challenges to effective turnaround work • A number of transitional and operational challenges have stalled the turnaround effort, making more time a reasonable request • Extending Edison’s contract through 2018 will provide three more years of performance data aligned with clear performance goals and more stable operating conditions to evaluate success and inform transition decisions. However, any contract extension decision must be informed by a broader assessment of the financial condition of the school corporation. • Edison has recently notified SBOE staff that it has concerns about the financial viability of its model given high facility costs and low student enrollment. Also, potential interruption of student transportation given the GCSC bussing contract issues is of concern.
Dunbar-Pulaski <i>Pending</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dunbar-Pulaski is eligible for state intervention 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct a needs assessment of GCSC and evaluate state intervention options and potential partners as soon as is feasible, and no later than April 2015 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New financial concerns have arisen in Gary in recent days, requiring further evaluation of the situation and possible challenges to

School(s)	Decision Point	Recommendation	Rationale
<i>Turnaround Academy</i> (GCSC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GCSC is undergoing deep financial troubles impacting how the school corporation operates 	<p>unless the SBOE determines more time is required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess GCSC and Edison’s proposed plan, presented to the Committee at the Gary meeting, for Edison Learning to serve as External Partner to GCSC in formulating and implementing district-wide school improvement, including schools under state turnaround Postpone decision until the above is complete 	<p>effective turnaround work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The positive relationship that has been developed between GCSC and Edison could support the effective implementation of a district-wide solution led by the school corporation