

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)

Support to Low Performing Schools

State Board Meeting
April 25, 2017

4.2 Identification of Schools

- **What is required?**
 - Identification and Exit Criteria for
 - Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools (CSI Schools)
 - Targeted Support and Improvement Schools (TSI Schools)
- **What we heard?**
 - Focus on school growth and improvement
 - Identify and address resource inequities
 - Reduce burden of exit by supporting sustainability of activities for schools that exit identification

Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools

Types of Schools	Description	Timeline for Identification	Initial year of Identification
Lowest Performing	Not less than the lowest-performing five percent of schools in the State participating in Title I.	At least once every three years	2018-2019
Low Graduation Rate	All public high school in the State failing to graduate at least 67% of enrolled students.	At least once every three years	2018-2019
Chronically Low-Performing Subgroup	Any Title I school identified for targeted support and improvement and did not improve over a State-determined number of years.	At least once every three years	State-determined
Additional Category	At the discretion of the State, additional statewide categories of schools	At least once every three years	State-determined

Targeted Support and Improvement Schools

Types of Schools	Description	Timeline for Identification	Initial year of Identification
Low-Performing Subgroup	Any school in which one or more subgroups of students is performing at or below the performance of all students in the lowest performing schools. These schools must receive additional targeted support under the law.	At least once every three years	2018-2019
Consistently Underperforming Subgroup	Any school with one or more consistently underperforming subgroups.	Annually	2019-2020

Exit Criteria

- ❑ Eligible for exit after three years.
- ❑ Schools must no longer meet the identification criteria that resulted in identification as CSI or TSI.
- ❑ Schools will be required to develop a sustainability plan.
- ❑ Sustainability plans must be approved by MSDE.

4.3 State Support and Improvement for Low-Performing Schools

- **What is required?**
 - School Improvement Resources
 - Technical Assistance Regarding Evidence-Based Interventions
 - More Rigorous Interventions
 - Periodic Resource Review
- **What we heard?**
 - Extensive feedback pertaining to staffing, leadership, funding and resources, partnerships and parental involvement, educating the whole child, and wrap around services

4.3 State Support and Improvement for Low-Performing Schools

- School Improvement Resources
 - Strategic allocation of funds with rigorous accountability for the use of funds.
 - Formula funding and competitive grants
 - Fiscal monitoring and evaluation
 - Provide incentives to drive change
 - Prioritize awarding of funds based on need and the implementation of evidence-based strategies with strong accountability measures

4.3 State Support and Improvement for Low-Performing Schools

B. Technical Assistance Regarding Evidence-Based Interventions

- MSDE will utilize the four domains for rapid school improvement as a framework to establish a systemic approach to improvement efforts.

Four Domains of Rapid School Improvement



**Turnaround
Leadership**



**Talent
Development**



**Instructional
Transformation**



Culture Shift

Systemic Improvement

Refer to Section 4.3 in the Table

Every Student Succeeds Act – State Examples – Support to Low-Performing Schools



State	4.2 Identification	4.2 Exit Criteria	4.3 School Improvement Resources	4.3 Technical Assistance on Selecting Evidence-Based Interventions	4.3 More Rigorous Interventions	4.3 Periodic Resource Review
Maryland	<p>Comprehensive and Support Improvement (CSI) Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicators in the accountability system will be used to identify CSI schools. CSI schools will include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Lowest Performing:</i> Title I schools that are the 5% of the lowest achieving Title I schools in the state based on both achievement data and lack of progress in the "all students" group; <i>Low Graduation Rate:</i> All public high schools failing to graduate at least 67% of enrolled students based on the four year adjusted cohort graduation rate; <i>Chronically Low-Performing Subgroup:</i> Any Title I school identified for targeted support and improvement that does not improve within three years. <p>Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TSI schools will include low-performing and consistently underperforming subgroups. Subgroups categories include: economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and English learners. The two types of TSI Schools are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Low-Performing Subgroup TSI Schools:</i> Schools with at least one low-performing subgroup of students, performing below the summative performance of all students subgroup 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on accountability system. CSI and TSI schools that no longer meet identification criteria after three years will be eligible to exit. CSI schools that fail to meet exit criteria after three years will be targeted for more rigorous interventions. Schools eligible to exit must develop a sustainability plan. The plan must be approved by MSDE prior to exit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formula funding and competitive grant opportunities will be provided to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to improve lowest performing schools. Awarding of funds will be prioritized based on need and implementation of evidence-based strategies with strong accountability measures. A robust monitoring and evaluation process for the use of funds has been established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A root cause analysis will be conducted by a third party, external to MSDE and the LEA. The purpose of the analysis is to uncover causes for school performance problems. LEAs must demonstrate that they have collaborated with a diverse stakeholder group that includes but is not limited to central office staff, school administration, teachers, parents, business partners, higher education partners and other community partners to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> review the results of the root cause analysis for the school; identify needs based on root cause analysis; and align and prioritize needs based on local school system and state goals. LEAs will be required to develop a plan of action that includes evidence-based interventions to address identified needs and accountability indicators that resulted in the school's designation. LEAs must demonstrate that the action plan was developed by a diverse stakeholder group. Action plans must be approved by MSDE. <p style="text-align: center;"><Continued on Next Page></p>	<p>MSDE will lead a stakeholder group to modify plan of action and revise intervention strategies.</p> <p>Local school superintendents will be required to assign experienced and effective teachers and leaders to schools identified as needing more rigorous interventions.</p> <p>Principals will be required to use MSDE school leadership coaches.</p> <p>Principals, assistant principals, and teacher leaders will be required to participate in MSDE professional learning experiences that are designed to address the needs of low-performing schools. They will be required to implement resources and strategies from professional learning experiences. MSDE will monitor implementation.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><Continued on Next Page></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review of resource allocation and inequities will be a part of the root cause analysis and monitoring process. MSDE will provide guidance and resources focused on addressing resource inequities in a school and/or school system. Local school superintendents will be held accountable for developing and implementing strategies to address resource inequalities in CSI and TSI schools.



Identify and Prioritize Needs

□ Current Practice

- Needs assessment completed by school principal.

□ Revised Practice

- Root cause analysis conducted by external stakeholder.
 - Analysis will include engagement with a broad range of stakeholders (parents, students, community partners, etc.)
- Assess allocation of resources to ascertain and develop strategies to correct inequities.
- Collaboratively prioritize needs and identify high-quality supports that are in alignment with state and school system goals.



Targeted and Differentiated Support

□ Current Practice

- Local school systems assess quality of curriculum and support implementation.
- All school systems receive the same level and type of support from MSDE.

□ Revised Practice

- MSDE vetted curriculum that aligns to standards.
- MSDE supports implementation of curriculum with a high-level of fidelity.
- MSDE provides customized professional learning experiences for school administrators designed to address the unique needs of low-performing schools.



Accountability for Improvement

- Current Practice
 - Document reviews
 - Monitoring visits
- Revised Practice
 - Establish stronger accountability measures.
 - Connect distribution of funds to meeting established benchmarks.
 - Provide purposeful on-site and virtual supports.

4.3 More Rigorous Interventions

Every Student Succeeds Act – State Examples – Support to Low-Performing Schools



State	4.2 Identification	4.2 Exit Criteria	4.3 School Improvement Resources	4.3 Technical Assistance on Selecting Evidence-Based Interventions	4.3 More Rigorous Interventions	4.3 Periodic Resource Review
Maryland	<p>Comprehensive and Support Improvement (CSI) Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicators in the accountability system will be used to identify CSI schools. CSI schools will include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Lowest Performing:</i> Title I schools that are the 5% of the lowest achieving Title I schools in the state based on both achievement data and lack of progress in the "all students" group; <i>Low Graduation Rate:</i> All public high schools failing to graduate at least 67% of enrolled students based on the four year adjusted cohort graduation rate; <i>Chronically Low-Performing Subgroup:</i> Any Title I school identified for targeted support and improvement that does not improve within three years. <p>Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TSI schools will include low-performing and consistently underperforming subgroups. Subgroups categories include: economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and English learners. The two types of TSI Schools are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Low-Performing Subgroup TSI Schools:</i> Schools with at least one low-performing subgroup of students, performing below the summative performance of all students subgroup 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on accountability system. CSI and TSI schools that no longer meet identification criteria after three years will be eligible to exit. CSI schools that fail to meet exit criteria after three years will be targeted for more rigorous interventions. Schools eligible to exit must develop a sustainability plan. The plan must be approved by MSDE prior to exit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formula funding and competitive grant opportunities will be provided to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to improve lowest performing schools. Awarding of funds will be prioritized based on need and implementation of evidence-based strategies with strong accountability measures. A robust monitoring and evaluation process for the use of funds has been established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A root cause analysis will be conducted by a third party, external to MSDE and the LEA. The purpose of the analysis is to uncover causes for school performance problems. LEAs must demonstrate that they have collaborated with a diverse stakeholder group that includes but is not limited to central office staff, school administration, teachers, parents, business partners, higher education partners and other community partners to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> review the results of the root cause analysis for the school; identify needs based on root cause analysis; and align and prioritize needs based on local school system and state goals. LEAs will be required to develop a plan of action that includes evidence-based interventions to address identified needs and accountability indicators that resulted in the school's designation. LEAs must demonstrate that the action plan was developed by a diverse stakeholder group. Action plans must be approved by MSDE. <p style="text-align: center;"><Continued on Next Page></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSDE will lead a stakeholder group to modify plan of action and revise intervention strategies. Local school superintendents will be required to assign experienced and effective teachers and leaders to schools identified as needing more rigorous interventions. Principals will be required to use MSDE school leadership coaches. Principals, assistant principals, and teacher leaders will be required to participate in MSDE professional learning experiences that are designed to address the needs of low-performing schools. They will be required to implement resources and strategies from professional learning experiences. MSDE will monitor implementation. <p style="text-align: center;"><Continued on Next Page></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review of resource allocation and inequities will be a part of the root cause analysis and monitoring process. MSDE will provide guidance and resources focused on addressing resource inequities in a school and/or school system. Local school superintendents will be held accountable for developing and implementing strategies to address resource inequalities in CSI and TSI schools.

4.3 More Rigorous Interventions

- MSDE leads revision of intervention strategies.
- Superintendents required to assign experienced and effective teachers and leaders to CSI schools.
- MSDE leadership coaches assigned to principals.
- Monthly on-site visits.

4.3 Periodic Resource Review

Every Student Succeeds Act – State Examples – Support to Low-Performing Schools



State	4.2 Identification	4.2 Exit Criteria	4.3 School Improvement Resources	4.3 Technical Assistance on Selecting Evidence-Based Interventions	4.3 More Rigorous Intervention	4.3 Periodic Resource Review
Maryland	<p>Comprehensive and Support Improvement (CSI) Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicators in the accountability system will be used to identify CSI schools. CSI schools will include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Lowest Performing:</i> Title I schools that are the 5% of the lowest achieving Title I schools in the state based on both achievement data and lack of progress in the "all students" group; <i>Low Graduation Rate:</i> All public high schools failing to graduate at least 67% of enrolled students based on the four year adjusted cohort graduation rate; <i>Chronically Low-Performing Subgroup:</i> Any Title I school identified for targeted support and improvement that does not improve within three years. <p>Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TSI schools will include low-performing and consistently underperforming subgroups. Subgroups categories include: economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and English learners. The two types of TSI Schools are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Low-Performing Subgroup TSI Schools:</i> Schools with at least one low-performing subgroup of students, performing below the summative performance of all students subgroup 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on accountability system. CSI and TSI schools that no longer meet identification criteria after three years will be eligible to exit. CSI schools that fail to meet exit criteria after three years will be targeted for more rigorous interventions. Schools eligible to exit must develop a sustainability plan. The plan must be approved by MSDE prior to exit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formula funding and competitive grant opportunities will be provided to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to improve lowest performing schools. Awarding of funds will be prioritized based on need and implementation of evidence-based strategies with strong accountability measures. A robust monitoring and evaluation process for the use of funds has been established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A root cause analysis will be conducted by a third party, external to MSDE and the LEA. The purpose of the analysis is to uncover causes for school performance problems. LEAs must demonstrate that they have collaborated with a diverse stakeholder group that includes but is not limited to central office staff, school administration, teachers, parents, business partners, higher education partners and other community partners to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> review the results of the root cause analysis for the school; identify needs based on root cause analysis; and align and prioritize needs based on local school system and state goals. LEAs will be required to develop a plan of action that includes evidence-based interventions to address identified needs and accountability indicators that resulted in the school's designation. LEAs must demonstrate that the action plan was developed by a diverse stakeholder group. Action plans must be approved by MSDE. <p style="text-align: center;"><Continued on Next Page></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSDE will lead a stakeholder group to modify plan of action and revise intervention strategies. Local school superintendents will be required to assign experienced and effective teachers and leaders to schools identified as needing more rigorous interventions. Principals will be required to use MSDE school leadership coaches. Principals, assistant principals, and teacher leaders will be required to participate in MSDE professional learning experiences that are designed to address the needs of low-performing schools. They will be required to implement resources and strategies from professional learning experiences. MSDE will monitor implementation. <p style="text-align: center;"><Continued on Next Page></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review of resource allocation and inequities will be a part of the root cause analysis and monitoring process. MSDE will provide guidance and resources focused on addressing resource inequities in a school and/or school system. Local school superintendents will be held accountable for developing and implementing strategies to address resource inequalities in CSI and TSI schools.

State Examples

Support to Low Performing Schools



Every Student Succeeds Act – State Examples – Support to Low-Performing Schools

State	4.2 Identification	4.2 Exit Criteria	4.3 School Improvement Resources	4.3 Technical Assistance on Selecting Evidence-Based Interventions	4.3 More Rigorous Interventions	4.3 Periodic Resource Review
Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify groups as defined by law Use 3 years of data to identify Using the summative rating, Colorado will annually rank order all schools based on the total percentage of points earned on the accountability system Using a four year graduation rate, but Colorado will utilize the discretion afforded states to add the use of extended year graduation rates in the accountability system Consistently underperforming schools are schools that earn the lowest rating on all indicators for a given student group based on aggregated three year performance, when the student group meets the minimum N for that indicator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on accountability system Schools will remain on the list for three years, regardless of student group performance No longer meet the identification criteria after three years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs-based approach to resource allocation, both fiscal and programmatic Approach is designed to maximize impact on learning, incentivize innovative and bold ideas, create fair and transparent processes, increase efficacy and efficiency, and provide fairness and predictability to LEAs. Consolidate multiple 1003 grant applications into one annual application process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs Analysis Improvement planning processes Performance management tools Community engagement Cycles of improvement State lists of evidence-based interventions, strategies and partnerships Leadership development opportunities with pre-vetted external partners and programs Assistance will increase in intensity and rigor as schools demonstrate a readiness for change and willingness to engage with external partners (including the state as a technical assistance provider) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing management partnerships with external providers Conversion to charter school School closure Increased autonomy through local or state waivers Recommendations by the state's independent State Review Panel and the State Board of Education will be considered when planning for more rigorous interventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual cycles of strategic resource allocation examination Analysis of portfolio of supports and the effectiveness of the supports Particular attention will be paid to geographic representation and to district that have a higher proportion of identified schools Adjustments will be made to address any gaps in resources and supports

Refer to Table for Examples

Every Student Succeeds Act – State Examples – Support to Low-Performing Schools

State	4.2 Identification	4.2 Exit Criteria	4.3 School Improvement Resources	4.3 Technical Assistance on Selecting Evidence-Based Interventions	4.3 More Rigorous Interventions	4.3 Periodic Resource Review
Maryland	<p>Comprehensive and Support Improvement (CSI) Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicators in the accountability system will be used to identify CSI schools. CSI schools will include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Lowest Performing:</i> Title I schools that are the 5% of the lowest achieving Title I schools in the state based on both achievement data and lack of progress in the “all students” group; <i>Low Graduation Rate:</i> All public high schools failing to graduate at least 67% of enrolled students based on the four year adjusted cohort graduation rate; <i>Chronically Low-Performing Subgroup:</i> Any Title I school identified for targeted support and improvement that does not improve within three years. <p>Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TSI schools will include low-performing and consistently underperforming subgroups. Subgroups categories include: economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and English learners. The two types of TSI Schools are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Low-Performing Subgroup TSI Schools:</i> Schools with at least one low-performing subgroup of students, performing below the summative performance of all students subgroup 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on accountability system. CSI and TSI schools that no longer meet identification criteria after three years will be eligible to exit. CSI schools that fail to meet exit criteria after three years will be targeted for more rigorous interventions. Schools eligible to exit must develop a sustainability plan. The plan must be approved by MSDE prior to exit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formula funding and competitive grant opportunities will be provided to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to improve lowest performing schools. Awarding of funds will be prioritized based on need and implementation of evidence-based strategies with strong accountability measures. A robust monitoring and evaluation process for the use of funds has been established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A root cause analysis will be conducted by a third party, external to MSDE and the LEA. The purpose of the analysis is to uncover causes for school performance problems. LEAs must demonstrate that they have collaborated with a diverse stakeholder group that includes but is not limited to central office staff, school administration, teachers, parents, business partners, higher education partners and other community partners to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> review the results of the root cause analysis for the school; identify needs based on root cause analysis; and align and prioritize needs based on local school system and state goals. LEAs will be required to develop a plan of action that includes evidence-based interventions to address identified needs and accountability indicators that resulted in the school’s designation. LEAs must demonstrate that the action plan was developed by a diverse stakeholder group. Action plans must be approved by MSDE. <p style="text-align: center;"><Continued on Next Page></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSDE will lead a stakeholder group to modify plan of action and revise intervention strategies. Local school superintendents will be required to assign experienced and effective teachers and leaders to schools identified as needing more rigorous interventions. Principals will be required to use MSDE school leadership coaches. Principals, assistant principals, and teacher leaders will be required to participate in MSDE professional learning experiences that are designed to address the needs of low-performing schools. They will be required to implement resources and strategies from professional learning experiences. MSDE will monitor implementation. <p style="text-align: center;"><Continued on Next Page></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review of resource allocation and inequities will be a part of the root cause analysis and monitoring process. MSDE will provide guidance and resources focused on addressing resource inequities in a school and/or school system. Local school superintendents will be held accountable for developing and implementing strategies to address resource inequalities in CSI and TSI schools.

Every Student Succeeds Act – State Examples – Support to Low-Performing Schools

State	4.2 Identification	4.2 Exit Criteria	4.3 School Improvement Resources	4.3 Technical Assistance on Selecting Evidence-Based Interventions	4.3 More Rigorous Interventions	4.3 Periodic Resource Review
Maryland	<p>in any of the lowest performing 5% percent of Title I schools.</p> <p>2. <i>Consistently Underperforming Subgroup TSI Schools:</i> Schools with consistently underperforming subgroups, as defined by the State’s accountability system.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSDE will collaborate with the central office staff and school administration in establishing and implementing a monitoring process to ensure selected practices are implemented with fidelity. Identified schools will be required to use MSDE vetted curriculum for English Language Arts and mathematics. MSDE will collaborate with LEAs to ensure that curriculum is implemented with a high level of fidelity. Principals, assistant principals, and teacher leaders from TSI and CSI schools will be required to participate in MSDE professional learning experiences designed to build leadership capacity and address the unique needs of low-performing schools. Professional learning experiences include but are not limited to the Aspiring Leaders Institute and Promising Principals Academy, and Priority Leaders Program. MSDE will develop a resource hub that contains evidence-based interventions, effective practices, research articles, rubrics, templates, planning documents, and other items that support the identification, implementation, and assessment of evidence-based interventions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSDE will provide strategies and implementation guidance to school-based personnel and central office staff on how to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide, monitor, and assess tiered academic support and nonacademic support to students; build teacher and leader capacity; and engage the community in school improvement efforts. LEAs will be required to implement strategies. Implementation of strategies will be monitored by MSDE MSDE will lead a team composed of central office staff, school administration, and other stakeholder groups to conduct monthly on-site school visits to analyze data, conduct learning walks, and participate in formal/informal classroom observations. School administration and central office staff will be required to implement recommendations that are developed as a result of monthly visits. MSDE will conduct quarterly fiscal review sessions. LEAs will be required to make modifications base on outcomes of fiscal review sessions. 	

Every Student Succeeds Act – State Examples – Support to Low-Performing Schools

State	4.2 Identification	4.2 Exit Criteria	4.3 School Improvement Resources	4.3 Technical Assistance on Selecting Evidence-Based Interventions	4.3 More Rigorous Interventions	4.3 Periodic Resource Review
Maryland				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly on-site and virtual visits will be conducted for fiscal monitoring and to review progress towards meeting identified goals. Distribution of funds will be connected to meeting established benchmarks and accountability measures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribution of funds will be connected to meeting established benchmarks and accountability measures. 	

Every Student Succeeds Act – State Examples – Support to Low-Performing Schools

State	4.2 Identification	4.2 Exit Criteria	4.3 School Improvement Resources	4.3 Technical Assistance on Selecting Evidence-Based Interventions	4.3 More Rigorous Interventions	4.3 Periodic Resource Review
Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify groups as defined by law Use 3 years of data to identify Using the summative rating, Colorado will annually rank order all schools based on the total percentage of points earned on the accountability system Using a four year graduation rate, but Colorado will utilize the discretion afforded states to add the use of extended year graduation rates in the accountability system Consistently underperforming schools are schools that earn the lowest rating on all indicators for a given student group based on aggregated three year performance, when the student group meets the minimum N for that indicator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on accountability system Schools will remain on the list for three years, regardless of student group performance No longer meet the identification criteria after three years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs-based approach to resource allocation, both fiscal and programmatic Approach is designed to maximize impact on learning, incentivize innovative and bold ideas, create fair and transparent processes, increase efficacy and efficiency, and provide fairness and predictability to LEAs. Consolidate multiple 1003 grant applications into one annual application process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs Analysis Improvement planning processes Performance management tools Community engagement Cycles of improvement State lists of evidence-based interventions, strategies and partnerships Leadership development opportunities with pre-vetted external partners and programs Assistance will increase in intensity and rigor as schools demonstrate a readiness for change and willingness to engage with external partners (including the state as a technical assistance provider) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing management partnerships with external providers Conversion to charter school School closure Increased autonomy through local or state waivers Recommendations by the state’s independent State Review Panel and the State Board of Education will be considered when planning for more rigorous interventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual cycles of strategic resource allocation examination Analysis of portfolio of supports and the effectiveness of the supports Particular attention will be paid to geographic representation and to district that have a higher proportion of identified schools Adjustments will be made to address any gaps in resources and supports

Every Student Succeeds Act – State Examples – Support to Low-Performing Schools

State	4.2 Identification	4.2 Exit Criteria	4.3 School Improvement Resources	4.3 Technical Assistance on Selecting Evidence-Based Interventions	4.3 More Rigorous Interventions	4.3 Periodic Resource Review
Delaware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identified groups as defined by law Identification based on an index across indicators of the accountability framework, a summative determination Will identify every three years Stakeholder feedback indicated that all schools in the lowest five percent should be considered for CSI, not just Title I schools Definition and methodology for identifying “consistently underperforming” is to be determined, but will be based on the accountability system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exit criteria based on identification criteria Have up to four years to exit Required to meet targets for two years Schools should develop a sustainability plan Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) will negotiate exit targets with LEAs based on the data from 2016-2017 school year. Targets set will be relevant and appropriate to the needs of the individual school communities and reasonable to the extent that the school will not be immediately reidentified in the next identification cycle 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using a consolidated grant application process Monitoring of implementation and expenditures during monthly check-ins Hybrid grant process, formula based allocation with optional competitive funds available Formula-based amount is based on student enrollment Do not anticipate “significant” funds for TSI schools, but will provide technical assistance to support LEAs 	<p>Provide support and assistance to LEAs in the form of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-site technical assistance, off-site networking sessions, embedded professional development, virtual learning experiences, guidance documents Planning tools and templates Sample needs assessment tools Root cause analysis Fiscal and plan monitoring Evidence-based resources/strategies Assistance in plan development and grant application Deploying DDOE experts for ongoing support Develop a resource hub with regionally implemented evidence-based strategies Individualization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify an external partner to conduct qualitative needs assessments at both the school and district levels The DDOE will work collaboratively with the LEA/school to provide support in the development of an appropriate and actionable improvement plan Revised plans will include a DDOE-determined intervention Root cause analysis to diagnose reasons for not exiting DDOE will review fidelity of implementation of original plan Identify and address resource inequities Enhance onsite technical assistance More intensive oversight Leadership capacity review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the beginning of each four-year improvement cycle, those LEAs determined to have a significant number of schools identified for school improvement will work to identify any resource inequities Staff members across DDOE branches and workgroups will work in collaboration with the LEAs to assess resource inequities and provide support for improvement plan development and implementation

Every Student Succeeds Act – State Examples – Support to Low-Performing Schools

State	4.2 Identification	4.2 Exit Criteria	4.3 School Improvement Resources	4.3 Technical Assistance on Selecting Evidence-Based Interventions	4.3 More Rigorous Interventions	4.3 Periodic Resource Review
Illinois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identified groups as defined by law Identification and notification will occur on a three-year cycle <p>Consistently underperforming:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any school that has failed to meet the 95 percent assessment threshold for all students or for one or more student demographic groups for the past three consecutive years will be identified and notified of their eligibility Any school for which the former English learners or the students formerly with disabilities subgroups' performance is as low as the "all students" group in any identified school will also be identified for comprehensive supports and improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No longer identified Established a growth trajectory for students Strong plan for sustainability that articulates a clear rationale for what it proposes to sustain and how the school will maintain a strong rate of growth while addressing reduced services, supports, and/or funding Schools have one optional planning year and up to three years of full implementation before being expected to meet exit criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will develop a formula for allotment of funds and services Will use funds for a review and approval process for external providers that will become part of the IL-EMPOWER network. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CSI Schools are required to partner with IL-EMPOWER, a framework for continuous improvement that is systemic, prevention-focused, and data-informed in order to build LEA talent and capacity IL-EMPOWER will provide comprehensive, differentiated and elective supports and services to eligible schools to ensure the effective implementation of evidence-based interventions Illinois recognizes three "foundational drivers of improvement," which are organizational, leadership, and capacity building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools that are subject to more rigorous intervention will be required to partner with an IL-EMPOWER approved partner Schools that do not exit will be supported in selecting contextually appropriate, evidence-based practices that have more rigorous levels of evidence supporting their effectiveness LEA will be supported in establishing a strong program monitoring system to ensure selected practices are implemented with high levels of fidelity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Every three years, Illinois will review state, federal, and other programmatic resource allocations for each LEA serving one or more schools Outcomes will be used to drive equity plan

Every Student Succeeds Act – State Examples – Support to Low-Performing Schools

State	4.2 Identification	4.2 Exit Criteria	4.3 School Improvement Resources	4.3 Technical Assistance on Selecting Evidence-Based Interventions	4.3 More Rigorous Interventions	4.3 Periodic Resource Review
Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any school rated ‘D’ or ‘F’ for three consecutive years will be classified CSI Schools will be added to the list on an annual basis Any school that has been in the bottom 30 percent of all schools for one or more major subgroup for three consecutive years, but is not already identified for comprehensive support, qualifies for targeted support Schools exhibiting excessive out of school discipline and/or chronic absenteeism within certain subgroups will be considered for CSI or TSI three or more years of low performance are required for identification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A school will have to achieve a C-rating for two consecutive years in order to exit CSI status To exit TSI status, schools must not have any subgroup scores in the bottom 30 percent of all schools for two consecutive years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEA plans will be submitted to the Department for review and successful plans will be funded through a competitive process Each LEA with CSI schools will submit one plan describing the goals, strategies and monitoring processes it will use to address the challenges at all of its identified schools Each identified school will have a point of contact at the SEA. The SEA point of contact will manage a portfolio of LEAS to monitor for effectiveness of implementation, including onsite visits, ongoing reports from the school and the LEA, and monitor improvement of students at each school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The state and the school system will develop a joint support plan in order to support the improvement of CSI and TSI schools The SEA will support school leaders in building a plan for improvement based on unique needs Support could include, but is not limited to, completing a comprehensive needs assessment, advising on system-wide resource allocation, identifying effective support partners, and building a plan for system-wide management of the improvement plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If, after four years, the school does not improve its “F” rating, the school will be eligible for inclusion in the Recovery School District The Recovery School District may run the school or identify a new operator for the school, subject to the approval of the state board 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviews will be conducted to examine equitable per pupil expenditures, distribution of staff, access to high quality prekindergarten, enriching experiences, and rigorous coursework The SEA will address any identified inequities in resources that are having a negative impact on schools and students The SEA annually publishes school-level information on per-pupil expenditures, a breakdown of expenditures by category and average staff salaries

Every Student Succeeds Act – State Examples – Support to Low-Performing Schools

State	4.2 Identification	4.2 Exit Criteria	4.3 School Improvement Resources	4.3 Technical Assistance on Selecting Evidence-Based Interventions	4.3 More Rigorous Interventions	4.3 Periodic Resource Review
Massachusetts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identified groups as defined by law Will use two years of assessment results and one year of graduation data for initial identification Massachusetts will identify the definition for consistently underperforming subgroups prior to the fall of 2018 TSI schools with low performing subgroup will be identified if the school has a subgroup that is in the lowest performing 10% of all eligible subgroups and the school has not already been identified for comprehensive support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Massachusetts will identify exit criteria prior to the first identification in 2018 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Competitive funding process If adequate school improvement funding is not available to sufficiently support all schools eligible for funding, Massachusetts will establish prioritization criteria for school improvement grant funds Massachusetts will structure the competitive school improvement grant process around critical elements of its former SIG competitive process If adequate funding is available, Massachusetts will open eligibility for school improvement funds to targeted support and intervention schools, and/or allocate school improvement grant funds according to a formula 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School turnaround practices highlighted Direct expert assistance and accountability from State staff and turnaround partners to support schools Identified schools will receive preferred access to professional development The direct targeted assistance for school turnaround is overseen through the Statewide System of Support in the District Support Center. “Commissioner’s Districts” provides additional support to ten largest, highest poverty districts Priority Partner Initiative is a state-level vetting of vendors for evidence-based practices Technical assistance provided through Regional District and School Assistance Centers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full state take-over through receivership Vetted educational management organizations to fully manage a school on behalf of districts or the department Support to districts in establishing alternative governance structures for specific schools or clusters of schools The department engages in active pursuit of educational management organizations In each instance of a persistently low-performing school or district, Massachusetts uses the approach that best meets their context and unique needs The department also supports districts in establishing alternative governance structures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No information Draft plan indicates section will be completed prior to plan submission

Every Student Succeeds Act – State Examples – Support to Low-Performing Schools

State	4.2 Identification	4.2 Exit Criteria	4.3 School Improvement Resources	4.3 Technical Assistance on Selecting Evidence-Based Interventions	4.3 More Rigorous Interventions	4.3 Periodic Resource Review
New Jersey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identified groups as defined by law Title I schools with at or below the fifth percentile in overall performance, based on all applicable indicators and in accordance with the weighting system CSI Schools are identified every three years Consistently underperforming TSI – identification criteria is differentiated for non-high schools and high schools NJDOE will conduct longitudinal analyses of student performance data to identify schools with consistently underperforming student subgroups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No longer meets identification criteria Successfully implemented its approved plan CSI and low-performing subgroup TSI schools have the opportunity to exit every three years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources allocated via formula and/or competitive grants Resources allocation include possibility of a limited competitive grant based on priority areas of need 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State System of Differentiated Support and Improvement Focus on the LEA as the “unit of change”, including coordinated support mechanisms and improvement planning protocol Evidence-based interventions will be matched to the specific accountability indicators that resulted in the school’s designation Performance data will be used to determine if the right interventions were selected and implemented 3- tiered levels of support based on need (universal, targeted and intensive) with an emphasis on building LEA capacity Explanations of tiered supports provided in draft plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools that fail to make progress within two years of designation will be provided with more rigorous interventions Current state regulations empower the Commissioner to appoint one or more qualified external providers for schools that fail to demonstrate progress despite multiple years of intervention The provider is accountable to NJDOE, as well as the district board of education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NJDOE will conduct annual resource reviews both internally and for LEAs with a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement The LEA reviews will include an examination of all federal, state and local funding sources The distribution of school improvement funds may be weighted to provide greater financial support to LEAs with the highest-need. The comparability reports generated by NJDOE will be examined closely to discern areas of inequity so additional funding can be allocated

Every Student Succeeds Act – State Examples – Support to Low-Performing Schools

State	4.2 Identification	4.2 Exit Criteria	4.3 School Improvement Resources	4.3 Technical Assistance on Selecting Evidence-Based Interventions	4.3 More Rigorous Interventions	4.3 Periodic Resource Review
Ohio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identified groups as defined by law CSI Schools will be identified every three years Lowest five percent based on the overall summative report card grade Proposes publishing a watch list of school approaching identification <p>Additional Criteria for identifying TSI Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools that earn a grade of a D or F for Gap Closing report card component for two consecutive years Schools that do not meet multiple student subgroup performance benchmarks Schools identified for the first time as having one or more student subgroups performing at a level similar to the lowest 5% of schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools meeting exit criteria will be removed from lists annually The exit criteria will be based on revised report card measures and the revised gap closing measure which includes achievement, progress, and graduation rate data of all required subgroups Schools must meet exit criteria for two consecutive years. Schools have up to four years to exit Planning to provide rewards and recognition for schools that show improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Competitive grant process May include incentives for a menu of options, such as random control trials and evidence-based research An additional incentive available to support a resource coordinator for student and family services Redesigned online planning tool/consolidated grants application, known as the Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP) Differentiated performance monitoring based on district continuum of support identification level Online collection of performance-monitoring data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ohio will offer a district continuum of support and promote local control for school improvement planning Ohio utilizes the Ohio Improvement Process and regional system for technical assistance. Stakeholders asked for more local control in decision Stakeholders emphasized the need for a focus on addressing the needs of students, families, and communities Ohio will create an online evidence-based clearinghouse, providing a broad menu of provide strategies and programs. Ohio will create at Peer-to-Peer Improvement Network 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools that do not make “significant progress” are subject to in-depth resource allocation reviews, use of SEA-approved evidence-based strategies, and required direct student services May receive direct support from the Educational Service Center These districts will also participate in a comprehensive district review, identifying areas of strengths and areas needing improvement, to align evidence-based practices Districts that have multiple years of poor performance may be subject to an Academic Distress Commission Community Schools may be subject to school closure requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ohio will develop a review process for resource allocation, analyze data to create ranges of acceptable allocations, and use this information to inform needs assessments, improvement planning, funding allocations, models of funding, and expenditure patterns

Every Student Succeeds Act – State Examples – Support to Low-Performing Schools

State	4.2 Identification	4.2 Exit Criteria	4.3 School Improvement Resources	4.3 Technical Assistance on Selecting Evidence-Based Interventions	4.3 More Rigorous Interventions	4.3 Periodic Resource Review
Tennessee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identified every three years based on evaluation of three-year achievement data For identification, Tennessee will consider the overall success rate of all students on the following state assessments High schools will be assessed on a weighted composite of graduation rate and end-of-course exams Elementary/middle schools will be assessed on the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program Consistently underperforming is defined using the aforementioned indicators 	<p>Schools will exit CSI (a.k.a. priority schools) status in one of several ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not identified on the next Priority school list (2020) meets or exceeds its achievement AMOs targets for two consecutive years achieves level 4 or 5 Tennessee Value Added Assessment System performance in all subject/grade content areas for two consecutive years School exceeds the 15th percentile in the state using a one-year success rate <p>Schools will exit TSI status if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the school is not identified the following year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District-led interventions grants provide districts with flexible funds to support multiple priority schools in implementing evidence-based strategies School-level grants provided through competitive application process and support eligible schools for three years: one year of planning and two years of implementation Rubrics will be developed to score competitive submissions All schools will receive a one year planning grant of equal amounts Implementation grants will be awarded through a competitive process Monitoring and annually review each district's implementation through a series of three milestone reviews Quarterly monitoring of school plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue state-run school district and offer district-led interventions The state will have an Office of School Improvement, Centers of Regional Excellence, professional learning communities, and an online performance management system (ePlan) All identified schools will receive training on needs assessments and root cause analysis Create a state plan for school improvement Plans to empower districts to lead turnaround in its low-performing schools Creation of a school improvement continuum, with three intervention tracks Meet with district and school leadership teams, twice yearly, to provide support in areas of challenge and to share promising practices 	<p>District options for schools that fail to exit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close School Initiate a district-led charter conversion Develop a transition plan with the Achievement School District Continue with current intervention In this additional year, schools must demonstrate success in order to continue district-led intervention If the school does not achieve a composite TVAAS of 4 or 5, then the school will begin the state-run school district planning year in subsequent year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tennessee will commit to the periodic review of resource allocations to ensure sufficient support for school improvement in each district serving a significant number of schools identified Resource allocation review will be integrated into existing state processes The SEA will examine district human capital resources to ensure that all students enrolled in identified schools have access to effective teachers