Turnaround and Tiered Supports for District Run Schools

*Focus on Achievement Session, March 10, 2016*
Desired outcomes for this work session

Put Turnaround & TSF work in context:
  – Consider results at the national level and in DPS
  – Funding overview for school supports

Share collective learning about what has worked and what hasn’t
  – Case studies shared by current principals that represent common issues in turnaround schools
  – Data and observations from Public Impact and UVA
  – Feedback on district supports

Through the discussion, we will:
  – Generate questions for further study or considerations for improvement
  – Inform thinking about key policy and strategy questions that will intersect with other work and decisions ahead
Why are we addressing this topic?
Why now?

Why TSF?
Tiered support framework is a set of core strategies to identify and help us improve low-performing schools. Given that Denver Plan calls for 80% seats in green/blue, we need strong strategy/implementation for improving our schools.

Why now?
With a set of “turnaround” schools that are reaching four or five years in intensive supports, we need to deeply assess what we can do differently to improve outcomes for students.
Guiding questions for the board

• Our strategy has evolved over time to be more flexible: is this the right approach or should it be tighter?
• What is our perspective on the right amount of time to let the work take root, while balancing the need for improved student outcomes?
• In a resource-constrained and flexible environment, do we have the right level of supports/interventions at the strategic level (or for schools that are yellow)
• Our return on dollars spent on turnaround are in line with national trends: what are reactions to this?
What have we learned about this work?

- This is incredibly difficult and necessary work.
- Positive results compared to what would have happened if we didn’t do anything. Our results are in line with the national trends.
- ERS analysis showed turning around low-performing schools provides outcomes.
- Matching the solution (restart, redesign, etc.) to the root cause is critical.
- Over time, we have learned that the “what” is less important than the “how” it’s done.
- Over time, we have evolved our strategy based on feedback from early turnarounds:
  - Extra planning time for a leader to work with community is important in order to have buy-in, so we’ve created year 0 and emphasized community connections.
  - Leadership team and staff are critical, so we’ve increasingly paid attention to hiring, culture-building and high-touch support from a small network, and this year started to craft a specific turnaround pipeline strategy for school leaders.
Denver Plan 2020 Goal: Great schools in every neighborhood

Our goal is 80% Green or Blue schools, which drives appropriate urgency at every level of the district.

% Students in Blue/Green Schools by Geographical Region

Note: 2008 was the first year that SPF was published. The data are based on the 2013-14 schools mapping backwards. School that closed prior to 2013-14 are not represented in the graph. All school types are included.

INCREASE NEEDED TO REACH 80% GOAL:

Near North East (61%)
- 3.2% annual increase (603 students/year)

Southwest (52%)
- 4.7% annual increase (889 students/year)

Far North East (47%)
- 5.6% annual increase (943 students/year)

Northwest (38%)
- 7.1% annual increase (1,005 students/year)
Across DPS, **almost 17,000 students** are in Red or Orange schools as measured by the 2014 School Performance Framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2013-14 # of Students in Blue/Green Seats</th>
<th>2013-2014 # of Students in Red, Orange and Yellow Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNE</td>
<td>7,868</td>
<td>2,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNE</td>
<td>11,350</td>
<td>2,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>5,355</td>
<td>4,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>17,283</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>9,729</td>
<td>1,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51,585</td>
<td>10,215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context &amp; results</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- National context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DPS context and results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External lens on DPS efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>80 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oakland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trevista</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- North</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Steps</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Trends

Public Impact
Nationally, we have spent $6 billion on turnaround through School Improvement Grants since 2009.

SIG has funded 1,399 schools, spending approximately $4 million per school.

The increase in the average percentage of students attending SIG schools scoring proficient on state mathematics assessments has outpaced the national average but gaps in achievement remain large.

The increase in the average percentage of students attending SIG schools scoring proficient on state reading assessments has outpaced the national average but gaps in achievement remain large.

SIG Schools: Gains and Losses in Math Proficiency

Figure 3. Percentage of schools making gains and losses in mathematics proficiency rates: prefunding year to 2012–13

http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/signationalsum09292015.pdf
SIG Schools: Gains and Losses in Reading Proficiency

Figure 5. Percentage of schools making gains and losses in reading proficiency rates: prefunding year to 2012–13

- Cohort 1: 2009–10 to 2012–13
  - Double-digit gains: 33%
  - Single-digit gains: 36%
  - Single-digit losses: 4%
  - Double-digit losses: 5%

- Cohort 2: 2010–11 to 2012–13
  - Double-digit gains: 31%
  - Single-digit gains: 36%
  - Single-digit losses: 4%
  - Double-digit losses: 7%

- Cohort 3: 2011–12 to 2012–13
  - Double-digit gains: 10%
  - Single-digit gains: 10%
  - Single-digit losses: 8%
  - Double-digit losses: 6%

http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/signationalsum09292015.pdf
Models Implemented by SIG Schools Nationally

Figure 1. Number of SIG awarded schools, by cohort, by model: 2012–13

- **Cohort 1**:
  - Total: 18 + 31 + 163 = 212
  - Closure: 18
  - Restart: 31
  - Turnaround: 163
  - Transformation: 563

- **Cohort 2**:
  - Total: 1 + 83 + 12 = 96
  - Closure: 1
  - Restart: 83
  - Turnaround: 12

- **Cohort 3**:
  - Total: 2 + 38 + 14 = 54
  - Closure: 2
  - Restart: 38
  - Turnaround: 14

School Turnaround Strategies

• School Leadership, including Teacher-Leaders
• Effective Teachers
• Data-Driven Instruction & use of Formative Assessments
• Intervention, Differentiation, and Personalization
• Standards-Aligned Curriculum
• School Culture
• Extended Time
• Community Engagement

What to do is well documented. How to execute these strategies effectively requires skillful leadership.
“What does a turnaround leader need that a leader of an already-successful school might not? A driving motivation to achieve, persistence in the face of obstacles and inspiring self-confidence, for starters—, can lead to actions — such as calculated risk taking, ambitious goal setting and detailed planning — that are crucial to school turnaround success.”

(Steiner & Barrett, 2012, p. 2)
Turnaround Leader Actions

- Focus on a few early wins, use the momentum
- Lead a turnaround campaign
- Get the right staff; right the remainder
- Drive decisions with open-air data
- Break organization norms
- Do what works, raise the bar
## Research on District Support: 7 Steps for District Leaders

- **Commit to Success**
- **Choose Turnaround for the Right Schools**
- **Develop a Pipeline of Turnaround Leaders**
- **Give Leaders the “Big Yes” - Autonomies**
- **Hold Leaders Accountable for Results**
- **Prioritize Teacher Hiring in Turnaround Schools**
- **Proactively Engage the Community**
DPS Context & Results
The Tiered Support Framework is used to identify and prioritize interventions and supports for high-needs schools.

Is the school meeting academic, non-academic and enrollment expectations?

Step 1: Academic Flags
- Red/Orange on SPF
- Red on Growth
- Persistence of low performance
- Significant drop in performance (<10%)

Step 2: Non-Academic Flags
- Teacher Voluntary Turnover
- In boundary choice out rate
- Enrollment demand
- Student Satisfaction
- Parent Satisfaction
- Attendance
- Suspensions

Are the necessary conditions for school success present?

Step 3: SQR
- Conduct 3rd party School Quality Review

What action does the body of evidence suggest?

Step 4: Other Body of Evidence
- Results from prior supports
- Instructional Superintendent review of current improvement efforts
- Sr. Leadership assessment and recommendation

DPS Results
Case Studies
Next Steps
**Tiering:**
Schools are placed in a support tier based on focus & need

- **Intensive**
  - Intensive support for high need schools engaging in transformative or turnaround strategies

- **Strategic**
  - Strategic realignment of school improvement plans and strategies

- **Universal**
  - Focus on continuous improvement and moving schools from good to great
How many tiered schools have been identified over time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1/ Intensive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2/ Strategic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TSF first used in 2012-13
**2015 SPF so no change in tiers for 2015-16

When do schools exit a tier?

**Intensive Tier:** Supports provided for a minimum of five years

In 2014, DPS updated the support approach to provide support to schools in intensive for five years in order to sustain gains.

**Strategic Tier:** As long as the school is meeting the identification criteria
Our analysis is based on these turnaround school interventions from 2010-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School name</th>
<th>SPF 2010</th>
<th>SPF 2011</th>
<th>SPF 2012</th>
<th>SPF 2013</th>
<th>SPF 2014</th>
<th>Year of Intervention</th>
<th>Type of Turnaround Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kunsmiller Creative Arts Academy</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Phaseout or Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilpin Montessori Public School</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>Redesign/Turnaround</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake International School</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>Phaseout or Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenlee Elementary School</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>Redesign/Turnaround</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North High School</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCIS at Ford</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Phaseout or Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Phaseout or Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Tech Early College</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Phaseout or Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCIS at Montbello</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Phaseout or Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Valley Elementary School</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Redesign/Turnaround</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGlone Elementary School</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Redesign/Turnaround</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial School</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Redesign/Turnaround</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevista at Horace Mann</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Redesign/Turnaround</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Community School</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Renaissance School</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCIS at Fairmont</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Redesign/Turnaround</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Elementary School</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Randolph</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to appendix for definition of turnaround intervention types
Students in district turnaround schools have outpaced the district average gain in math by 1% and outpaced the gains in other bottom quartile schools where turnaround action was not taken by 4%, but gaps remain.
Students in district turnaround schools have not made gains on pace with the district in reading, with a 3% gain since 2010.
### Summary of results for district-run turnaround schools

The majority of district-run turnaround schools performed better than the school they replaced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of district-run turnaround schools 2010-14 that performed better compared to legacy school.</th>
<th>SPF %</th>
<th>Status %</th>
<th>MGP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of turnaround schools that performed better compared to legacy school, how much better did they perform?</th>
<th>SPF %</th>
<th>Status %</th>
<th>MGP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although DPS results are on par with national results, they are not enough.

- While we have seen larger increases initially, the size of the gains decreases over time.
- 43% of turnaround schools between 2010 to 2014 achieved green status on SPF, but by 2014 that percentage was 19% green.
Turnaround & TSF
Continuous Improvement Efforts

Current improvement work

2014-15 lessons learned review yielded several improvement strategies:

• Piloting “Year 0” approach to turnaround
• Piloting turnaround leadership pipelines with funding from the CDE Turnaround Leaders Grant
• Additional 1.2M in funding for intensive tier schools

We need to go deeper

January 2016 - Public Impact analysis and University of Virginia assessment of how well the district is supporting turnaround and high-needs schools

March 2016 - Grant funding for a two-year partnership with UVA to support improvement at district level and support of four to five schools launching turnaround strategies (Pending approval by CDE board 3/10)
As we have seen a decrease in Federal funding over time, the district is increasing its investment in our highest need schools.

**NOTES:** Does not include philanthropic funding. Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG), School Improvement Support (SIS) and Diagnostic Review (DR) are federal funds deployed by CDE via competitive grant processes.
How have we funded the Improvement Work in the Intensive & Strategic Tiers? Per Pupil

**NOTES:** Does not include philanthropic funding. Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG), School Improvement Support (SIS) and Diagnostic Review (DR) are federal funds deployed by CDE via competitive grant processes.
What return can we see regarding federal TIG funding?

In a regression analysis of TIG results since 2011, a positive correlation was found in the two most recent years in math.

Finding:

For every additional $100/student of TIG funding

TIG spending in 2013 and 2014 correlated with a 0.6 to 0.7% increase in math proficiency.

Which would translate to:

- An average elementary school of 500 students would have seen a 6% to 7% increase in math for $500,000 worth of TIG funds in 2013 and 2014.
Two groups analyzed how well DPS is supporting high-needs schools:

**Public Impact** focused on quantitative comparisons with national and other Colorado schools

**University of Virginia Partnership for Leaders in Education** focused on qualitative interviews & document review
## DPS Turnarounds – Public Impact Perspective

### Strengths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Performance Framework</th>
<th>Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Enhanced data-driven intervention | - Leading indicators  
- Informed “rapid retry” |
| Expand accountability for the district and principal supervisors |

### Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intense Talent Focus</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Boost differentials, especially for teacher-leaders  
Competency-based selection of turnaround leaders  
Extend / systematize “exec principal” |
| Build supply of restart leaders |
## DPS Turnarounds – Public Impact Perspective

### Strengths

- **Varied Toolset – including “Restarts”**
- **Autonomy Commitment, but with Support**
- **Sustained Effort (decade-plus)**

### Gaps

- Build in-house supply of restarts
- Continue honing value proposition for external restarts (charters)
- Clarify tight-loose for district-run
- Identify & grow successful models
- More rapid retry
- Scale success more quickly
UVA Assessment Categories for System Role in Turnaround Success – Conducted January 13-14, 2016

- Differentiated Support & Accountability
- Talent Management
- Leadership
- Effective Instructional Infrastructure
- Readiness for Turnaround

University of Virginia School Turnaround Program
Four primary gaps and opportunities identified in assessment

1) **Invest in execution of clear focus areas.** There is undefined direction on what is a priority and how stakeholders will work together to achieve desired outcomes of these priorities. For example, clarifying aspirations and expectations of Teacher Leadership Strategy and data-driven instruction could drive deep execution support, whereas now there is often only deep planning support. These supports and expectations would need to be designed with principal decision making rights in mind.

2) **Invest in strengthening the role of Instructional Superintendents in turnaround.** More work needed to deepen investment in capacity building and support of school leadership teams while clarifying expectations of role and how role should be differentiated for turnaround.
Four primary gaps and opportunities identified in assessment

3) Invest in leadership skills and pipeline needed for turnaround. Strengthen selection and preparation processes, including more pro-active early identification of potential turnaround leaders and support with exposure to excellent schools, change management and design thinking in addition to strong instructional systems.

4) Embolden investment in different turnaround strategies depending on status compared to School Performance Compact. Continue promising investment in year zero for any direct-run restart, further clarifying approach and ownership of this process. Invest more strongly in early interventions for schools at risk of qualifying for compact in two-to-four years, including opportunities for targeted staffing changes and school redesign.
Case studies – areas of focus

1) Oakland:
   - Restart strategy
   - Autonomy & flexibility in turnaround
   - Experienced school leader facing challenges specific to social-emotional needs of students

2) Trevista:
   - What strategies are making a difference?
   - Distributed leadership team
   - Rebuilding community trust after multiple turnarounds

3) North:
   - Sustaining gains/issues of plateauing
   - Turnaround vs. “good to great” strategies
   - Effects of TIG funding ending
Case Study #1: Oakland
Oakland Summary

At a Glance:

- Restart in 2011-12: Oakland phases out and SOAR at Oakland charter school opens
- Restart in 2014-15: District run Oakland Elementary opens with Innovation Status
- Currently on Year 2 of CDE Accountability Clock (on the basis of SOAR Oakland scores. Oakland Elementary was not given a new school number)

Intensive Supports at Oakland

- Blueprint Schools partnership
- DSSN Turnaround Network
- Extended year/ Extended Day
- Achievement Network coaching
- Denver Math Fellows Tutoring
- Additional Funding for needs analysis, planning and implementation of school plan (See box)

### Additional funding at Oakland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>Diagnostic Review Grant</td>
<td>$31,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Intensive Tier funding</td>
<td>$572,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>Intensive Tier funding</td>
<td>$518,414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Oakland Data Snapshot

## Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 October Count</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>FRL</th>
<th>ELL</th>
<th>SPED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SPF History

Oakland (using SOAR at Oakland SPF because Oakland does not yet have any SPF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPF overall</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Soar Oakland)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>(SOAR Oakland) 11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Progress Over Time – Growth</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement Level - Status</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Student Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>DRA status. % Students meet EOY expectation in 2014-15</th>
<th>ACCESS MGP 13</th>
<th>ACCESS MGP 14</th>
<th>ACCESS MGP 15</th>
<th>Fall 2015 ANET average % Correct Literacy</th>
<th>Fall 2015 ANET average % Correct Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oakland Case Study – Questions

1. Which strategies and supports are making a difference in seeing gains at Oakland? Where are supports falling short, or what gaps exist?

2. What are the pros and cons of having a “tighter” model (eg, based on the Blueprint Schools Model) that included some specific strategies such as extended year/extended day?

3. What have been the benefits and challenges of having Innovation status?

4. What are your reflections as an experienced leader coming into a Turnaround environment for the first time?
Case Study 1: Oakland Elementary

Related National Research

- Network Clustering
- Autonomy and Flexibility

Give turnaround leaders the “BIG YES” to:
- develop a great team
- manage teachers as professionals
- change curriculum and classroom structure
- schedule day and year for program fit
- allocate funding and select services
- define a unique school culture
Case study #2 - Trevista
Trevista Summary

At a Glance:
- 2008-09: Consolidation of Remington, Smedley and Horace Mann to create an ECE-8 model
- Turnaround Transformation began in 2012-13 with La Dawn Baity
- Successful succession planning and transition to Jesus Rodriguez in 2015-16
- Reconfiguration of Trevista to ECE-5 in 2015-16
- Currently on Year 5 of CDE Accountability Clock

Intensive Supports at Trevista
- 2011-15: WDN Turnaround Network
- 2015-16: Network 1 intensive network (IS Ratio 1:5)
- MetroCenter partnership
- Achievement Network coaching
- Denver Math Fellow Tutoring
- Literacy Fellows Tutoring
- Additional Funding for implementation of school plan and additional staff (currently: AA, Restorative Justice Coord, Family Liaison, ELA-S interventionist) (See box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional funding at Trevista</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIG Planning Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11 – Intensive Tier Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12 – Intensive Tier Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIG Grant (Aug 2011 - July 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13 – Intensive Tier Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14 – Intensive Tier Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15 - Diagnostic Review Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15 - Intensive Tier Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16 - Intensive Tier Funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Trevista Data Snapshot

### Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 October Count</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>FRL</th>
<th>ELL</th>
<th>SPED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPF History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trevista</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPF overall</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Progress Over Time – Growth</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement Level - Status</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>DRA status. % Students meet EOY expectation in 2014-15</th>
<th>ACCESS MGP 13</th>
<th>ACCESS MGP 14</th>
<th>ACCESS MGP 15</th>
<th>Fall 2015 ANET average % Correct Literacy</th>
<th>Fall 2015 ANET average % Correct Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trevista ECE-8 at Horace Mann</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2014-15, Trevista had one of the highest academic growth in an elementary school in the city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trevista</th>
<th>SPF overall</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Progress Over Time – Growth: Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement Level - Status: Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Progress Over Time – Growth: Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement Level - Status: Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Progress Over Time – Growth: Ed levels Combined</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement Level - Status: Ed levels Combined</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trevista Case Study Questions

1. Which strategies and supports are making a difference in seeing gains at Trevista? Where are supports falling short, or what gaps exist?

2. What were the challenges and the approaches to building trust with the community, especially in a school that had multiple attempts at turnaround?

3. What role did the strategy of a Distributed Leadership team play in Trevista’s gains?
Case Study 2: Trevista

Related National Research

- “Rapid Retry”
- Talent – Getting the Right Leaders and Teachers
- Distributed Leadership - Teacher Leader Roles
- Leading Indicators

Use **DATA** to:

- Document early wins and build momentum
- Help schools make mid-course corrections
- Tailor district support based on identified needs
- Make decisions about when to retry, shortening the time horizon of change and thus increasing the cumulative success rate
Case study #3 - North
North HS Intensive Supports

At a Glance:

• 2006-07: Redesign (Pre-TIG)
• 2010-2013: Turnaround Transformation
• North Engagement Center
• Successful succession planning and transition to Scott Wolf in 2015-16
• Will serve as CDE ‘TIG Bright Spot’ school this spring

Intensive Supports at North

• WDN Turnaround Network
• MetroCenter partnership
• Extended Learning Time
• Additional Funding for implementation of school plan and additional staff (See box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional funding at North</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11 – Intensive Tier Funding</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIG Grant (2010 - 2013)</td>
<td>$ 3,105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15 – Extended Learning</td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15 - Intensive Tier Funding</td>
<td>$ 198,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16 - Intensive Tier Funding</td>
<td>$ 437,515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## North Data Snapshot

### Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 October Count</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>FRL</th>
<th>ELL</th>
<th>SPED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPF History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPF overall</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Progress Over Time – Growth</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement Level - Status</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>ACT % Students meet Composite 20 in 2014-15</th>
<th>ACCESS MGP 13</th>
<th>ACCESS MGP 14</th>
<th>ACCESS MGP 15</th>
<th>CMAS ELA 3+</th>
<th>CMAS Math 3+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North HS</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
North - Questions

1. Which strategies and supports made a difference in seeing gains at North? What strategies are helping to sustain gains?

2. What intensive supports should the district provide to a school recently out of turnaround?

3. What impact did the TIG funding "cliff" have?

4. What would take North to the next level – to green or blue?
Case Study 3: North HS

Related National Research

- Turnaround v. Good to Great
- Investing Wisely & Sustaining Gains

“What does a turnaround leader need that a leader of an already-successful school might not? A driving motivation to achieve, persistence in the face of obstacles and inspiring self-confidence, for starters, can lead to actions — such as calculated risk taking, ambitious goal setting and detailed planning — that are crucial to school turnaround success.” (Steiner & Barrett, 2012, p. 2)
Guiding questions for the board

• Our strategy has evolved over time to be more flexible: is this the right approach or should be tighter?
• What is our perspective on the right amount of time to let the work take root, while balancing the need for improved student outcomes?
• In a resource constrained and flexible environment, do we have the right level of supports/interventions at the strategic level (or for schools that are yellow)
• Our return on dollars spent on turnaround are in line with national trends: what are reactions to this?
Next Steps
Appendix – Tier 1 Schools (Turnaround & Intensive)
21 schools in the Intensive Tier this year have interventions already in progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School name</th>
<th>TSF Designation 2015-16</th>
<th>Year of intervention</th>
<th>Type of intervention</th>
<th>TIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gilpin Montessori Public School</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>Redesign/Turnaround</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake International School</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>Phaseout/Replacement</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenlee Elementary School</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>Redesign/Turnaround</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Community Arts</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Phaseout/Replacement</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCIS at Ford</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Redesign/Turnaround</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCIS at Montbello</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Phaseout/Replacement</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Phaseout/Replacement</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Tech Early College</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Phaseout/Replacement</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Valley Elementary School</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Redesign/Turnaround</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGlone Elementary School</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Redesign/Turnaround</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Generations Academy</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Phaseout/Replacement</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Leadership Academy</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Phaseout/Replacement</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial School</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Redesign/Turnaround</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevista at Horace Mann</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Redesign/Turnaround</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Community School</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Phase:
Schools executing on Turnaround/Improvement plan and within 5-year support model
21 schools in the Intensive Tier this year have interventions already in progress (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School name</th>
<th>TSF Designation 2015-16</th>
<th>Year of intervention</th>
<th>Type of intervention</th>
<th>TIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Randolph MS</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Elementary School</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Phaseout/Replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham Elementary School</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbine Elementary School</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Elementary School</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro Elementary School</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Elementary School</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Phase:
Schools executing on Turnaround/Improvement plan and within 5-year support model
One school launched this year &
Six schools are preparing to launch next year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School name</th>
<th>TSF Designation 2015-16</th>
<th>Year of Intervention</th>
<th>Type of Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Launched in 2015-16</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual High School</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Launching in 2016-17</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmitt Elementary School</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>Redesign with Year 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington Elementary School</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>Redesign with Year 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldrick Elementary School</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>Redesign with Year 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valverde Elementary School</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>Redesign with Partial Year 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepner (Kepner Beacon)</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>Phase-out/Replacement with Planning Year support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry (Bear Valley International School</td>
<td>1-Intensive</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>Phase-out/Replacement with Year 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix/Other Slides
DPS data: Gains tend to be the largest in year one

Net change since intervention

Year 1
- Average SPF % Gain: 12.5%
- Average Status % Gain: 8.4%
- Average Growth % Gain: 17.0%

Year 2
- Average SPF % Gain: 2.9%
- Average Status % Gain: 2.4%
- Average Growth % Gain: 6.0%

Year 3
- Average SPF % Gain: 4.5%
- Average Status % Gain: 3.0%
- Average Growth % Gain: 8.7%

Overall by 2014
- Average SPF % Gain: 6.3%
- Average Status % Gain: 1.7%
- Average Growth % Gain: 8.1%
## Types of Turnaround Interventions - Federal definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of strategy</th>
<th>Description of Required Strategy Elements for TIG Grant: Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Transformation Model**             | • Replace principal (if principal hired to lead a reform effort and in second year, can provide a case to keep)  
  (new leader, new program)            | • Ensure teachers in school are right teachers to support effort through targeted evaluation, job-embedded PD, and rewards  
                                           • Implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies  
                                           • Increase learning time  
                                           • Provide operational flexibility and sustained support (for example, from external partners)                                                                                                                                                |
| **Turnaround Model**                 | |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| **DPS TERM: Redesign**               | • Replace principal (if principal hired to lead a reform effort and in second year, can provide a case to keep)  
  (new leader, new staff, new program)  | • Hire new team of teachers, ensuring no more than 50% taught in previous school  
                                           • Provide targeted evaluation, job-embedded PD, and rewards to teachers  
                                           • Adopt new governance structure including support from turnaround network  
                                           • Adopt new instructional program  
                                           • Increase learning time  
                                           • Provide social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students                                                                                                                                             |
| **Restart Model**                    | |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| **OTHER DPS TERMS: Replacement or Phase In** | • Replace school with a new school, such as a high-performing charter school  
  (new school)                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| **School Closure Model**             | • Close school and ensure students enroll in a high performing school  
                                           • Funds can be used to support the expenses related to closure.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |