Changes to ACSIP: Providing School Improvement Resources Where the Need is Greatest

September 15, 2015

Prepared for

THE HOUSE INTERIM COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

AND THE SENATE INTERIM COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Contents

BACKGROUND

Historically, systematic or formalized school improvement planning grew out of research findings on the effectiveness of schools in raising student achievement (Wendel, 2000; Wideen & Pye, 1994). A primary catalyst for a steady stream of research on the effectiveness of schools on achievement was a legacy of doubt created by large-scale, rigorous studies that indicated that the effects of school policies and practices were miniscule in comparison to the impact of poverty and family characteristics (Coleman et al., 1966; Jencks et al., 1972; Moynihan, 1965). For example, the widely-cited study, known as the Coleman Report, of over 60,000 students in 4,000 schools concluded that when family background is taken into account, the impact of any school polices or practices on student performance is reduced to insignificance statistically (Coleman et al., 1966).

These counterintuitive findings of large-scale studies stimulated a vigorous reaction from researchers, who theorized that the effectiveness of schools would be revealed by examining more complex interrelationships between school practices, family background, and environmental factors, such as poverty (e.g., Edmonds, 1982; Lezotte, 2012; Raudenbuch, 2004). Indeed, these more methodologically sophisticated "school effectiveness" and "school improvement" studies began to identify policies and practices that contributed to student achievement gains, irrespective of family background and poverty (e.g., Borman et al., 2003; Burkhauser et al., 2012; Coley & Baker, 2013; Dobbie & Fryer, 2011 a & b). The effectiveness research also demonstrated that educational practices and student achievement gains varied widely within and between states (Redding & Rhim, 2014). Furthermore, the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) issued a startling report, *A Nation at Risk,* which indicated that U. S. students' academic performance compared unfavorably to several other countries. Scores on most national and state tests also fell during the 1980s (Ravitch, 2000; Redding & Rhim, 2014).

These unfavorable findings on student performance provided the impetus for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 1994, which called upon states to create systems of standards and assessments and to provide support for school improvement. Incentivized by federal dollars, comprehensive school reform models began spreading research-based educational practices across the country (Borman et al., 2003).

ARKANSAS COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (ACSIP)

This section of the report presents a brief synopsis of the Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Planning (ACSIP) model shown on the next page (Figure 1). Historically, Act 915 of the regular session, 1995, gave the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) authority to require school improvement plans from districts identified as in fiscal or academic distress. Act 1108 of the regular session, 1997, stated that every school will develop and implement a data-driven school improvement plan based on analyses of factors that lead to student achievement, including standards for teachers and administrators, and involvement of parents and the community.

With the passage of No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2002) amendments to ESEA in 2001, Arkansas had to submit a state improvement plan to the U. S. Department of Education (USDOE) for approval to receive federal funds. Title IX, part C of NCLB allowed states to submit a consolidated plan that included all eight individual applications for federal funds (e.g. Title I-A, Title II-A), which in Arkansas became the ACSIP. USDOE also encouraged states to allow districts to submit consolidated plans.

In 2004, the ADE partnered with Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL) to design a web-based system to enable districts to meet state and federal improvement planning requirements.

FIGURE 1. ACSIP MODEL

Source: Arkansas Department of Education (2014-15)

Act 807 of the 2007 regular session established that each public school and district shall develop and file with the ADE an ACSIP.

According to the ACSIP Handbook (p. 2), "The Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Planning (ACSIP) model is an annual planning and fund distribution design that must be used by all Arkansas public and charter schools, as defined by Ark. Code Ann. §6-15-419. Using the ACSIP model, every district and school – including charter schools - is required to develop and file with the ADE a comprehensive school improvement plan. The plan is also used as the school's application for all federal programs administered by the Arkansas Department of Education, under Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), in addition to Student Special Needs Funds. The plan must include school improvement actions based on results of the required school's annual comprehensive needs assessment. Goals, priorities, interventions, actions, and evaluations are based on state standards and assessed needs of a particular district and school."

State law requires all ACSIPs to contain certain information (A.C.A. §6-15-426). The plan must include activities aimed at addressing the greatest needs as indicated by student test score data. State statute also requires the ACSIP to describe how the school or district intends to use each of the four state categorical funds (professional development, National School Lunch, English language learners, and alternative learning environment). At the end of each school year, districts and schools are required to assess the effectiveness of the interventions described in the ACSIP and include the assessment in the following year's plan. State law also requires low performing schools identified under ESEA to revise their ACSIPs to include any new requirements added due to their status. Districts are required to post their school ACSIPs on their website (A.C.A. §6-15-2202(b)(1)(A)).

According to the ACSIP Handbook (ADE, 2014-15, p. 12) "The plan must be designed to ensure that all students have an opportunity to obtain an adequate education and demonstrate proficiency on all portions of state-mandated, augmented, criterion-referenced (CRT), and/or norm-referenced (NRT) assessments. The plan must include strategies to address the achievement gap existing for any identifiable group or subgroup and the gap of that subgroup from the academic standard…. Academic goal statements must address Annual Measureable Objectives (AMOs)." AMOs establish academic performance, growth, and graduation targets that reduce proficiency and graduation gaps in half within six years for all students.

In terms of priorities, "each district and school plan must be based on areas of greatest need identified through the comprehensive needs assessment."(ADE, 2014-15, p. 13) Each plan must also incorporate goals and objectives for nutrition, physical activity, and special education as priorities. Priority Schools (lowest 5% of schools on student achievement) must include a Priority Improvement Plan (PIP) as a priority. Focus Schools (lowest 10% of schools on student achievement) must include a Targeted Improvement Plan (TIP) as a priority.

Benchmark statements need a reference point against which outcomes can be measured and reviewed over time as a growth target for performance. Priority and Focus Schools must set measurable benchmarks that include Interim Measureable Objectives for improving learning for all students. Evidence-based interventions must be used, and they must be aimed at the needs identified in the comprehensive needs assessment. Each school must include actions involving Academic Improvement Plans and Intensive Reading Interventions for all students performing below state standards. Parent involvement must comply with ADE rules and regulations. Professional development plans must be included in ACSIP, along with assurances that these plans are individualized based on the Teacher Effectiveness and Support System (TESS).

ARKANSAS ESEA FLEXIBILITY: CHANGES TO SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY AND ASSISTANCE

The Arkansas ESEA Flexibility Requests, approved on June 29, 2012 and on August 6, 2015, are based on the recognition that the majority of schools in the state are small, rural, and many are inundated with poverty (ADE, 2012a, 2015). Because of small student populations, these rural schools often do not have the minimum number (N = 40) of students in subgroups for student achievement accountability under the current No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requirements. The Flexibility Requests approved in 2012 and 2015 include students that were not being identified in accountability determinations because of subpopulation size requirements under NCLB.

According the most recent ADE ESEA Flexibility Request (2015), assessment data indicated that the NCLB accountability system enabled large achievement gaps to persist. For example, only 16% of Arkansas schools met the minimum number of special education students, whereas 96% of schools reported having special education students. ADE reports (2015) data analyses revealed 80% of the schools were not being held accountable for this subpopulation of students. The most recent ESEA Flexibility Request, approved on August 6, 2015, requires schools to be accountable for all students, while continuing to report on ESEA subpopulations and including their performance in the ACSIP and intervention responses (ADE, 2015).

The primary goal of the approved Arkansas Flexibility Request (2015) is the implementation of a unitary system of accountability, differentiated ACSIP, and tiered response to intervention based on individualized comprehensive school improvement plans. Furthermore, districts with Focus and Priority Schools are no longer required to hire outside consultants to assist in the implementation of the ACSIP.

The central mechanism for accomplishing this goal is a Differentiated Accountability, Recognition and Tiered Support System (DARTSS) implemented in the 2012-13. DARTSS establishes new performance and growth targets for math and literacy that are projected to cut the proficiency gap in half within six years for all students. High school non-graduation rates also must be reduced by half in this time period. Furthermore, the minimum number of students necessary for individual subgroup performance to be considered for accountability classification is lowered from 40 to 25.

These AMO requirements include the newly formed Targeted Achievement Gap Group (TAGG), which consists of economically disadvantaged students, English-language learners (ELs), and students with disabilities SWD). According to ADE (2012a, p. 45), "The use of the TAGG for accountability increases accountability for at risk students over and above reducing the minimum N from 40 to 25."

It should be clear that Arkansas continues to report individual AMOs for each ESEA subpopulation. Reporting the individual AMOs for each ESEA subpopulation ensures that their performance is not lost by the use of TAGG, and that the needs of these students are identified and addressed in the ACSIP (ADE, 2015, p. 23). An example of how AMOs are calculated is provided in Table 1.

TABLE 1. SAMPLE CALCULATION OF SCHOOL PERFORMANCE AMO*

All Students' Proficiency AMOs**	TAGG's Proficiency AMOs**
76% Proficient 100%-76%=24 %age point Proficiency Gap	52% Proficient 100%-52%=48 %age point Proficiency Gap
24 ÷ 2 = 12 %age points (Half of Proficiency Gap)	48 ÷ 2 = 24 %age points (Half of Proficiency Gap)
Annual Increase = 2 Percentage Points (12%age points ÷ 6 = 2)	Annual Increase = 4 Percentage Points (24%age points ÷ 6 = 4)
2012 AMO = 76 + 2 = 78% Proficient 2013 AMO = 78 + 2 = 80% Proficient 2014 AMO = 80 + 2 = 82% Proficient 2015 AMO = 82 + 2 = 84% Proficient 2016 AMO = 84 + 2 = 86% Proficient 2017 AMO = 86 + 2 = 88% Proficient	2012 AMO = 52 + 4 = 56% Proficient 2013 AMO = 56 + 4 = 60% Proficient 2014 AMO = 60 + 4 = 64% Proficient 2015 AMO = 64 + 4 = 68% Proficient 2016 AMO = 68 + 4 = 72% Proficient 2017 AMO = 72 + 4 = 76% Proficient

* Actual calculations are rounded to the nearest hundredth (two places to right of decimal).
**Growth and/or graduation rate AMOs will also be calculated for schools and districts.
Source: ADE Power Point (2012b) on ESEA Flexibility

USE OF DARTSS FOR ACSIP

The DARTSS provides a roadmap for the shift from using ACSIP primarily as a federal funds allocation tool to a collaborative partnership between the ADE and districts, which allows districts the flexibility to assume more responsibility in continuous improvement planning (ACSIP) based on comprehensive needs assessments. DARTSS furnishes accountability classifications for all schools based on annual measurable objectives (AMOs). These classifications, their description, and district autonomy for each are presented in Table 2. This table indicates that districts gain more autonomy as their AMOs increase. As a result, districts are incentivized to support their lowest performing schools in ACSIP interventions.

Briefly, all students, including ESEA subgroups and TAGG, have performance and progress above proficient in "exemplary schools." In "achieving schools," all student groups have

TABLE 2. ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATIONS BASED ON ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES

Accountability Classification	Description	ADE Engagement/ District Autonomy
Exemplary	High performance High progress High TAGG high performance High TAGG high progress	Very low ADE engagement/ Very high district autonomy
Achieving	3-yr ACSIP—meet all performance, graduation rate and growth AMOs for All Students and TAGG 1-yr ACSIP—meet all performance and graduation rate AMOs for All Students and TAGG, but miss growth AMOs for All Students or TAGG	Very low ADE engagement/ High district autonomy
Needs Improvement	Does not meet performance, graduation rate or growth AMOs for All Students and TAGG	Low to Moderate ADE engagement / Moderate district autonomy
Needs Improvement Focus	Schools with largest, persistent gaps between Non-TAGG and TAGG students	High ADE engagement/ Low district autonomy
Needs Improvement Priority	Schools with persistently lowest achievement in math and literacy over three years for All Students	Very High ADE engagement/ Low district autonomy

Source: ADE Power Point (2012) on ESEA Flexibility

reached their annual achievement targets (AMOs), and in high school their annual graduation rate target (AMO). "Needs improvement schools" either test less than 95% of their students or they miss the achievement or growth targets. A high school will be classified as "needs improvement" if it does not meet the annual graduation AMO.

ADE continues to review and approve, as needed, all school and district ACSIPs. However, the level of engagement by ADE in the needs assessment and improvement planning varies based on support and intervention needed by schools and districts. The DARTSS classifications provided by the ESEA Flexibility approval allow ADE school improvement specialists to focus their support and interventions on schools with the greatest needs based on indicators of performance, achievement growth, graduation rate, and ACSIP implementation (ADE, 2015).

School improvement specialists are assigned to particular Regional Educational Cooperatives (RECs) that work with schools and districts on needs assessments and school improvement planning. These cooperatives are staffed with specialists that instruct and assist schools and districts with technology, data use, core content areas, and English-language learners (EL) and students with disabilities (SWD) programs.   School improvement specialists work to coordinate these REC services with Focus and Priority Schools, as well as districts in academic distress.

Exemplary Schools are exempt from annual approval of ACSIP and submit plans on a 3-year cycle as long as they continue to meet accountability requirements to be designated as an Achieving School. However, they do need annual approval of funding from the ADE.

These schools receive very limited services from ADE, and they have high district autonomy. Exemplary Schools receive public recognition and serve as model schools that collaborate and share effective policies and practices with other schools in Arkansas.

Achieving Schools that meet all performance, growth, and graduation AMOs also receive very few ADE services, submit a 3-year ACSIP for review by ADE, and they have high district autonomy. Limited ADE services and high district autonomy applies to Achieving Schools that meet either performance <u>or</u> growth AMOs and graduation rate AMOs as well. However, they must submit an ACSIP every year for review (ADE, 2015).

Needs Improvement Schools receive low to moderate services from ADE based on the degree of identified need and student performance and graduation.   They also receive low to high services from their REC. Schools that demonstrate a lack of progress in student performance, graduation rate, and/or closing achievement gaps are subject to increasing ADE direction of interventions and funding allocations.

On average, school improvement specialists visit Focus Schools once a month, whereas they may visit Priority Schools several consecutive days per month, varying widely depending on needs and ACSIP progress. These schools submit a one-year ACSIP for review and approval by ADE. Focus Schools include a Targeted Improvement Plan (TIP) with the ACSIP, while Priority Schools submit a Priority Improvement Plan (PIP). The TIP and PIP are individualized for a particular school based on its assessed needs, and these plans provide specific details about targets of intervention, including reasons, actions, monitoring, and outcome measures. Their TIP or PIP must demonstrate fund allocations sufficient to support interventions. School improvement specialists are assigned to Focus and Priority Schools to coordinate REC services, and assist with writing the ACSIP and effective use of interventions, processes, diagnostic analysis; building leadership and instructional capacity; implementation of the Seven Turnaround Principles in the Appendix A; and evaluation of progress. Both TIP and PIP concentrate on Interim Measureable Objectives (IMOs), which are measureable incremental steps or intervals toward goals. Responsibility for implementation and results rests initially with districts, with increasing ADE oversight based on severity of deficiency in school improvement over time (ADE, 2014-15).

USE OF INDISTAR FOR COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANNING

In 2014-15, the ADE pilot-tested a software package, Indistar (2013), in 35 public schools and two charter schools that volunteered to use it for their comprehensive school improvement planning (or ACSIP). These districts were selected from different regions of the state. Some of the districts that volunteered for the pilot had Priority Schools that have used Indistar for school improvement planning since 2012. ADE will be introducing Indistar for ACSIP in all schools in the Fall of 2015. Training in the use of Indistar will be conducted by school improvement specialists in their assigned Regional Educational Cooperatives.

Indistar was created at the University of Virginia, in the School of Education, specifically for school improvement planning. According to internet sources, Indistar has been used in over 30 states, and other states are considering it (e.g., Kentucky). A power point presentation by the creators of Indistar, and a description of how to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment that informs school improvement planning may be found at:
http://www.arkansased.gov/divisions/public-school-accountability/school-improvement/school-improvement-conference-2014/continuous-school-improvement-process

Indistar is a software package on the internet that can be tailored to specifications of a state, district, or school for continuous school improvement planning (e.g., ACSIP).   It is a tool with many applications that has been developed with assistance of states and school districts that have used it. Users ultimately can build their own system for comprehensive needs

assessments, choosing indicators of objectives, recording meeting agendas and attendance, assigning responsibilities, monitoring IMOs, coaching, and posting outcome evaluations. In a nutshell, Indistar breaks down professional practices into understandable clusters of specific activities, and provides task management features that enable the leadership teams to efficiently implement plans, manage interventions, monitor progress, and evaluate outcomes. It provides more than 40 reports, including charts and graphs that inform district and school leadership teams about progress in all phases of school improvement.

A central feature of Indistar is a message board where coaches (ADE or district) can provide continuous guidance and feedback to district and school leadership teams that, in turn, work with grade-level and content teams of teachers. Teachers and leadership teams are able to get immediate answers and feedback from coaches, who are school improvement specialists in Arkansas. School leadership teams focus on improving professional practices (e.g., lesson preparation, instruction) that contribute to increases in student achievement gains. The professional practices are arranged in categories and subcategories in Indistar along with a set of indicators of each practice. The indicators are behavioral descriptions of elements of these practices, and Indistar has 144 indicators as examples from which users can choose (they also can create their own indicators). For example, one indicator in Indistar states that the school monitors progress of the extended learning time programs and other strategies related to ACSIP.

The current Indistar User Guide, and examples of indicators, can be found at the following website: http://www.doe.virginia.gov/support/school_improvement/indistar/ Each indicator is supported by a Wise Ways brief that provides an explanation and relevant research evidence with citations for designated practices. Video demonstrations and discussions of the 144 indicators are provided through Indictors in Action and Indicators Now. "Indicators in Action" consists of online courses and modules that teach and demonstrate how to apply practices represented by indicators. "Indicators Now" is video index of briefer explanations and demonstrations extracted from Indicators in Action for users who need immediate information: (http://www.indistar.org/VideoPlayer/IndicatorsNow.aspx).

A major advantage of Indistar is that leadership teams and teams of teachers, based on content areas and grade levels, can record information about their chosen indicators and school improvement efforts in one location. This feature allows all users to view the entire comprehensive improvement plan and efforts, including implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and modifications. This overview of the comprehensive school improvement process provides leadership, grade-level, and content teams with information needed to integrate and link course materials and curriculum and evaluate progress. The bulletin board feature facilitates communication needed to establish integration and linkages between elements of the school improvement effort and to evaluate their impact on outcomes.

BRIEF SURVEY OF FEDERAL AND DISTRICT COORDINATORS REGARDING INDISTAR

In May, 2015, the Bureau of Legislative Research (BLR) conducted a brief survey of federal coordinators (or school liaisons) who oversaw the pilot-test of Indistar in 35 school districts in the 2014-15 school-year. This pilot only involved the district leadership team, and its aim was to elicit feedback about the use of Indistar in developing an ACSIP. The vast majority of responses to the BLR survey were very positive regarding the use of Indistar. Most respondents indicated that Indistar was a noteworthy improvement over the current SEDL software approach to ACSIP. Many highlighted the fact that all data were entered in one location, providing an overview of the entire improvement planning, implementation, Interim Measureable Objectives, tasks, assignments, meetings, coaching, evaluations, and modifications. The survey indicated that this overview of the entire comprehensive plan will

facilitate integration and linkages between elements of the ACSIP, such as grade-level and content teaching areas.

The sample indicators and evidence-based support for their use were highlighted in favorable reviews, along with the demonstrations of practices presented in the "Indicators in Action" feature of Indistar. Many federal coordinators also indicated that Indistar included teachers for the first time in ACSIP. They reaffirmed information provided in BLR's Adequacy Study site visits that teachers typically are not involved in the ACSIP process, and often they are unaware of their school's ACSIP.

In contrast, some of the federal coordinators gave negative responses about Indistar. A few indicated that Indistar was just another compliance approach to school improvement like the current approach to ACSIP. They also characterized ACSIP generally as additional burdensome paperwork that served no practical purpose.

The greatest concern expressed was the absence of systematic accounting procedures in Indistar. The concern is displayed in Appendix B, which is an actual entry in ACSIP-SEDL for 2014-15 by an Arkansas public school. In Appendix B, it may be observed that there is linkage between the intervention, actions, person responsible, timeline, and source of funds with details about how the money is spent. According to federal coordinators who participated in the pilot project, those linkages and descriptions were not present in Indistar. Aside from the lack of accounting details, they were also concerned that state and federal monitors would expect that level of detail to determine if expenditures were allowable under Federal regulations (Title 2 of the Code of Federal Regulations Part 200, Uniform Administrative requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards). The most recent version of these regulations may be accessed at: The Education General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), and 2 CFR Part 200 Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards. A brief summary of this oversight responsibility is shown in Appendix B (200.302 Financial Management). However, it should be noted that ADE staff indicated that these linkages are now presented in Indistar in a form similar to the previous approach.

 A final major concern noted in the survey of federal coordinators, and in conversations with them, was the absence of pre-population in Indistar. In the previous ACSIP-SEDL system, several data elements were already entered in the software, such as cash on hand, allotment balances, school names, enrollment, poverty, rank order based on poverty, indirect cost rate, and various allocations. Also, ACSIP-SEDL had built-in compliance features that gave error messages if required elements of a federal application were not provided or contained incorrect entries. It also had features that applied formulas to provide data needed in applications, and checked for errors. Without these automated features, all of this work will have to be done by hand, which will be labor-intensive and more subject to errors than programmed computations. There is also the problem of people, who have used automated software for several years, remembering how to calculate certain figures needed in Federal funding. ADE staff reported that the automated features are being developed in Indistar as well.

ACSIP ISSUES ADDRESSED BY ADE

This final section of the report deals with issues that have been presented in site visits by the Bureau of Legislative Research and in responses from various organizations such as the Arkansas Association of Education Administrators, Arkansas Education Association, and Arkansas Association of Federal Coordinators. For example, a major concern has been that the previous approach to ACSIP is merely a compliance document. However, the overwhelming opinion of federal coordinators and school improvement specialists is that the Indistar approach is a dynamic process that engages leaders and teachers in teamwork to develop, implement, monitor, modify, and link diverse elements, such as indicators, tasks, responsibilities,

assessments, and outcomes. The common phrase used for Indistar is "living document." The vast majority reported that Indistar is a significant improvement over the previous approach.

Another major concern was that the whole ACSIP process was "driven" by funding instead of interventions needed to improve student achievement. The whole Indistar approach to ACSIP is aimed at indicators (factors) identified in research as major factors contributing to student achievement gains.

A very common complaint was that a budget was created in APSCN and another in ACSIP. Aside from redundancy, these budgets often were not in agreement because they were prepared by different people. With the Indistar approach, only one budget is created in APSCN, and a form is filled out in Indistar with general items noted without attaching specific dollar amounts. According to Dr. Wilde, Public School Program Director, this procedure has been approved by the Arkansas Division of Legislative Audit.

There have been observations that ACSIP should be limited to targeted interventions that address populations/needs that require improvement. With the creation of DARTSS accountability classifications, exemplary and achieving schools submit a 3-year ACSIP and do not receive ADE interventions, while Focus and Priority Schools submit yearly ACSIPs and receive the vast majority of services from school improvement specialists.

There has been a concern that districts have to amend their ACSIP when they made trivial changes, such as ordering 25 computers instead of 20. This is not a problem in Indistar because you do not create a detailed budget, and the general form that is filled out does not specify exact numbers or dollar amounts. According to Act 841, Regular Session, 2015, the budget in Indistar must now only include a general description of the use of categorical funding for: a) alternative learning environments, b) professional development, c) English-language learners, and d) national school lunch students.

The previous approach did not have a repository of evidence-based practices like Indistar's Wise Ways, or videos that demonstrate practices like Indistar's Indicators in Action.   Indistar also allows conversion of documents to PDF and Word, which was a concern of some organizations.

Finally, perhaps the greatest advantage of Indistar over the previous approach is the ability to view the entire comprehensive school improvement planning process in one location.

REFERENCES

1. Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) (2012a). Approved ESEA Flexibility Request. Retrieved July 24, 2015, from, http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/map/ar.html

2. Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) (2012b). ESEA *Flexibility: Changes to School and District Accountability and Assistance*. Little Rock, AR: ADE power point. Retrieved July 2, 2015, from, www.arkansased.gov/.../**ESEA**/**ESEA-flexibility-**Arkansas_CIV_rev1_7

3. Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) (2014-15). *Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Planning (ACSIP) Handbook*. Little Rock, AR: Author. Retrieved May 6, 2015, from, http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Public_School_Accountability/ACSIP_Handbook_2014_2015.pdf

4. Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) (2015). *ESEA Flexibility Request.* Retrieved August 6, 2015, from, http://www.arkansased.gov/esea-flexibility

5. Borman, G. D., Hews, G. M., Overman, L. T., & Brown, S. (2003). Comprehensive School Reform and Achievement: A Meta-analysis. *Review of Education Research, 73*. 125-230. Retrieved June 6, 2013, from, http://rer.aera.net

6. Burkhauser, S., Gates, S. M., Hamilton, L. S., & Ikemoto,S. L. (2012). *First-Year Principals in Urban School Districts: How Actions and Working Conditions Relate to Outcomes*. Arlington, VA: RAND Corporation. Retrieved November 15, 2013, from, http://www.rand.org

7. Coleman, J. et al. (1966). *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

8. Coley, R. J., & Baker, B. (2013). *Poverty and Education: Finding the Way Forward*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. Retrieved October 7, 2013, from, www.ets.org/research

9. Dobbie, W., & Fryer, R. (2011a*). Creating "NO Excuses" (traditional) Public Schools: Preliminary Evidence from an Experiment in Houston.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Working Paper 17494. Retrieved February 28, 2013, from, http://www.nber.org/papers/w17494

10. Dobbie, W., & Fryer, R. (2011b). *Getting Beneath the Veil of Effective Schools: Evidence from New York City*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Working Paper 17632. Retrieved February 25, 2013, from, www.economics.harvard.edu/faculty/fryer/files/effective_schools.pdf

11. Edmonds, R. (1982). *Programs of School Improvement: An Overview.* Education Leadership, Retrieved July 16, 2015, from, http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_198212_edmonds.pdf

12. Indistar (2013). *The Basics.* Lincoln, IL: Academic Development Institute. Retrieved May 6, 2015, from, http://www.indistar.org/gettingstarted/resources/Indistar_The_Basics.pdf

13. Jencks, C. et al. (1972). *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America.* New York: Basic Books.

14. Lezotte, L. (2012). *Revolutionary and Evolutionary: The Effective Schools Movement.* Webberville, MI: Effective Schools. Retrieved July 16, 2015, from, https://www.effectiveschools.com/resources

15. Moynihan, D. (1965). *The Negro Family: The Case For National Action.* Washington, DC: Office of Policy Planning and Research, U. S. Department of Labor. Retrieved July 16, 2015, from, http://web.stanford.edu/~mrosenfe/Moynihan's%20The%20Negro%20Family.pdfNo

16. No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 U.S.C.S. § 6301 et seq. (2002). Retrieved February 22, 2014, from, http://www2.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml

17. Raudenbush, S. W. (2004). *Schooling, Statistics, and Poverty: Can We Measure School Improvement?* (William H. Angoff Memorial Lecture Series). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. Retrieved July 22, 2015, from, http://www.ets.org/Media/Education_Topics/pdf/angoff9.pdf

18. Ravitch, D. (2000). *Left Behind: A Century of Failed School Reform*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

19. Redding, S., & Rhim, L. M. (2014). Evolution of school turnaround. In L. M. Rhim & S. Redding (Eds.), *The State Role in School Turnaround: Emerging Best Practices (pp. 19– 28).* San Francisco, CA: WestEd. Retrieved July 21, 2015, from http://centeronschoolturnaround.org/ wp content/uploads/2013/12/Evolution_of_School_Turnaround1.pdf

20. Wendel, T. (2000). *Creating Equity and Quality: A Literature Review of School Effectiveness and Improvement.* Society for the Advancement of Excellence in Education. Retrieved July 15, 2015, from, http://education.devenir.free.fr/Documents/CreatingEquity.pdf

21. Wideen, M. F., & Pye, I. (1994). *The Struggle for Change: The Story of One School.* Bristol, PA: Taylor and Francis Inc.

Seven Turnaround Principles

- Leadership – skills & authority
- Effective Teachers – hiring, PD, evaluation
- Extended learning time – hours, days, year
- Rigorous instruction – standards, research,
- Use of data – instruction, school improvement
- School culture – commitment, discipline
- Engagement of parents & community – tutors, volunteers, decision-making

08/20/2015

APPENDIX B

Intervention: School-wide assistance will be provided to support effective instructional & parental involvement initiatives that focus on the social & academic language skills for all identified ELL students.

Actions	Person	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds	
State ELL funds will be used to purchase appropriate materials and supplies to support an ELL Parent\Student events to promote the ELL programs, inform parent of services, and provide a time for parents to become familiar with the teaching staff. Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Parental Engagement	(name)	(dates)	Adm. Staff Teachers	ELL (State-276) - Purchased Services:	$580.00
				ELL (State-276) - Materials & Supplies:	$2000.00
				ACTION BUDGET:	$2580

Source: 2014-2015 ACSIP – SEDL

200.302 Financial Management.

(a) Each state must expend and account for the Federal award in accordance with state laws and procedures for expending and accounting for the state's own funds. In addition, the state's and the other non-Federal entity's financial management systems, including records documenting compliance with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal award, must be sufficient to permit the preparation of reports required by general and program-specific terms and conditions; and the tracing of funds to a level of expenditures adequate to establish that such funds have been used according to the Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal award.