

FLORIDA
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
October 3-7, 2011

BACKGROUND

Overview of SIG Schools in Florida FY 2009

Tier	Number of FY 2009 Eligible SIG Schools	Number of FY 2009 Served SIG Schools
Tier I	52	52
Tier II	19	19
Tier III	758	6

Implementation of SIG School Intervention Models

Models	Number of Schools implementing the Model
Turnaround	17
Transformation	54
Restart	0
Closure	0

Overview of SIG Schools in Florida FY 2010

Tier	Number of FY 2010 Eligible SIG Schools	Number of FY 2010 Served SIG Schools
Tier I	37	31
Tier II	47	0
Tier III	890	0

Implementation of SIG School Intervention Models

Models	Number of Schools implementing the Model
Turnaround	5
Transformation	26
Restart	0
Closure	0

FLORIDA
 Targeted Monitoring Review of
 School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
 Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
 October 3-7, 2011

MONITORING TRIP INFORMATION

Monitoring Visits	
LEA Visited	<i>Miami-Dade County Public Schools</i>
School Visited	<i>Booker T. Washington Senior High School</i>
Model Implemented	<i>Turnaround</i>
FY 2009 Funding Awarded (over three years)	<i>LEA Award: \$43,279,701 School-level funding: \$644,329 (first year)</i>
FY 2010 Funding Awarded (over three year)	<i>LEA Award: \$6,225,000</i>
Monitoring Visits	
LEA Visited	<i>School District of Palm Beach County</i>
School Visited	<i>Lake Worth Community High School</i>
Model Implemented	<i>Transformation</i>
FY 2009 Funding Awarded (over three years)	<i>LEA Award: \$6,833,637 School-level funding: \$1,049,605 (first year)</i>
FY 2010 Funding Awarded (over three year)	<i>LEA Award: \$3,455,000</i>
Monitoring Visits	
SEA Visited	<i>Florida State Department of Education</i>
FY 2009 SIG Award	<i>\$170,241,485</i>
FY 2010 SIG Award	<i>\$26,990,000</i>

Staff Interviewed	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>SEA Staff: Latrell Edwards, Frederick Heid, Gina Eyerman</i> ➤ <i>LEA #1 Staff: Assistant Superintendent, Education Transformation Office (ETO) Staff</i> ➤ <i>School #1 Staff: Principal, vice principals, leadership team, 5 teachers, 3 parents, students and 3 classroom visits</i> ➤ <i>LEA #2 Staff: Director of Federal and State Programs, Area Superintendents, and staff</i> ➤ <i>School #2 Staff: Principal, leadership team, 5 teachers, 4 parents, students and 3 classroom visits</i> 	

U.S. Department of Education Staff	
Team Leader	<i>Carlas McCauley</i>
Staff Onsite	<i>David Yi and Molly Scotch</i>

FLORIDA
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
October 3-7, 2011

OVERVIEW OF MONITORING REPORT

The following report is based on the U.S. Department of Education's (ED) onsite monitoring visit to Florida from October 3 to October 7, 2011 and review of documentation provided by the State educational agency (SEA), local educational agencies (LEAs), and schools. The report consists of three sections: *Summary and Observations*, *Technical Assistance Recommendations*, and *Monitoring Findings*. The *Summary and Observations* section describes the implementation of the SIG program by the SEA, LEAs, and schools visited; initial indicators of success; and any outstanding challenges being faced in implementation. This section focuses on how the SEA, LEAs, and schools visited are implementing the SIG program with respect to the following five areas: school climate, staffing, teaching and learning, use of data, and technical assistance. The *Technical Assistance Recommendations* section identifies strategies and resources for addressing technical assistance needs. The *Monitoring Findings* section identifies areas where the SEA is not in compliance with the final requirements of the SIG program and indicates required actions that the SEA must take to resolve the findings.

Please note that the observations and descriptions included in this report reflect the specific context of the limited number of classrooms visited and interviews conducted at a small number of schools and LEAs within the State. As such, they offer a snapshot of what was occurring at the LEA and school levels, and are not meant to represent a school's, LEA's, or State's entire SIG program. Nor are we approving or endorsing any particular practices or approaches by citing them.

SUMMARY AND OBSERVATIONS

Climate

Miami-Dade County School District

According to Miami-Dade County School District (M-DPS) staff and Booker T. Washington Senior High School (BTWHS), it was necessary to make several changes to the school climate to improve student achievement including: building a more rigorous data system, implementing a behavior intervention system, and connecting students with resources in the greater Miami-Dade community. These issues were also reflected in the school's needs assessment, which called for teachers to take more responsibility for student achievement. BTWHS teachers and district staff explained that staff used student data in past years, but not at a level that would produce the marked changes in student performance. According to its needs assessment, BTWHS also needed help in implementing the Florida Continuous Improvement Model as well as the Response to Intervention (RtI) model that was mandated by the SEA for any school receiving SIG funds. In order to implement these models, school leadership indicated that the school was able to purchase software, such as Edusoft and Reading Plus, as well as increase its instructional coaching staff to aid in meeting these needs. BTWHS teaching staff indicated that these changes helped push the school to be more data driven and rigorous than it was in any years past.

FLORIDA
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
October 3-7, 2011

According to the BTWHS needs assessment, the school also needed to focus on strengthening its behavior interventions to improve its graduation rate and suspension numbers. With a graduation rate of less than 50% and over 200 out-of-school suspensions during the 2009-2010 school year, BTWHS leadership fully supported the implementation of the Positive Behavior Support (PBS) model as required by the LEA. BTWHS leadership credited the drop in suspensions and referrals during the 2010-2011 school year, in large part, to the PBS implementation. They also indicated that their alternative to suspension program (which was paid with SIG funds) allowed more students to recover credits and ultimately raise the graduation rate at the school. They stressed that these changes are the first steps towards reaching their goal of implementing all elements of PBS over time and to sustain the implementation. Additionally, M-DPS staff indicated that in past years BTWHS added to the culture of low expectations by not strictly enforcing the attendance policy. In the past two years, the attendance level has increased because of an Intervention Specialist, who is paid by SIG funds, and City Year staff who meet with truant students to help work through their barriers to attendance.

The third climate area the needs assessment highlighted was the need for more community involvement. BTWHS's needs assessment recommended that the school implement a Student Action Team (SAT) to increase the use of community mentors and partnerships and to re-energize the alumni association. With a SAT in place, school staff, parents, and students noticed a continuous change in the community's feelings about the school. They indicated that while the school must still improve, the community has begun to view the school as more of a success academically than it was in previous years. Parents of BTWHS students also indicated that they feel more welcome and included in school events now because of the increase in community partnerships and activities. They also noted that the teachers have become more accessible and open to taking suggestions or answering questions from members of the community. Parents indicated that these changes have transformed the school culture and that this year their students respect the teachers at BTWHS more than they have in the past.

School District of Palm Beach County

During interviews at the School District of Palm Beach County (SDPBC) and Lake Worth Community High School (LWCHS), staff indicated that students have always been proud to attend LWCHS because many family members have attended the school for generations. However, according to the school's needs assessment the culture was disjointed prior to SIG because of high staff turnover and students were struggling academically in reading, math, and science. According to LWCHS's needs assessment, the school had not met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for many years.

SDPBC realized that the school needed to make changes in several areas in order to create a "single school" culture. According to school leadership, its greatest concern was the school's inability to recruit and retain effective teachers. SDPBC indicated in its SIG application that an urban school like LWCHS needs monetary incentives to promote longer teaching commitments. After implementing pay for performance at the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year, school

FLORIDA
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
October 3-7, 2011

leadership noticed that teachers' expectations for themselves began to grow and that they felt more accountable for their work.

Another concern identified in LWCHS's needs assessment was a lack of collaborative planning that could help create a school-wide expectation for high rigor in the classroom as well as a more cohesive culture. With the SIG funds, LWCHS implemented a collegial planning time that allowed teachers in common subjects to meet at least once a week after school to discuss best practices, data, behavioral problems, and creative lesson ideas. According to LWCHS students, this year teachers are more involved and are able to both plan "cool lessons" together and offer increased extra-curricular offerings to engage students. Parents stated that their children felt more academically challenged and that teachers are more accessible and knowledgeable. LWCHS leadership also noted an increase in differentiated instruction and student-centered learning activities that allow the students to "own the information." The collaborative planning paved the way for the development of a tutoring program as well as credit recovery programs. Teachers indicated that with these changes the school has adopted a more focused vision for academics and student success

LWCHS's needs assessment also suggested that the school needed to provide more rigorous mechanisms for community and family engagement. The parents indicated that the diverse community provided communication challenges for the school. To reach its diverse community, the school used SIG funds to establish reading, math and science curriculum nights and well as a Parent Link system designed to make informative phone calls in the three common languages of the community. The SIG funds also allowed the school to hire a part-time Parent Liaison to answer questions and provide a list of community resources to parents. Despite these efforts to increase involvement, parents indicated that there is still a significant lack in parental involvement.

Changes in Leadership

Miami-Dade County School District

BTWHS replaced its principal during the 2009-2010 school year. The principal was chosen from a pool of applicants for his marked success in turning around other low-performing schools in the district. Although BTWHS's performance data improved since his hiring, ETO staff indicated that he had a different vision for school reform than did the district. This difference became evident during ETO's instructional review (a part of their monitoring protocol); the principal subsequently resigned in 2010. The current principal, who was hired in October 2010, was also selected because of his past success in a low-performing school, having helped achieve significant gains as a vice principal at another ETO high school. According to M-DPS staff, the school showed marked improvements within two weeks of hiring the current principal. Parents spoke about the new principal's "incredible accessibility and motivation" as something they noticed from his first day at the school. While the ETO office oversees the turnaround efforts,

FLORIDA
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
October 3-7, 2011

the principal at BTWHS stated that he feels that he has significant input into budget and personnel decisions.

School District of Palm Beach County

During the first year of the implementation of SIG in 2010-2011, SDPBC hired a new LWCHS principal and promoted the former principal to a district superintendent position in SDPBC's transformation area office. The new principal had a history of strong student academic gains. But in an effort to maintain growth and align school and district visions, he was replaced after one year in the position. SDPBC staff explained that they evaluated new principal candidates using locally adopted competencies and that they selected a candidate with considerable experience in a school, like LWCHS, that was part of a school-choice system. SDPBC assigned the current principal to LWCHS at the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year.

Changes in Staff

Miami-Dade County School District

As part of its turnaround efforts, M-DPS created an Education Transformation Office (ETO) to aid schools in Miami-Dade with the implementation of the SIG grant. A total of twenty six positions have been created to work in the (ETO). Led by an Assistant Superintendent, ETO is comprised of former teachers, instructional coaches, and instructional leaders with a proven record of improving student achievement in low-performing schools. Together, the staff supports the 26 ETO schools within M-DPS in various aspects of SIG implementation including the development of future leadership and staff and promotion of community engagement.

In its fiscal year (FY) 2009 SIG application, BTWHS explained that it opted for the Turnaround Model, in part, because it believes that schools in high-poverty communities must be reorganized and re-energized to counteract the effects of poverty. To recruit and retain highly effective instructional personnel, M-DPS used a data-based process to make decisions about staffing. BTWHS retained only teachers that showed marked learning gains in 65% or more of their students. Throughout the summer of 2010 and 2011 M-DPS staff and school leadership reviewed student data to make decisions about teacher replacements. A teacher who had been at BTWHS for three years or more could either be terminated or involuntarily moved to another district school. M-PDS placed any new district teacher on a one-year contract and could terminate the position within the first 90 days for a variety of reasons, including student achievement. The district staff explained that these contractual agreements were made with the union and that their relationship with the union is "strong and built on a foundation of honesty." After the first round of replacements, 55% of teachers that were dismissed from BTWHS were transferred to other district schools. According to district leadership, many of the vacant positions were filled by Teach for America (TFA) recruits because of these candidates' alignment to M-DPS's reforms.

FLORIDA
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
October 3-7, 2011

BTWHS also implemented a financial incentive program for teachers that is designed to improve student achievement. M-DPS provided teachers with a signing bonus in the SIG grant's first year and offered them in years two and three incentive pay that is directly linked to their students' Florida Comprehensive Academic Test (FCAT) scores. BTWHS hired reading and math coaches to help teachers improve their student test scores. According to interviews with BTWHS teachers, these coaches had an immediate impact, especially with the lowest 25% of students, and acted as "an extra hand and an extra brain" to raise test scores and to demonstrate best practices.

M-DPS also partnered with external providers to offer more staff support for its students. The school leadership described both its collaborative relationships with City Year and College Summit, which participated in some other M-DPS schools prior to SIG through private donations, and a Smaller Learning Community (SLC) grant from ED. District leadership explained that it is using student achievement data, as well as teacher and principal feedback, to assess the performance of its providers. According to M-DPS, it renewed both City Year and College Summit's contracts because they "did a fantastic job and are extremely committed to the work." TFA also became a central part of the teaching staff at BTWHS; ETO staff explained that many TFA teachers took leadership roles and helped build the school's teacher capacity.

School District of Palm Beach County

While SDPBC did not use SIG funds to add new positions to the district office, it tasked its Title I compliance specialist with modifying the responsibilities of existing employees to include monitoring and supporting SIG recipients. These employees work within a newly developed Transformation Area Office that also includes an area superintendent, area director, instructional support team leader and an administrative assistant. Together, the team is responsible for supporting and monitoring the implementation of reforms designed to turn around SDPBC's lowest performing schools, including SIG.

While LWCHS was not required to replace teachers as part of implementing the transformation model, SDPBC staff explained that it was willing to replace any of the teaching staff that did not support its transformation efforts or did not improve student achievement. LWCHS replaced several teachers because of poor performance. Like in M-DPS, SDPBC replaced teachers that failed to advance at least 65% of students an equivalent of a year or more on their FCAT. Parents indicated that they were upset because they were not informed prior to the staffing changes. SDPBC explained that it decided a month before FCAT testing to implement the transformation model at LWCHS and did not want to inform teachers and principals of possible personnel changes so close to the testing date.

According to LWCHS's SIG application, the school designed its pay-for-performance plan to be "both an attraction as well as a retention device to ensure high-quality educators are in front of the students." LWCHS used part of its SIG funds to create an incentive for all teachers who stayed for at least 99 school days. The school provided an additional amount to teachers of core subjects as well as another sum for those who improved student achievement within the core

FLORIDA
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
October 3-7, 2011

subject areas. New LWCHS teachers explained that they were surprised about the awards and that it motivated them to improve, even though it was not the deciding factor in choosing to teach at LWCHS. M-DPS also provided signing bonuses for new teachers, believing that it would increase its pool of applicants. SDPBC staff described LWCHS as an “urban school in a rural community” that made it difficult to recruit new and highly effective staff.

Teaching and Learning

Miami-Dade County School District

BTWHS’s needs assessment indicated that the schools’ instructional programs lacked sufficient rigor and were not implemented effectively. To improve its instructional programs, M-DPS adopted a new state-approved curriculum that complemented the Florida Next Generation Sunshine State Standards; they believed it would provide quality instruction, higher expectations, an increased focus on reading, and more consistency for students. M-DPS and BTWHS staff explained that they purchased programs that had been successful in other ETO schools. Two of the programs, Plugged into Reading and Accelerated Reader (AR), helped address BTWHS’s need for a cross-curricular reading program; teachers indicated that they were very excited to be using it. The school also changed the math curriculum to Carnegie Learning that focuses on Algebra and purchased Discovery Learning as a supplement to build background knowledge. Other programs added include the following: I-Core in Science and Advancement via Individual Determination (AVID) program.

BTWHS attempted to increase learning time by starting reading and math learning sessions on Saturdays from 9 AM to 12 PM. Teachers can apply to teach these sessions and indicated that they positively influence students. The school also added an extra 50-minute period that is aligned to the curriculum in the school’s career academies. Parents praised the school for offering a wide selection of both academic- and career-oriented classes.

Professional development time was increased as well. After conducting a needs assessment, BTWHS established lesson study groups that include teachers and instructional coaches for each core subject. These sessions occur during common planning times and allow instructional coaches to provide job-embedded professional development to teachers. The professional development focuses on the use of data to inform instruction, the positive behavior system, pacing within lessons and units of study, reading across curriculums, and how to use new software and programs.

The instructional coaches also worked with BTWHS leadership to create a tier system for evaluating teachers. The instructional coaches differentiate their amount of instructional support based upon a teacher’s tier selection, and as teachers demonstrate improvement, they are moved into different tiers. Teachers expressed gratitude at having so much support from the coaching staff. They highlighted the new coaches as one of the best uses of the SIG funds. Because of the new professional-development, combined with the increased learning time and instructional programs, the BTWHS leadership and teaching staff explained that the school’s rigor and culture

FLORIDA
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
October 3-7, 2011

had improved and that BTWHS's FCAT proficiency levels in all core subjects increased over the first year of SIG implementation.

School District of Palm Beach County

LWCHS's needs assessment concluded that the school should provide more time for teachers to work and plan with their team members. To address this need, SDPBC implemented collegial planning during the 2010-2011 school year. Once a week common core teachers meet with their colleagues, as well as with their assigned learning coaches, to discuss student progress, best instructional practices, and how to increase rigor. Teachers reported that they appreciate the increased collaboration time because they are often unable to meet together outside of this new planning time due to the large size of the campus.

LWCHS also adopted new instructional programs to improve their use of data and offer more student-centered opportunities in the classroom; these programs were not funded with the SIG grants. Leadership chose these programs for their track records and their alignment to the Next Generation of Sunshine State Standards. The teachers indicated that their students have responded positively to the reading programs especially Reading Plus and eBooks, and that Rotational Instructional Model (RIM) has created a balanced approach to language acquisition and competency for their English learners.

The school also increased job-embedded professional development by using instructional coaches to focus on various topics, including how to use textbooks, higher-order questions, and data. In addition to the formal professional development, school leadership explained that they are also providing teachers with weekly bulletins that include strategies for effective instruction and with bi-weekly professional development during team meetings.

Use of Data

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

M-DPS and BTWHS had a robust data system for making school-wide decisions prior to SIG implementation, but are focusing through its current turnaround effort on how to improve teacher use of data to inform instruction. Prior to the implementation of the SIG program, M-DPS already collected school-level data, including both current year and longitudinal data such as student attendance and school climate data. M-DPS used these data points, in addition to FCAT and interim assessment data, to review and analyze the school's progress and student achievement and to develop program outcome data for each of its SIG schools. This information was used to align curriculum and instruction, allocate resources, focus professional development, and create student growth measures. M-DPS used these measures to target and develop the required interventions in each of its SIG schools and develop its SIG application.

FLORIDA
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
October 3-7, 2011

At the same time, BTWHS determined that it needed to develop its staff's proficiency in collecting, analyzing, and using data. With this in mind, BTWHS included professional development on data-driven instruction as part of its larger lesson study initiative. As data are collected at the school, the lesson study teams modify instructional lessons in order to address current needs to more efficiently re-teach and reflect on classroom instruction.

M-DPS also conducts Data/COM meetings four times a year in which the Superintendent, M-DPS cabinet staff, regional superintendents, and all SIG school principals analyze individualized school-level data. Data elements included in the review are student achievement, student attendance, suspensions, withdrawals, and staff vacancies.

In addition to helping individual teacher improve their use of data, BTWHS's administrative team and instructional coaches hold regular meetings to discuss data. The school leadership team uses test data and classroom observations to collect information on areas such as student engagement and the rigor of teachers' lesson plans. The team uses the data to assess how the SIG strategic plan is being implemented and to target teachers that need more intensive support. Teachers reported that they also regularly meet with instructional coaches to discuss their students' data and use the data to make decisions on differentiated grouping in their classrooms and on which students need targeted remediation.

School District of Palm Beach County

As part of its SIG application, SDPBC planned to utilize the data that it collects in its Data Warehouse to support LWHS in its implementation of the SIG model. The SDPBC officials described Palm Beach as a "data-rich district" that collects many school- and district-level data in its Data Warehouse. SDPBC staff reported that it regularly collects and analyzes achievement data from its SIG schools to provide better support and assistance.

LWHS collects data on a weekly basis and is using it to inform its classroom instruction. Data are disseminated to the classroom level so that teachers understand their student performance and can discuss the data during learning team meetings and collegial planning. Teachers also administer formative and summative assessments at the end of each unit to determine what topics need to be re-taught and which students may need more remediation. Instructional coaches also use the data to work with teachers to improve instructional strategies. LWHS also uses data from the Data Warehouse to establish early warning systems such as identifying students who are at risk of failing or not graduating. The school regularly analyzes the data to determine if it is on track to meet its progress towards meeting its goals and effectively implementing the intervention model.

Technical Assistance

Florida Department of Education

FLORIDA
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
October 3-7, 2011

The SEA provided application support to its districts. In preparation for the SIG application process, the SEA held a series of webinars and conference calls with LEAs about the steps they would need to take to prepare for and submit a SIG application. The technical assistance included making sure that all components of the LEA application were completed including conducting needs assessments and selecting an appropriate intervention model for each SIG school. For the FY 2010 SIG application, the SEA also provided additional information and support to the superintendent of every district that had previously not had schools awarded SIG funds. The SEA also provided LEAs an email address to specifically address SIG questions and maintained a list of ongoing frequently asked questions that LEAs could use as a reference.

FLDOE divided the state into five regional centers to support SIG implementation. Each regional center has a team that is led by a Regional Executive Director (RED) and includes instructional specialists in reading, mathematics, science, and Response to Intervention (RtI). The REDs report back to the Regional Executive Director of School Improvement at the FLDOE, and they are in continuous contact with each other to provide updates on SIG schools and districts. The regional teams provide direct technical assistance to the SIG schools and districts in their region by conducting on-site visits. During these visits they assess the needs of each school and then work in partnership with the districts to address any areas of weakness. Schools are provided action plans that outline the key actions that need to be taken, including changes to staff and timelines. The areas of need that the regional teams address include: curriculum and instruction, school leadership, school improvement planning, professional development, and teacher quality. Both district- and school-level officials reported that the FLDOE regional teams have been very supportive and helpful in ensuring that the intervention models are being implemented effectively and that their needs are addressed. Through this technical assistance approach, there is open and regular communication between the SEA, LEAs, and SIG schools.

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

M-DPS staff speak about a strong commitment to building the district's capacity to support the lowest-performing schools. Both BTWHS's and M-DPS's SIG applications focus on developing district and school leadership teams that are able to "establish key attributes to facilitate school change, including: a mutually aligned vision for confronting the multiple factors negatively affecting student academic success." In order to build district capacity to work with SIG schools, M-DPS created the ETO office. ETO staff work with school leadership to aid in turning around the original nineteen lowest-performing schools identified for SIG in M-DPS. This year, they will begin working with the additional seven schools added for cohort 2 of SIG. According to handouts created by ETO leadership, the mission of ETO is to recruit and retain high-quality educators, provide wrap around services for students, build the capacity of teachers, develop instructional leadership, and promote community engagement all for the purpose of increasing student achievement. As part of ETO's turnaround vision and commitment to capacity building (and with help from another grant from ED), M-DPS is implementing project LEAD, a six-month internship for instructional coaches and assistant principals preparing to lead ETO school and continued job-embedded professional development for current ETO principals.

FLORIDA
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
October 3-7, 2011

Additionally, M-DPS supports its SIG schools by providing professional development and collaboratively planning strategies in instruction, capacity building, lesson planning, data analysis, and student interventions. The ETO also provides instructional supervisors and curriculum support supervisors who work directly with the instructional coaches at SIG schools. ETO staff visit schools on a regular basis; school officials reported having an open line of communication to reach out to the ETO. The ETO also conducts three official instructional reviews at each school every year in conjunction with the FLDOE.

M-DPS also uses its quarterly Data/COM meetings with SIG principals to identify areas of needs, develop strategies to further support schools, and hold LEA and school administrative staff accountable. From the information presented at the Data/COM meetings, M-DPS is able to develop school action plans for acceleration of improvement; provide direct support to coaches, teachers, and students; track schools' progress toward meeting their annual target goals and develop high-quality intervention materials to assist schools' turnaround efforts. Specific emphasis is placed on the Benchmark Interim Assessment results and the data from these assessments are used to flag and design interventions for the core content areas in reading, mathematics, science, and writing. Progress updates are provided at subsequent Data/COM meetings to review the effectiveness of interventions.

M-DCPS also funded leadership academies for SIG assistant principals and teacher academies for SIG teachers to attend during the summer to prepare for the interventions that would be implemented during the school year. The assistant superintendent of the ETO stated that his goal is to provide extensive support to principals, assistant principals, instructional coaches, and teachers so that the district has a pipeline of experienced turnaround leaders in the future to sustain reform efforts.

School District of Palm Beach County

The SDPBC uses its transformation area office to provide on-site support and technical assistance to its SIG schools. The transformation area office pairs a support specialist from the district with instructional coaches at the school in the areas of reading, math, writing and science. The district support specialist is on-site one to two days a week to mentor the instructional coaches, provide additional resources, and ensure that all teaching is aligned to State standards. Additionally, SDPBC hosts a website called Learning Village that provides additional resources for SIG schools such as curriculum pacing guides, training opportunities, and tools that instructional coaches can use in their schools. SDPBC also uses an internal Microsoft SharePoint website to track the progress of SIG implementation. SDPBC requires SIG principals to update and upload documentation of the activities that have been completed at their schools as part of SIG implementation. SDPBC and the regional RED use this information to provide further support to schools if they are missing targets or falling behind in implementation.

SDPBC also planned to further utilize the data that it collects in its Data Warehouse to better support LWHS in its implementation of the SIG model. As part of its technical assistance,

FLORIDA
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
October 3-7, 2011

SDPBC staff reported that it regularly analyzes achievement data to make sure SIG schools are making progress towards their goals. Regional superintendents also work with the school administration to use the data to make adjustments to their SIG plan and ensure that schools are making progress toward meeting their annual targets.

FLORIDA
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
October 3-7, 2011

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE RECOMMENDATION

This section addresses areas where additional technical assistance may be needed to improve the quality of implementation of the SIG program.

Issue: Interviews with parents and school staff about the SIG program at Lake Worth Community High School revealed that parents have not been fully informed about events and offerings at the school and changes that are occurring as part of the reform effort. Parents noted that the biggest challenge is educating parents with limited English proficiency, a large percentage of the greater Lake Worth community.

Technical Assistance Strategies:

- Provide resources (including webinars) to the Florida Department of Education (FDOE) that discuss effective strategies and examples of engaging parents in the school community and reform efforts. (Responsibility: ED)
- Develop a family and community engagement plan or a set of strategies that will help Lake Worth Community High School and other schools improve parent and community outreach and increase parent engagement in the implementation of a turnaround effort (Responsibility: SDPBC)

FLORIDA
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
October 3-7, 2011

MONITORING FINDINGS

Summary of Monitoring Indicators

Critical Element	Requirement	Status	Page
1. Application Process	The SEA ensures that its application process was carried out consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Sections I and II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]	Finding	16-17
2. Implementation	The SEA ensures that the SIG intervention models are being implemented consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Sections I and II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]	Finding	18
3. Fiscal	The SEA ensures LEAs and schools are using funds consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Section II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010)) ; §1114 of the ESEA; and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-87]	N/A	
4. Technical Assistance	The SEA ensures that technical assistance is provided to its LEAs consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Section II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]	N/A	
5. Monitoring	The SEA ensures that monitoring of LEAs and schools is being conducted consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Section II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]	N/A	
6. Data Collection	The SEA ensures that data are being collected consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Sections II and III of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]	N/A	

FLORIDA
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
October 3-7, 2011

Monitoring Area: School Improvement Grant

Critical Element: Application Process

Finding 1:

During the FY 2009 SIG application process, FLDOE awarded SIG funds to LEAs on a noncompetitive, formula basis: FLDOE awarded \$46.2 million in SIG funds to all of its LEAs with Tier I and Tier II schools (52 Tier I and 19 Tier II schools). As a result of FLDOE's noncompliance with SIG requirements, ED reiterated to FLDOE during the FY 2010 SIG application approval process that the SEA was required to use a competitive application process to award FY 2010 SIG funds to enable LEAs to fully and effectively implement intervention models.

FLDOE's FY 2010 application process did not ensure that LEAs received awards that were of sufficient size and scope to support the activities outlined in the LEA applications and to fully and effectively implement the intervention models in SIG schools. Although FLDOE conducted a competition through which it assessed the capacity and commitment of the LEA applicants and made awards only to applicants with the highest scores, it made awards based on a formula and disregarded the amounts requested in the LEAs' SIG applications. An LEA that met a minimum score requirement in the application review received a base funding of \$500,000 for each of the Tier I schools it was approved to serve. FLDOE awarded additional funds using a formula based on school size, poverty level, and score earned on the application review. LEAs received between \$730,000 and \$975,000 in FY 2010 SIG funds for each of the thirty-one Tier I schools they were approved to serve.

Citation: Section II.B.5 of the final requirements for the SIG program states that “[a]n SEA must award a School Improvement Grant to an LEA in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to support the activities required under section 1116 of the ESEA and these requirements. The LEA’s total grant may not be less than \$50,000 or more than \$2,000,000 per year for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school that the LEA commits to serve.” (75 FR 66363, 66369 (October 28, 2010))

Further action required:

As a result of the repeated noncompliance, FLDOE must:

1. Provide each LEA that received a SIG grant through the FY 2010 competition an opportunity to submit an amended application demonstrating the amount of funds the LEA needs to continue full and effective implementation of the school intervention models in the schools it is serving with FY 2010 SIG funds (or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds awarded through the FY 2010 competition) during the 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 school years;

FLORIDA
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
October 3-7, 2011

2. Carefully review each LEA's amended application and determine the amount that each LEA needs to continue full and effective implementation of the school intervention models in the schools it is serving with FY 2010 SIG funds (or FY 2009 carryover SIG funds awarded through the FY 2010 competition) during the 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 school years;
3. Submit its process to address these corrective actions to ED within 30 days of receipt of this letter. This submission must include: (a) the information that FLDOE plans to provide its LEAs regarding the renewal process; (b) a description of the process it will use to review each LEA's amended application, including the process it will use to determine the amount of funds each LEA needs to continue full and effective implementation of the school intervention models during the 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 school years; and (c) an assurance that moving forward, the FLDOE will continue to make award decisions by reviewing the amount of funds each LEA needs to fully and effectively implement school intervention models.
4. After reviewing LEAs' amended applications, submit to ED by April 30, 2012: (a) the results of the process described in step 3(b) (*i.e.*, the amount of SIG funds the FLDOE intends to award to each LEA that received SIG funds through the FY 2010 competition for its continued implementation in the 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 school years); and (b) the source(s) of funds for these awards. For purposes of this submission, FLDOE should assume that each LEA that received SIG funds through the FY 2010 competition will, in fact, receive a renewal award.
5. After reviewing state assessment data and examining whether schools that received FY 2010 (or FY 2009 carryover) SIG funds met their achievement goals, submit to ED by July 15, 2012 any revisions to: (a) the amount of SIG funds the FLDOE intends to award to each LEA that received SIG funds through the FY 2010 competition for its continued implementation in the 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 school years; and (b) the source(s) of funds for these awards.

ED will review the FLDOE's written submissions and will not approve the FLDOE's FY 2011 SIG application or award the SEA's FY 2011 funds until its review of the submissions is complete and it has determined that the FLDOE has demonstrated that LEAs that received SIG funds through the FY 2010 competition will receive a sufficient amount of funds to fully and effectively implement the school intervention models in the 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 school years.

In addition, FLDOE must award its FY 2011 SIG funds by July 31, 2012, and submit a written report to ED demonstrating that it used those funds to make awards as it described it would do pursuant to this corrective action. Upon review of that report and confirmation that, in fact, FLDOE made its FY 2011 SIG awards in compliance with the final requirements for the SIG program, this finding will be resolved.

FLORIDA
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
October 3-7, 2011

Critical Element: Implementation

Finding 2:

The documentation provided by the FLDOE does not demonstrate that M-DPS implemented increased learning time (ILT) at Booker T. Washington Senior High School (BTWHS) as required for the Turnaround model. While FLDOE provided school schedules for BTWHS, it is unclear where the additional time was added and how it is being used. The FLDOE also did not ensure that SDPBC implemented ILT with fidelity in Lake Worth Community High School (LWCHS), as required for the transformation model. Although LWCHS rearranged the school schedule to increase the instructional minutes-in the school day, the school did not significantly increase the total number of school hours to include additional time for the three required ILT components: instruction in core academic subjects, instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities, and additional time for teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development.

Citation: Sections I.A.2(a)(viii) and I.A.2(d)(3)(i)(A) of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010)), requires an LEA implementing the Turnaround or Transformation models to establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in the final requirements.)

Further action required: FLDOE must demonstrate that schools implementing the Turnaround and Transformation models are implementing ILT with fidelity by significantly increasing the total number of school hours to include additional time for the three components outlined in the SIG final requirements. The FLDOE must submit evidence to ED that it has reviewed each LEA that received SIG funds to implement the Transformation and Turnaround model to determine if increased learning time is actually being provided consistent with the SIG final requirements . The FLDOE must then submit to ED a timeline for implementing ILT in schools that are currently failing to do so.