

ILLINOIS
 Targeted Monitoring Review of
 School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
 Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
 December 12-16, 2011

BACKGROUND

Overview of SIG Schools in Illinois FY 2009

Tier	Number of FY 2009 Eligible SIG Schools	Number of FY 2009 Awarded SIG Schools
Tier I	40	4
Tier II	20	6
Tier III	678	0

**Implementation of
 SIG School Intervention Models**

Models	Number of Schools Implementing the Model
Turnaround	4
Transformation	4
Restart	1
Closure	1

Overview of SIG Schools in Illinois FY 2010

Tier	Number of FY 2010 Eligible SIG Schools	Number of FY 2010 Awarded SIG Schools
Tier I	46	8
Tier II	52	5
Tier III	829	0

**Implementation of
 SIG School Intervention Models**

Models	Number of Schools Implementing the Model
Turnaround	0
Transformation	13
Restart	0
Closure	0

ILLINOIS
 Targeted Monitoring Review of
 School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
 Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
 December 12-16, 2011

MONITORING TRIP INFORMATION

Monitoring Visits

LEA Visited	<i>Chicago Public Schools</i>
School Visited	<i>Phillips Academy</i>
Model Implemented	<i>Restart</i>
FY 2009 Funding Awarded (over three years)	<i>LEA Award: \$23,993,655 School-level Funding: \$5,135,370</i>
FY 2010 Funding Awarded (over three years)	<i>LEA Award: \$47,999,998</i>
Monitoring Visits	
LEA Visited	<i>Springfield Public Schools</i>
School Visited	<i>Lanphier High School</i>
Model Implemented	<i>Transformation</i>
FY 2009 Funding Awarded (over three years)	<i>LEA Award: \$0 School-level funding: \$0</i>
FY 2010 Funding Awarded (over three years)	<i>LEA Award: \$5,523,420 School-level funding: \$5,305,428</i>
Monitoring Visits	
SEA Visited	<i>Illinois State Board of Education</i>
FY 2009 SIG Award	<i>\$22,555,328; ARRA: \$124,023,185</i>
FY 2010 SIG Award	<i>\$22,145,132</i>

Staff Interviewed

- *SEA Staff: Monique Chism, Kurt Miller, Elizabeth Staudenmeier*
- *Chicago Public Schools: Director of High School Strategy & Execution, Director of Performance Management*
- *Phillips Academy: Principal, vice principals, Leadership Team, teachers, parents, students, Academy for Urban School Leadership (AUSL) staff*
- *Springfield Public Schools: Superintendent, School Turnaround Officers, department staff*
- *Lanphier High School: Principal, Leadership Team, teachers, parents, students*

U.S. Department of Education Staff

Team Leader	<i>Carlas McCauley</i>
Staff Onsite	<i>Ashley Brown, Michael Lamb, Michael Wells, David Yi</i>

ILLINOIS
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
December 12-16, 2011

OVERVIEW OF MONITORING REPORT

The following report is based on the U.S. Department of Education's (ED) onsite monitoring visit to Illinois from December 12-16, 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, teachers and leaders, instructional strategies and time, 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

School Climate

Phillips Academy (Chicago Public Schools)

The Academy for Urban School Leadership (AUSL), the lead partner selected to implement the restart model at Phillips Academy, focused on improving the school climate as part of its restart effort. As part of its needs assessment of Phillips Academy, the AUSL noted that the school faced a number of issues regarding climate and culture, including considerable school violence and gang activity in the surrounding neighborhoods. To address these issues, Phillips Academy's SIG application included a major focus on: (1) safety, discipline, and engagement; (2) action against adversity (e.g., disengaged parents, gang activity); and (3) development of close student-adult relationships.

Since the school implemented the restart model, teachers, parents and students have reported that there have been fewer fights and the school has implemented a strategy to more consistently enforce its rules. Staff, students, and parents also reported that the environment at Phillips Academy was more welcoming, the school was cleaner, and there was more engagement with teachers and staff. Both students and parents noted feeling that teachers care and are invested in the success of students.

ILLINOIS
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
December 12-16, 2011

Additionally, Chicago Public Schools (CPS) has developed plans to address the attendance problems throughout all the district's SIG schools. At Phillips Academy, plans are to target the top non-attenders and provide opportunities to make up missed days after school and provide non-monetary incentives for on-time attendance. During the first year of the restart, staff discovered that records were not updated and there were a number of students (as many as 300) still on the enrollment list that were no longer living in the area or had completely stopped attending school some time before the restart began. Updating these records took some time and resulted in a large number of students being dropped from enrollment lists. Efforts to intervene and encourage non-attenders are beginning and continue to be developed. The school has introduced incentives for academic success including a program that recognizes students for attendance and achievement every five weeks.

Lanphier High School (Springfield Public Schools)

Like Chicago Public Schools, Springfield Public Schools (SPS) emphasized creating a safe and supportive learning environment to improve Lanphier High School. To improve school climate, the school established a Freshman Academy as well as academies for grades 10, 11, and 12 to create smaller learning communities. The Freshman Academy is designed to continue to help freshman with their transition into high school and raise freshman achievement levels. Teachers in the freshman academy spend time collaborating and aligning their teaching efforts. Both students and teachers report that the Freshman Academy has had a positive impact on teaching and overall school culture. Lanphier High School is also focusing on the first year of high school by implementing a Summer Bridge orientation program for all incoming freshmen. The Summer Bridge program sets forth early the school's expectations for academics and behavior and assists students with their initial transition into high school.

Moreover, the school employed a social worker to address significant social emotional needs of students and implemented Positive Behavior Intervention Strategies (PBIS). The school stated that it will measure success of these strategies by reviewing student attendance, discipline incidents, and academic successes.

In interviews, the majority of students, parents, and teachers did not report seeing a dramatic change in overall school climate. Some administrators reported that the level of disruption and violence at the school had declined from previous years, but data provided by the school showed that the number of suspensions had increased in the first semester of SIG implementation as compared to the previous school year. Still, many believe that the school is poised for significant improvements in school culture and climate. Parents indicated that they feel more engaged with staff this school year than in previous years. Students also noted that they were aware that teachers and staff have raised their expectations of students and expect them to graduate. However, some students were concerned that not all teachers genuinely believe in the statements about increased expectations.

Teachers and Leaders

ILLINOIS
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
December 12-16, 2011

Phillips Academy

As part of the restart model, the principal at Phillips Academy was replaced. AUSL selected a new principal from its pool of successful assistant principals at other AUSL schools, but did not renew the principal's contract for the second year. The Phillips Academy's assistant principal became the principal at the beginning of the second year of implementation.

AUSL interviewed all teachers who applied to stay at Phillips Academy as part of the restart and elected to rehire two of those teachers. AUSL determined that the school needed faculty who could align lessons to standards, use data to inform instruction, and raise the level of rigor. To recruit teachers with those skills, AUSL used a human resources database that it maintains to screen and hire teachers at its schools; twenty new teachers were former residents from AUSL's teacher residency program. After the first year of implementation, fifteen to eighteen teachers did not return to the school. It appears that the school leadership asked at least seven teachers to leave before the second year for failure to meet expectations.

Students and parents overwhelmingly had positive comments about the new teachers and administration. Students reported that they appreciated that their teachers were more engaged and held them to a higher standard as compared to past years.

AUSL provided Phillips Academy with five coaches – one for each core content area. Coaches provide support in every classroom at least once per week and assist with lesson planning, instructional strategies, and professional development. Assistant Principals also provide support in at least three classrooms each day for observation with a post-observation conference. Teachers reported that the instructional coaches have had a positive impact on teaching and learning.

AUSL also provides extensive professional development to staff based on the school's needs. Phillips Academy's teachers reported that its new professional development is relevant and applicable in the classroom. Moreover, the school leadership reported that staff is using the knowledge gained from professional development in their planning and delivery of instruction. Phillips Academy's teachers explained that school leadership has encouraged them to seek additional professional development based on their own interests and needs and that many have done so.

Lanphier High School

Springfield Public Schools (SPS) replaced the principal as part of implementing the transformation model. SPS conducted a nationwide search for a new principal before selecting an individual who had previously served as a principal at an alternative school. LEA staff reported that the new principal understands how to improve the school culture; the LEA staff will provide some ongoing support on instruction leadership.

SPS retained the majority of the Lanphier High School's faculty during the first year of implementation, after determining that the faculty was well-positioned to implement the

ILLINOIS
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
December 12-16, 2011

necessary reforms. To help facilitate the reform process, Lanphier introduced a new staffing structure of twelve teacher-leader positions that serve as instructional coaches. The teacher-leaders are full-time teachers who set aside one hour in the day to provide instructional support to other teachers. Each teacher-leader meets regularly with a group of teachers that teach different grades and subject matters. In interviews, teachers stated that the school leadership's criteria for selecting teacher-leaders was unclear and that the new staffing structure made it more difficult to collaborate with teachers that taught in the same content area.

As part of SPS's strategy, the staff at Lanphier High School has participated in professional development sessions provided by two vendors. According to some teachers, the providers' sessions often lacked coordination with each other and the professional development in general does appear to be part of an overarching strategy. In addition, it appeared that that much of the professional development is provided during time designed for collaboration between teachers, leaving less time for collaboration.

School and district leadership reported that it intends to provide teacher leaders with training on how to conduct walk-throughs and provide feedback to other teachers. However, at the time of the visit, this element had not been fully implemented. Additionally, SPS identified additional areas for support, including the student assessment process, using data to inform and improve instruction, and data management. SPS also expressed a desire to network with other SIG schools.

Instructional Strategies and Time

Phillips Academy

AUSL changed the school day to provide freshman with an additional period of content each day. Freshman now attend eight periods of core-academic classes and participate in an elective course (e.g., physical education, ROTC, fine arts) at the end of the school day. According to interviews, Phillips Academy teachers are also spending more time each day to work with students and plan their lessons.

Lanphier High School

Lanphier High School is aligning curriculum and assessments with the common core standards over the three-year SIG grant period. The school will begin curricular and assessment alignment to the reading and math standards in the second year of implementation, science and social studies in the third year, and other content areas the following year.

The school also is attempting to increase the number of students who complete advanced coursework. In 2010, 252 students completed advanced mathematics courses, compared with 180 in 2008. While no students completed dual enrollment courses in 2009, 115 students were participating in dual enrollment in 2010.

ILLINOIS
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
December 12-16, 2011

Lanphier has taken several steps to increase learning time. In the 2009-2010 school year (prior to the start of the SIG intervention), Lanphier shifted from a six-period day to a seven-period day and added eleven minutes to the school day. Additionally, as part of the SIG intervention in the 2011-2012 school year, the school increased the overall school day by 15 minutes and subtracted 2 minutes from each class period to create an additional enrichment period for students. Students, teachers, and parents reported mixed results and some concerns about the enrichment period. While some eleventh-grade students found the enrichment period valuable for ACT preparation, many parents and students expressed concerns that two minutes were removed from each class period. Many students feel it is now more difficult to fully grasp class material and stated that the enrichment period was not valuable to them. Teachers also reported that it is challenging and often stressful to complete their lessons in the shorter class period.

Use of Data

Phillips Academy

AUSL has prioritized using data to inform instruction at Phillips Academy. Staff at the school reported collecting and analyzing data on a regular basis to make instructional decisions. At the end of each class period, students complete an exit ticket so that teachers may assess whether students grasped the lesson objectives. Each student has an individual data profile that is kept up-to-date with test scores, attendance, and disciplinary information. Phillips Academy staff also use detailed attendance data to target the top non-attenders and provide opportunities to make up missed days after school and provide incentives for on-time attendance and achievement.

Chicago Public Schools

CPS has established an office dedicated to data collection and analysis which provides technical assistance on findings from data analyses, how to interpret and understand that data, and how that data can be useful in planning and making needed adjustments in school-wide planning, classroom approaches, and individual teacher- student plans and learning activities. Additionally, CPS is working with the Consortium on Chicago School research to develop metrics that will determine whether students are on track for postsecondary success. Schools that are supported by CPS's Office of School Turnaround utilize the Scantron Performance Series online adaptive assessment, which provides snapshots of student growth in reading, mathematics, and science three times each school year.

Lanphier High School

Lanphier created a data and individual-student-learning-plan manager position for the full grant period. This position was created to increase the school's capacity to use data effectively, measure student progress, and address individual students' needs. Currently, the data manager is a half-time position and splits her time between teaching and coaching. The teachers and administration have stated that having only a half-time position has made it difficult for the school to collect, analyze, and disseminate data regularly to teachers to make instructional decisions. Lanphier plans to make this position full-time beginning in the second semester of the

ILLINOIS
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
December 12-16, 2011

2011-12 school year. The school intends to identify and individually assess students' needs through monthly, quarterly, and yearly screenings; place students struggling with reading and math in a 30-minute intervention block; and create enrichment and extension activities for students functioning at or above grade level.

Lanphier High School also uses an early-warning system to track and monitor student progress during the first twenty days of school and help the school identify students who need extra assistance before they fall too far off track. Students currently have access to their individual cumulative data folders, which include the results of assessments and standardized tests, current grades, grade transcripts, credits earned, and attendance.

Springfield Public Schools

SPS is collecting SIG leading indicators and other indicators of student success. The LEA staff member on site at the school regularly shares school-level data with the rest of the staff.

Technical Assistance

Chicago Public Schools

As a school implementing the restart model, Phillips Academy has received the majority of its technical assistance, professional development, and support from its lead partner, the Academy for Urban School Leadership.

CPS has played a more direct role in providing technical assistance and support to its other eleven SIG schools. CPS has provided central office staff to work directly with SIG schools on site. Each staff member is assigned to four schools and regularly visits and works with staff to support the implementation of the intervention models. Additionally, the CPS provides professional development that is available to all schools within the district to staff and leaders working in SIG schools.

In 2009, the CPS created an Office of School Improvement (OSI) that provides oversight and operational and strategic management support to lead partners that work directly with SIG schools. The Chief School Improvement Officer in the Office of School Improvement reports directly to the CPS Chief Executive Officer. The OSI is staffed with school improvement specialists, subject matter experts, and project managers who have had documented successful experience in turning around low-performing schools.

Springfield Public Schools

There are two LEA staff members dedicated to SIG at SPS. One member of the LEA staff is located on-site at Lanphier High School and another individual is a turnaround officer at the district office. The on-site staff is a former SIG principal who led a successful turnaround effort at another school and was hired to work directly with the Lanphier's principal to provide support in the implementation of the transformation model. The turnaround officer at the district office

ILLINOIS
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
December 12-16, 2011

coordinates with other departments in the LEA to provide district-level support to Lanphier High School. The turnaround officer is in direct contact with the Superintendent and cabinet members to provide support in the recruitment, selection, and retention of highly qualified staff; budgeting; integration of technology; use of data to drive instruction; professional development and integration of all instructional services.

Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE)

ISBE administers the SIG program through its Office for Innovation and Improvement. The Division Administrator of the Office for Innovation and Improvement serves as the ISBE SIG lead. Additionally, the ISBE has created three positions to serve as principal consultants for the SIG program (one position was vacant at the time of the visit). One principal consultant works with all CPS SIG schools while the other principal consultant works with all other SIG schools in Illinois. The principal consultants serve as the main ISBE points of contacts to SIG schools and conduct monitoring and site visits. Both principal consultants have prior experience working in school turnaround either as district or school leaders. The ISBE has also hired two additional staff members to assist in the monitoring visits.

The ISBE provided extensive technical assistance to schools and districts in the SIG application process. The ISBE staff hosted a four-course, web-based series designed to ensure that applications were built upon best practices for dramatic school improvement. ISBE encouraged district teams to engage in the large group and self-paced sessions as a full district team. Additionally, ISBE provided support to LEAs on understanding the SIG requirements and models, conducting needs assessments, increasing district and school capacity, improving performance management, managing the budget process, contracting and using lead partners, and engaging and responding to local school boards. ISBE also provided LEAs with an approved lead-providers list to assist them in selecting lead partners. Additional technical assistance included multiple webinars, statewide conferences, and onsite visits to applying districts. Finally, ISBE staff met with all non-funded SIG grantees to talk about why they were not funded and what they could do to build their capacities to support school turnaround efforts.

The ISBE staff reported that they did not feel they provided as much technical assistance as they would have liked during the Cohort I (FY 2009) application period due to a shortened timeframe and small state-level staff. The ISBE reported that the overall quality of the SIG applications it received for its second cohort of SIG schools was much higher than the quality of the applications it received from its first cohort because of the increased technical assistance that ISBE provided to districts during the application process.

The ISBE has increased its staff and are planning for more frequent visits and contacts with districts as they move into full implementation of their SIG models. The ISBE stated it has provided less technical assistance for implementation than it for the application process. Much of the support for implementation, as well as individual support for district-level transformation officers, have been left to the districts' lead partners. The ISBE staff requested more support in helping districts address operational flexibility for principals in the SIG-awarded schools.

ILLINOIS
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
December 12-16, 2011

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE RECOMMENDATIONS

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

Issue 1: The ISBE requested technical assistance on how to work with LEAs to provide principals with more operational flexibility (e.g., for staffing, scheduling, and budgeting).

Technical Assistance Strategies:

- Connect ISBE with other states that have had success supporting their LEAs in establishing more autonomy at the school level (Responsibility: ED).
- Connect ISBE with external resources or providers that have had experience supporting schools in using operational flexibility to achieve results (Responsibility: ED).

Issue 2: Although external providers seem to be offering extensive professional-development opportunities, some LEAs need more support to target some professional development at improving data use and instructional coaching. LEAs also need support in holding external providers accountable.

Technical Assistance Strategies:

- Connect ISBE with the Center for Innovation and Improvement for strategies to hold external providers accountable and ensure they are providing meaningful professional development (Responsibility: ED).
- Offer LEAs support in creating plans to track projects and tasks that external providers have agreed to complete (Responsibility: ISBE).
- Connect LEAs struggling to use instructional and data coaches to those LEAs that are effectively using those strategies (Responsibility: ISBE).

Issue 3: Some LEAs would benefit from additional support in recruiting, supporting, and retaining effective teachers, particularly in terms of developing teacher/leader pathways.

Technical Assistance Strategies:

- For those LEAs that are struggling to recruit additional effective teachers, offer LEAs strategies to that would help recruit effective teachers from outside the LEA, or from other successful schools in the LEA (Responsibility: ISBE).
- Provide LEAs with support around transparently building career pathways within schools, particularly teacher/leader positions, so that there is increased capacity at the school level that will sustain reforms (Responsibility: ISBE).

ILLINOIS
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
December 12-16, 2011

Issue 4: Some LEAs need more support in helping schools align curriculum to the state standards.

Technical Assistance Strategies:

- Help LEAs develop processes for benchmarking and curriculum mapping so that schools can better assess whether their curriculum is aligned with state standards (Responsibility: ISBE).

ILLINOIS
 Targeted Monitoring Review of
 School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
 Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
 December 12-16, 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))]	N/A	
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	14-15
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	

ILLINOIS
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
December 12-16, 2011

Monitoring Area: School Improvement Grants Program

Critical Element 2: Implementation

Finding (1):

The SEA has not ensured that a system of rewards is in place at Lanphier High School for school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates.

Citation: Section I.A.2(d)(1)(i)(C) 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 that an LEA must identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so.

Further action required: The ISBE must work with SPS and other LEAs with schools implementing the transformation model to develop and implement a strategy to identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing the transformation model, have increased student achievement. The strategy must include a process that bases decisions in part on student performance and includes other indicators such as observations of classroom instruction and attendance. The ISBE must submit to the Department this strategy that includes LEAs' implementation timelines. Implementation of any reward system must take place during the 2012-2013 school year.

Finding (2):

The ISBE did not ensure that SPS implemented increased learning time (ILT) with fidelity in Lanphier High School, as required for the transformation model. Although Lanphier High School rearranged the school schedule to add an enrichment period 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).

ILLINOIS
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
December 12-16, 2011

Further action required: The ISBE 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 as outlined in the SIG final requirements. The ISBE must submit to the Department evidence that it has reviewed each LEA that received SIG funds to implement the transformation or turnaround model to determine if it increased learning time consistent with the SIG final requirements. The ISBE must then submit to ED a timeline and plan for implementing ILT in schools that are failing to do so.