(E) Turning around the Lowest Achieving Schools

State Reform Conditions Criteria

(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs (10 points)

The extent to which the State has the legal, statutory, or regulatory authority to intervene directly in the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and in LEAs that are in improvement or corrective action status.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (E)(1):

- A description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.

(E)(1) INTERVENING IN THE LOWEST-ACHIEVING SCHOOLS AND LEAs

Introduction

Over the past three years, Connecticut has pursued an aggressive reform agenda building on new accountability legislation and the implementation of the Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative (CALI) (See Appendix (A)(1)(d) for a comprehensive overview of CALI.) In addition, in the past five months, from January through May 2010, Connecticut has made extensive progress to expand its work in turning around low-performing districts. The passage of Public Act 10-111 (see Appendix (A)(1)(c)) now provides two additional measures that the Commissioner of Education and the State Board of Education (SBE) can take to intervene in low-performing schools or districts without legislative or gubernatorial approval: (1) reconstitution of local or regional boards of education and; (2) creation of parent-teacher school governance councils with the authority to petition the local board of education to reconstitute the school. In addition, the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) has been awarded a three-year $26.5

million federal School Improvement Grant (SIG) that will provide solid funding for adoption of one of the four intervention models specified in Race to the Top (RTTT) in up to seven LEAs: Bridgeport, Hartford, New Haven, New Britain, Windham, Stamford Academy and Area Cooperative Education Services (ACES).

During this same time period, Governor Rell established a time-limited special commission to examine data and trends in Connecticut's achievement gap and make recommendations for changes in October 2010. The Connecticut Commission on Educational Achievement includes largely business and philanthropic leadership and is staffed by a former staff member of The Education Trust. Public hearings are now underway throughout the state as are visits to schools in the CALI Partner Districts (as noted in Section (A) Connecticut's most disadvantaged districts since 2007). CSDE's Bureau of Accountability and Improvement has given the Commission multiple overviews on Connecticut's work in the 15 Partner Districts, CALI, the SIG process and Phase 2 RTTT application to ensure close coordination and high impact leveraging of their multiple efforts to gather information.

State Authority to Intervene

CGS Section 10-223e: Connecticut's Accountability Statute

Section 10-223e of the Connecticut General Statutes (CGS), which the state legislature first adopted in 2007 and subsequently revised in 2008 and 2010, gives the State Board of Education (SBE) the authority to intervene directly in both the state's persistently lowest-achieving schools and local education agencies (LEAs). (See section 21 of Public Act 10-111 in Appendix (A)(1)(c) for a complete copy of CGS 10-223e, as amended.) Acting through the Commissioner of Education and the CSDE, the SBE has used this authority by working with the 15 LEAs participating in the CALI that are referred to as Partner Districts.

Subdivision (2) of Subsection (c) of Section 10-223e authorizes the SBE to provide intensive supervision and direction to any school or LEA identified as in need of improvement and requiring corrective action pursuant to the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). The SBE may take any of the actions shown in the following table to improve student performance.

Statutory Authority of the Connecticut SBE to Intervene in Persistently Low-Achieving Schools 2007-2010
1. Require an operations audit to identify possible programmatic savings and an instructional audit to identify any deficits in curriculum and instruction or in the learning environment of the school or LEA.
2. Require the local or regional board of education for such school or LEA to use state and federal funds for critical needs, as directed by the SBE.
3. Direct the transfer and assignment of teachers and principals.
4. Provide incentives to attract highly qualified teachers and principals.
5. Require additional training and technical assistance for parents and guardians of children attending the school or a school in the LEA and for teachers, principals and central office staff members hired by the LEA.
6. Require the local or regional board of education for the school or LEA to implement model curriculum, including, but not limited to, recommended textbooks, materials and supplies approved by the CSDE.
7. Identify schools for reconstitution, as may be phased in by the Commissioner, as state or local charter schools, or schools based on other models for school improvement, or for management by an entity other than the local or regional board of education for the LEA in which the school is located.
8. Direct the local or regional board of education for the school or LEA to develop and implement a plan addressing deficits in achievement and in the learning environment as recommended in the instructional audit.
9. Assign a technical assistance team to the school or LEA to guide school or LEA initiatives and report progress to the Commissioner of Education.
10. Establish instructional and learning environment benchmarks for the school or LEA to meet as it progresses toward removal from the list of low-achieving schools or LEAs.
11. Provide funding to any proximate LEA to an LEA designated as low achieving so that students in a low-achieving LEA may attend public school in a neighboring LEA.
12. Direct the establishment of learning academies within schools that require continuous monitoring of student performance by teacher groups.
13. Require local and regional boards of education to (i) undergo training to improve their operational efficiency and effectiveness as leaders of their LEA's improvement plans; and (ii) submit an annual action plan to the Commissioner of Education outlining how, when and in what manner their effectiveness shall be monitored.
14. Any combination of the actions described in this subdivision or similar, closely-related actions.

In addition to the authority listed above, the statute also grants the General Assembly the authority to enact legislation authorizing that control of a district be reassigned to the State Board of Education or other authorized entity, when certain conditions are met. (See 10-233e(d) in section 21 of Public Act 10-111 in Appendix (A)(1)(c)). Lastly, section 10-223e grants the Commissioner the authority to directly intervene under certain conditions as well. Pursuant to section 10-223e(e), any school district or elementary school that fails to make adequate yearly progress for two years in a row must be evaluated by the Commissioner and, depending on the results of that evaluation, the Commissioner may require that such school district or school provide full-day kindergarten classes, summer school, extended school day, weekend classes, tutorial assistance to its students or professional development to its administrators, principals, teachers and paraprofessional teacher aides.

In recognition of some of the limitations of the previous accountability legislation specifically related to parent involvement and the role of local boards of education in closing the achievement gap, in May 2010, Connecticut passed landmark education reform legislation to support the turnaround of low-performing schools: Public Act No.10-111. (See Appendix (A)(1)(c)). Most notably, as mentioned above, the bill allows the SBE to authorize the Commissioner to reconstitute a local or regional boards of education and it provides for the creation of parent-teacher school governance councils that have the authority to petition the local board of education to reconstitute the school. While many aspects of this bill have been previously referenced in the application, the provisions most pertinent to turning around low-performing schools are summarized in the table below.

New Statutory Authority to Intervene in Persistently Low-Achieving Schools Pursuant to Public Act 10-111
1. Track and report data relating to student, teacher and school and district performance growth and make such information available to local and regional boards of education for use in evaluating educational performance and growth of teacher and students enrolled in public schools in the state.
2. Student suspensions shall be in-school suspension unless during the hearing held the pupil being suspended poses such a danger to persons or property or such disruption of the educational process that the pupil shall be excluded from school during the period of suspension.
3. Local or regional boards of education for a school that has been identified in need of improvement <u>may</u> establish a school governance council (SGC), predominately made up of parent representatives, for each school so identified.
4. Local or regional boards of education for a school that has been designated as a low-achieving school due to such school failing to make adequate yearly progress in mathematics and reading at the whole school level <u>shall</u> establish a SGC, predominately made up of parent representatives, for each school so designated. The SGC shall have multiple responsibilities including: a. analyzing school achievement data, b. reviewing fiscal objectives of draft budgets, c. participating in the hiring process of the school principal, d. assisting the principal in making programmatic and operational changes, e. working with school administration to develop and approve a school compact for parents, and f. developing written parent involvement policies. In addition, the SGC may recommend the reconstitution of the school into one of the following models: a) one of the four turn around models required by the federal School Improvement Grant (SIG); b) an innovative school model (described in detail in section (F)(2)(v) below); or c) a CommPACT school model (also described in detail in section (F)(2)(v) below). The SGC informs the local board of education of its recommendation for the reconstitution of the school and the board is required to vote whether or not to accept the model. The local board can adopt or recommend a different model. If no such agreement can be met between the board and the SGC, the Commissioner of Education shall decide which of the alternatives to implement.
5. The SBE may authorize the Commissioner of Education to reconstitute a local or regional board of education.
6. The Act establishes a task force to study and monitor the academic achievement gap between racial and socioeconomic groups in Connecticut considering effective approaches to closing the achievement gap in elementary, middle and high schools.

Sanctions Employed by the CSDE Pursuant to CGS 10-223e

Pursuant to the statutory authority described above, over the period 2007 to 2010 the CSDE has employed the following sanctions:

1. Conducted instructional and financial assessments at the LEA level and in schools in need of improvement in year three and beyond.
2. Required the LEA superintendent and local board of education chair to make a presentation on results of the LEA assessment to a SBE Ad Hoc Committee on Accountability.
3. Assigned CSDE staff and an external consultant to work in identified LEAs.
4. Required revision of the district improvement plan (DIP) facilitated by CSDE staff with LEA stakeholder participation.
5. Required alignment of school improvement plans (SIP) to the DIP.
6. Required the LEA to secure approval of the DIP by the SBE.
7. Required formation of a LEA accountability system and creation of LEA-, school- and instructional-level data teams.
8. Required completion of a request for service (RFS) application and participation in CALI training.
9. Required the identification and implementation of two demonstration schools in each LEA.
10. Set aside a portion of state education funds to be directed by the CSDE to support the implementation of the DIP.
11. Conducted two annual monitoring visits to monitor implementation of the DIP.
12. Provided for attendance of CSDE staff at monthly LEA data team meetings to monitor implementation of the DIPs.

In addition to the above sanctions for all Partner Districts, two LEAs were assigned external consultants to work with their local boards of education, one LEA was required to complete a comprehensive evaluation of the special education programs and services and the CSDE assisted one LEA with identifying an interim superintendent for a two-year period to develop and implement a DIP and the district accountability system.

As part of its intervention in the 15 CALI Partner Districts, the SBE exercised its authority under the state accountability legislation and took steps to sanction districts in the ways described above. In many instances, Partner Districts have replaced staff members or

principals as part of restructuring, although the CALI process did not require that this action be taken. As part of school restructuring, Partner Districts provided high-quality, job-embedded professional development designed to ensure that staff members are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and promoted the continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction. Some LEAs established schedules and strategies to increase instructional time for students and planning time for teachers. All Partner Districts were required to identify time for collaboration and professional development for staff. CALI focused on leader effectiveness through professional development, executive coaching and monitoring the effectiveness of the Partner District and school data teams.

As part of the CSDE's involvement with local boards of education, the CSDE is working in collaboration with the Connecticut Association of Boards of Education (CABE) to introduce a research-based training model on the Roles of Boards of Education in an Accountability Era. This training, "The Lighthouse Project," was originally developed by the Iowa State Board of Education. CSDE and CABE have been extensively trained in the model and are currently conducting this training for five local boards of education. The project requires a two-year training and five-year collection of data commitment on behalf of the local board to complete the training and contribute to the research base. Connecticut is the only state in this nationwide project conducting the training collaboratively with the state education agency and the state's local board of education association. To date, the feedback from local board members and superintendents is extremely positive regarding the alignment between our school reform efforts, the CALI initiative and the essential contribution of local boards of education to this work.

Lastly, the CSDE has also forged a stronger relationship with the philanthropic sector and expanded several initiatives involving the same communities and LEAs now engaged in school turnaround efforts. One group in this sector is intensely focused on young children in economically distressed municipalities and the other on designing strategies for improving the early health and early learning of children from birth through the third grade, in an attempt to create conditions that eliminate the school readiness "preparation gap" and support early academic success.

Appendices Cited in (E)(1)

Appendix (A)(1)(c) Public Act 10-111

Appendix (A)(1)(d) Comprehensive Overview of CALI

(E)(2) TURNING AROUND THE LOWEST-ACHIEVING SCHOOLS

(E)(2)(i) Identification of Persistently Low-Achieving Schools

The CSDE has identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in the notice) using a detailed methodology as outlined in Appendix (E)(2)(a). Application of this detailed methodology resulted in identification of 18 schools as constituting the lowest 5 percent among low-achieving Title I schools (Tier I). In addition, five non-Title I high schools were identified in Tier II. A list of the Tier I schools follows. A complete list of the Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools is included in Appendix (E)(2)(b).

A List of Tier I Persistently-Lowest Achieving Schools

Title I	Elementary or Secondary	District	School	District Name	School Name	Years In Need of Improvement	2009 Unadjusted Math*	2009 Unadjusted Reading*	2009 Average Unadjusted (Math & Reading)*
Yes	Secondary	282	60	Stamford Academy	Stamford Academy	3	14.3	9.5	11.9
Yes	Elementary	93	51	New Haven School District	Urban Youth Center Middle School	6	11.5	14.8	13.2
Yes	Elementary	64	19	Hartford School District	Milner Core Knowledge School	9	27	14.2	20.6
Yes	Elementary	64	6	Hartford School District	Burns Latino Studies Academy	6	32.8	14.2	23.5
Yes	Secondary	64	63	Hartford School District	Weaver High School	7	17.5	31.6	24.6
Yes	Elementary	244	61	Area Cooperative Educational Services	Collaborative Alternative Magnet School	4	29	23.1	26.1
Yes	Elementary	64	1	Hartford School District	Sand School	6	27.8	25.8	26.8

A List of Tier I Persistently-Lowest Achieving Schools									
Title I	**Elementary or Secondary**	**District**	**School**	**District Name**	**School Name**	**Years In Need of Improvement**	**2009 Unadjusted Math***	**2009 Unadjusted Reading***	**2009 Average Unadjusted (Math & Reading)***
Yes	Elementary	64	51	Hartford School District	Fox Middle School	6	28.3	28.7	28.5
Yes	Elementary	64	52	Hartford School District	Quirk Middle School	6	31	26.3	28.7
Yes	Elementary	15	1	Bridgeport School District	Barnum School	6	36.6	25.3	31.0
Yes	Elementary	89	9	New Britain School District	Northend School	2	35.4	26.9	31.2
Yes	Elementary	15	26	Bridgeport School District	Roosevelt School	6	42.1	20.7	31.4
Yes	Elementary	89	3	New Britain School District	Chamberlain School	6	37	26.1	31.6
Yes	Elementary	93	4	New Haven School District	Katherine Brennan School	3	39.2	26.9	33.1
Yes	Elementary	64	28	Hartford School District	Dr. Ramon E. Betances School	5	46.2	20	33.1
Yes	Elementary	15	41	Bridgeport School District	Dunbar School	6	37.9	28.6	33.3
Yes	Elementary	64	30	Hartford School District	Sanchez School	6	46.1	21	33.6
Yes	Elementary	163	1	Windham School District	Natchaug School	3	45.2	23	34.1

**Using a federally mandated formula, the unadjusted rate is calculated by dividing the number of students scoring proficient or above by all tested students who are not absent for the exam or are considered English language learner(ELL) exempt.*

(E)(2)(ii) Support for LEAs Implementing One of the Four Turnaround Models

The CSDE is well positioned to support LEAs in turning around schools based on its history and results with CALI and the recently awarded federal School Improvement Grant (SIG). Funds from the School SIG will support implementation of the specific RTTT school intervention models in up to seven low-performing districts: Bridgeport, Hartford, New Britain, New Haven, Windham, ACES and Stamford Academy. We also take this opportunity to report here on recent results of CALI to boost student achievement and advance districts out of adequate yearly progress (AYP) Needs Improvement status.

The Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative (CALI)

CALI has been described and integrated throughout our Phase 2 application as one of the two core instructional improvement processes; see Appendix (A)(1)(d) for complete overview of CALI. The CSDE has developed a vision, mission and theory of action to take CALI to the next level in supporting systemic LEA reform (see Section (D)(5)).

Although this effort has only been implemented as a transformational process for a few years, we are seeing important gains at various grade levels that have led us to commit to its statewide implementation within the RTTT context. Some of these findings are presented below.

Student Achievement Results in CALI Demonstration Schools

Understanding that it would take a substantial human investment (that is, in time, expertise, energy and leadership) and a minimum of two to three years to make changes resulting in student achievement gains, over the period 2007-2010, the CSDE funded two demonstration schools in each of the CALI Partner Districts. The purpose of the demonstration schools was to examine the impact on student performance if provided additional resources beyond the traditional CALI supports. These additional resources included an executive coach for the principal and leadership team, a data team facilitator to work with the school- and instructional-level data teams and stipends for release time for teachers to work in collaborative professional learning communities. This strategy of “learning as we work to change” is core to the CALI process.

As reported in Section (C)(3), while statewide gains in mathematics and reading have been positive but generally "minimal or less" except in mathematics, CALI districts and demonstration schools have shown one-year gains that outpaced the statewide average. More importantly, in some of these "CALI plus demonstration schools" with extra resources, one-year gains in the proportion of upper elementary school students scoring at the state proficiency level or above ranged from 6 percent to 29 percent across both math and reading. These data are presented in the table below. Gains were also made among CALI districts in AYP status. This past year, among the 15 CALI Partner Districts, five schools (of which three were demonstration schools) were removed from the federal NCLB In Need of Improvement status. An additional 36 schools that had not made AYP in the previous year made AYP or Safe Harbor status in 2009. Eight of these schools were demonstration schools.

One Year (2008-2009) Sample of Student Gains in CALI Schools

District	School	Gains from 2008 to 2009 CMT
Ansonia	Meade School	Grades 3-5: students proficient or better in math increased by 4%
Ansonia	Middle School	Grades 6-8: students proficient or better in math increased by 13%
Danbury	Roberts Avenue School	Grades 3-4: students proficient or better in math increased at least 5% Grades 3-5: student proficient or better in reading increased 14%
Meriden	John Barry School	Grades 3-5: students proficient or better in math increased by at least 4% Grades 3-4: students proficient or better in reading increased by at least 4%
Meriden	Roger Sherman School	Grade 3: students proficient or better in math increased by 16% Grades 3-5: students proficient or better in reading increased by 8%
New Britain	Vance School	Grades 3-5: students proficient or better in math increased at least 9% Grades 4-5: students proficient or better in reading increased at least 6%
New London	Harbor School	Grades 3-4: students proficient or better in math increased at least 8% Grade 4: students proficient or better in reading increased by 28%
New London	Nathan Hall School	Grades 3-4: students proficient or better in math increased at least 5% Grade 4: students proficient or better in reading increased 6%
Norwalk	Silvermine Elementary School	Grades 3-5: students proficient or better in math increased at least 4% Grades 3-5: students proficient or better in reading increased at least 5%
Norwich	Samuel Huntington School	Grade 3: students proficient or better in math increased by 20% and in reading by 18%
Windham	W.B. Sweeney School	Grades 3-4: students proficient or better in math increased at least 14% Grades 3-4: students proficient or better in reading increased at least 11%

Student Gains in CALI "Supported" Districts

In 2008-09, the CSDE also identified an additional seven LEAs that were in year three or longer in need of improvement for a subgroup of students. These LEAs are referred to as "Supported Districts." With support from the CSDE, these LEAs completed a self-assessment using the *Decision Support Architecture Consortium Framework II* (DSAC II), developed collaboratively with the Council of Chief State School Officers and Center on Leadership in Technology. The LEAs were required to use the results of the self-assessments to revise their district improvement plans (DIPs). They also were offered access to the CALI training modules and each LEA was awarded one (rather than two) demonstration school. Following receipt and use of these additional resources, 17 schools in the supported districts that had not made AYP in the past year made AYP or Safe Harbor.

Prior Use of One of Four Mandated Intervention Models and Lessons Learned

Connecticut has not yet implemented any one of the four intervention models as described in RTTT. We have required LEAs to restructure schools under the NCLB requirement for schools in year five in need of improvement as outlined below in Table (E)(2)(ii)(b). It is important to note that many of the elements of CALI, required of all restructured schools, are also core components of each of the four mandated intervention models. As we move forward with implementation of the SIG, schools will be required to implement all requirements of the mandated models as well as CALI. In addition, CSDE's Bureau of Accountability and Improvement will monitor progress of the SIG schools on an annual basis using the newly developed student growth model.

Table (E)(2)(ii)(b) Restructured Schools		
Approach Used	**# of Schools since SY 2004-05**	**Results and Lessons Learned**
Restructuring required by NCLB	84	Narrative Below

Lessons Learned from NCLB Restructuring Work

While there are obviously no lessons learned (yet) from adopting one or more of the specified models, Connecticut has learned a lot from restructuring 84 schools under NCLB and from the implementation of the CALI reform model. The first learning is clearly that the requirements for restructuring schools under NCLB alone were not sufficient to turn around low-performing schools. Rather, restructuring or turnaround needs to be done in the context of systemic change within the LEA through the use of a comprehensive reform model aligned across the state, LEAs and schools to create and sustain change. Restructuring also requires strong leadership at the LEA and building level and the willingness to move from a culture of isolation to one of collaboration anchored in an identified accountability model.

In some instances, in order to overcome systemic barriers, there needs to be external pressure from the state to move a change agenda forward at the LEAs and school-level, but the priority goals for the restructuring or turnaround need to be established by a strong credible stakeholder group, including parents and union representatives. Resources must be specifically allocated to sustain priorities set in the restructuring or turnaround plan and there must be ongoing evaluation and research of interventions to allow for continuous improvement of the model and efficient use of resources. There must be an identified accountability model to oversee implementation of the restructuring. To assure that change occurs at the classroom level, professional development must be of high-quality and integrated into classroom work where effective teaching strategies in the use of standards-based curriculum must be modeled and implemented with fidelity. Finally, for true systemic change, there needs to be a significant redesign of the school day and expansion of the school year.

Connecticut's Reform Plan

The CSDE is fully prepared to support LEAs in incorporating one of the four school intervention models -- the turnaround, restart, school closure or transformation model – and has already begun planning for the use of the four intervention models in addition to CALI through Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) School Improvement Grant (SIG). Specifically, LEAs on the list with the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools identified in Section (E)(2)(i) will continue to participate in CALI and are in the process of applying for SIG using one of the four school intervention models.

Goal 1: Support LEAs in implementation of specific school reform models over the period 2010-2014.

As the result of this goal, 18 individual schools will be restructured with evidence of improvements in student achievement that exceed the statewide average by 2014.

Over the period January through May 2010, staff from the CSDE provided eligible LEAs with a formal overview of the requirements of the SIG and met with them individually to identify specific requirements of the turnaround models. On May 14, 2010, LEAs submitted formal applications for funding from the SIG. Of the 25 Tier I and Tier II schools eligible for the funding, 18 have applied. Applications are currently being reviewed and funds will be awarded within 30 days of the grant submission. Final SIG awards will not be made until after the RTTT application is submitted; however, Table (E)(3)(ii)(c) provides a listing of schools and the specific intervention model that each has selected. The CSDE will be working with the SIG schools over the summer in preparation for the fall 2010 and will begin in the fall assigning technical assistance teams from the CSDE to each school and convening the principals of the SIG schools as a professional learning community.

Table (E)(3)(ii)(c) Applications Received for SIG Schools and Models Chosen

District Name	School Name	Tier	Intervention Model
Bridgeport School District	Barnum School	I	Transformational
Bridgeport School District	Dunbar School	I	Transformational
Bridgeport School District	Roosevelt School	I	Transformation
Hartford School District	Dr. Ramon E. Betances School	I	Turnaround
Hartford School District	Burns Latino Studies Academy	I	Turnaround
Hartford School District	Milner Core Knowledge School	I	Turnaround
Hartford School District	Sanchez School	I	Turnaround
Hartford School District	Sand School	I	Turnaround
Hartford School District	Weaver High School	I	Turnaround
New Britain School District	Smalley Academy	I	Transformational
New Haven School District	Katherine Brennan School	I	Turnaround
Stamford Academy	Stamford Academy	I	Transformational
Windham School District	Natchaug School	I	Transformational
Bridgeport School District	Bassick High School	II	Transformational
Bridgeport School District	Harding High School	II	Restart
New Haven School District	James Hillhouse High School	II	Transformational
New Haven School District	Hill Central Music Academy	II	Turnaround
New Haven School District	Wilbur Cross High School	II	Transformational

Performance Measures	**Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)**	**End of SY 2010-2011**	**End of SY 2011-2012**	**End of SY 2012-2013**	**End of SY 2013-2014**
The number of schools for which one of the four school intervention models will be initiated each year.	0	18	TBD	TBD	TBD

Connecticut's SIG funding for FY 09 is only sufficient to fund Tier I and Tier II schools. Nonetheless, in an effort to expand this work and to reach a limited number of Tier III schools, the CSDE will collaborate with the philanthropic sector by supplementing their work in select SIG communities with funds known as "RTTT Resources."

The Connecticut Early Literacy Project is currently partnering with the Graustein Memorial Fund, the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the CSDE in a demonstration project contributing more than a million private dollars over a three-year period in the target community, New Britain, to support community and family literacy in a two-generation approach that coordinates community and school elements to "Third Grade Level Reading," a national initiative supported by Annie E. Casey Foundation. Technical assistance and support will be provided to both the early childhood providers in the district and in the community in a partnership with the Department's New Britain Technical Assistance Team in order to align efforts. There is a high expectation that this grant will be renewed for an additional two years if adequate progress is made.

Since all of the CALI communities with which the CSDE is working are also part of the Graustein Discovery communities and recipients of the Early Childhood Community Co-Investment Partnership Grants, the opportunity to take the lessons learned from the Early Literacy Project and use them as catalysts for the CALI high-need communities presents an opportune time to streamline and integrate multiple efforts and best practices that ensure success for children. RTTT resources will be used to expand the current literacy efforts with the Connecticut Early Literacy Project to the unfunded Tier III SIG schools. A competitive request for proposals (RFP) will be issued for these schools in order to expand their current work with CALI to an increased emphasis on family literacy and community involvement.

Activities

- District SIG applications approved by CSDE
- Provide technical assistance for planning to SIG schools
- Convene Professional Learning Community (PLC) – SIG Principals
- Assign technical assistance team from Bureau of Accountability and Improvement to each SIG school for ongoing monitoring and assistance in implementing SIG
- On an annual basis, monitor the progress of SIG schools utilizing student growth data
- CALI training and technical assistance – ongoing – see application sections (C)(3) and (D)(5***)***

Time Frame: June 2010-2014

Responsible Parties: The Partnership for Pre-service Training and Professional Development, Bureau of Accountability and Improvement, RESC Alliance, State Education Resource Center (SERC) and the Connecticut Association of Schools.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools *(40 points)*

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) Identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and, at its discretion, any non-Title I eligible secondary schools that would be considered persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) if they were eligible to receive Title I funds; and *(5 points)*

(ii) Support its LEAs in turning around these schools by implementing one of the four school intervention models (as described in Appendix C): turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model (provided that an LEA with more than nine persistently lowest-achieving schools may not use the transformation model for more than 50 percent of its schools). *(35 points)*

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (E)(2) (please fill in table below):

- The State's historic performance on school turnaround, as evidenced by the total number of persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) that States or LEAs attempted to turn around in the last five years, the approach used, and the results and lessons learned to date.

Goal 2: Expand turnaround work to Tier III SIG schools through partnership with the Connecticut Early Literacy Project.

As the result of this goal, the Connecticut Early Literacy Project will be expanded to schools identified as Tier III for persistently low-achieving schools.

Activities:

- Develop RFP for Tier III schools for the Connecticut Early Literacy Projects
- Coordinate the Connecticut Early Literacy Project awards with the Graustein Memorial Fund and plan training and technical assistance

Time Frame: Fall 2010 - 2014

Responsible Parties: The Partnership for Pre-service Training and Professional Development, the Bureau of Accountability and Improvement, SERC, the Graustein Memorial Fund and Annie E. Casey Foundation

Goal 3: Design and pilot Connecticut's student growth model, using student data gathered in the 18 SIG schools and the input of teachers, school principals and district leaders.

As the result of this goal, the Bureaus of Student Assessment, Accountability and Improvement and Educator Certification and Standards, will establish the research base and essential knowledge necessary to design a reliable, valid evaluation system for Connecticut's teachers and principals (See Section (D)(2)).

Activities

- CSDE will set targets for each SIG school based on the student growth model.
- CSDE will provide training to SIG schools on use of student growth model.
- CSDE will monitor the progress of the SIG schools on an annual basis using the newly developed student growth model.

***Time Frame**:* 2010-2014

Responsible Parties: The Partnership for Teacher, Principal Effectiveness and Accountability**,** the Bureau of Accountability and Improvement, the Bureau of Student Assessment and the Bureau of Educator Certification and Standards

Appendices Referenced in this Section

Appendix (A)(1)(c)	Public Act 10-111
Appendix (A)(1)(d)	Comprehensive Overview of CALI
Appendix (E)(2)(a)	Methodology for Selection of Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools.
Appendix (E)(2)(b)	Complete listing of Tier I, II and III Schools