



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

MEMORANDUM

To: Indiana State Board of Education
From: Ron Sandlin, Senior Director of School Performance & Transformation
Date: August 2, 2017
RE: Turnaround Academy Performance Management System

ISSUE: Turnaround academies in Indiana currently operate without a clear performance expectations to inform decision-making and evaluation of overall success. While the Board has established performance goals in some instances, they are inconsistent in form and in substance. As a result, it is difficult to evaluate the success of the Board's efforts to transform student outcomes in Indiana's chronically underperforming schools.

RECOMMENDATION: Beginning in 17/18, establish a performance management system to guide SBOE decision-making and evaluation of all turnaround academies that includes:

- The minimum expectation that all turnaround academies will receive a 'D' or higher rating after two years, and will meet the exit criteria for comprehensive status by the end of five years
- Performance agreements between each school and the Board outlining two- and five-year benchmarks aligned to the state's A-F Accountability Model to serve as 'proof points' at critical stages in the intervention
- Annual leading indicators of performance the guide ongoing monitoring and support from the IDOE through the continuous improvement process

DETAILS: In an effort to strengthen the Board's model for state intervention to better support successful outcomes for students, schools, and communities, the Board created a School Turnaround Committee to inform the Board's work in this area. The committee met with key stakeholders throughout the state including school superintendents, turnaround school operators, lead partners, and school oversight entities. Committee meetings were held in Gary, Evansville, and Indianapolis to solicit feedback from the communities most directly impacted by this work. The SBOE partnered with Public Impact to provide expert analysis of Indiana's efforts to improve student outcomes at the state's turnaround academies and make recommendations to the Board.

After analyzing community and stakeholder input, and partnering with the expert team from Public Impact, the SBOE adopted a series of [Actions and Policies to Refine the SBOE School Intervention Model](#). One of the key recommendations that emerged from the committee was the need for a more clear and consistent performance criteria. Specifically, the committee recommended that the SBOE:

- Articulate a clear set of transition options and criteria for current and future turnaround academies
- Take action to reset performance goals and targets for current turnaround academies to guide future performance evaluation

Over the past several months, in collaboration with the IDOE, Board staff has worked to develop a comprehensive performance management system that provides a clear framework for the ongoing evaluation of performance at current and future turnaround academies.



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Turnaround Academy Performance Management System

State law authorizes the Indiana State Board of Education (SBOE) to intervene after a school receives the lowest performance designation for four consecutive years. In 2014 the SBOE partnered with Public Impact to evaluate the Board's model for school intervention and make recommendations to refine and improve the system. Based on an analysis of past practices and interviews with key stakeholders throughout the state, Public Impact identified seven high-priority recommendations to help improve the overall structure and likelihood for success at Indiana turnaround academies.

Prominent among their findings, and strongly supported by stakeholder input, was the need to clarify the performance outcomes that the state expects from school operators and school corporations that oversee one or more turnaround academies. SBOE staff, in collaboration with the IDOE, has developed a comprehensive performance management system that establishes universal expectations for all turnaround academies, while maintaining the necessary flexibility to tailor performance metrics to the unique needs of each school.

Overview: There is considerable support for the idea that successful school turnaround can take anywhere from three to five years, with improvements in student performance (mainly student growth) appearing after two years. Additionally, successful turnaround efforts yield more dramatic results related to culture and climate earlier on in the process, often after only one year of intervention. Therefore, all turnaround academies will mutually agree to a five-year performance agreement with the SBOE that outlines performance expectations aligned to leading indicators of school climate and culture, and lagging indicators of student achievement.

- **Student Achievement:** All turnaround academies will develop clear benchmarks for student achievement after the second and fifth year of intervention. Each turnaround academy will have some autonomy when selecting student achievement benchmarks; however, all turnaround academies must meet the minimum criteria outlined below. The two- and five-year 'proof-point' model is meant to avoid the pitfalls of annual, high-stakes performance benchmarks (as in the AYP model), while maintaining high expectations for student achievement.

Year 2: Each turnaround academy will establish two-year benchmarks that serve as a 'proof point' for initial success of the intervention. Two-year benchmarks are tied directly to student achievement and reflect the initial indicators of long-term success. Specifically, schools should focus their 2-year benchmarks on dramatically improving student growth or increasing the 5-year graduation rate. Regardless of the benchmarks chosen, **each turnaround academy will be expected to improve their letter grade to a 'D' or better after two years.**

Year 5: Each turnaround academy will also establish five-year benchmarks that serve as the overall barometer for success of the intervention. Five-year benchmarks are tied directly to student achievement and should incorporate indicators of sustained success. Specifically, schools should include goals related to improving student proficiency on the state assessment, increases in the 4-year graduation rate, and other lagging indicators of student success. Regardless of the benchmarks chosen, **all turnaround academies are expected to meet the exit criteria for comprehensive status by the end of the fifth year.**



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Leading Indicators: Each turnaround academy will establish annual benchmarks aligned to key leading indicators of student success. These benchmarks will focus on measuring improvements in school climate and culture, and may align to the 2- and 5-year benchmarks of student achievement as well. These leading indicators are meant to inform planning at each turnaround academy; therefore, the IDOE will partner with each school throughout the continuous school improvement process and use this information to drive decision-making.

For example:

- **Lagging Indicator of Student Achievement:** Improve student growth in the bottom 25% after 2 years to 125 or more growth points.
- **Leading Indicators:** Improve attendance for students in the bottom 25% by 5%, and have zero chronically absent students in this subgroup.
- **Lagging Indicator of Student Achievement:** Improve the 5-year graduation by 10% after two years, and the 4-year graduation by 20% after 5 years.
- **Leading Indicator:** 80%+ of freshman and sophomores are on track to graduate according to credit accumulation.

Two- and Five-Year Student Achievement Benchmarks

- 2- and 5-year benchmarks must align to components of Indiana's A-F Accountability Model
- Aligning all student achievement benchmarks to Indiana's A-F Accountability Model will standardize the metrics used to evaluate the success of SBOE interventions
- Each turnaround academy must agree to achieving a 'D' or higher rating after two years, and meet the exit criteria for comprehensive status after five years
- The SBOE will evaluate the success of each intervention based on progress towards these two- and five-year benchmarks

Annual Leading Indicators of Student Success

- Each turnaround academy will partner with IDOE to establish annual leading indicators of student success
- Progress towards these annual benchmarks will be used to inform ongoing monitoring and support from the IDOE and the continuous school improvement process
- The leading indicators will align directly to the two- and five-year student achievement benchmarks
- IDOE and SBOE staff will meet regularly to review progress towards the leading indicators and share that information with the Board

1003 School Improvement Grant (SIG) Application

- SBOE/IDOE will review each 1003 SIG application to ensure the proposed activities align to the school improvement plan.
- IDOE will tailor monitoring and support to the activities outlined in each 1003 SIG application and school improvement plan.



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Key Considerations: Over the past several months SBOE staff has analyzed the current status of performance benchmarks across each turnaround academy. In addition to this internal analysis, SBOE staff has met with external stakeholders from multiple turnaround academies to better understand their experience as it relates to monitoring and support from the state. Based on this review and input from key stakeholders, SBOE staff identified the three considerations that should inform the new framework:

Single Set of Benchmarks: SBOE staff determined that turnaround academies were being asked to establish performance benchmarks for different purposes, and at different times. For example, the SBOE adopted performance benchmarks for multiple turnaround academies in the approved operating contracts. The same turnaround academies then were asked to develop annual benchmarks within their school improvement plan, and once more as a part of their application for federal turnaround funding. More frequently than not, these goals did not align and often established different goals for the same metric within a given year. As a result, SBOE staff has developed a system that aligns the annual goals developed through the school improvement plan with the two- and five-year benchmarks established between the school and the SBOE.

Minimum Standard for Success: While the multiple stakeholders expressed a desire for flexibility in the goal-setting process, a review of existing benchmarks revealed inconsistent expectations for student results. While it is critical to maintain flexibility within the performance management system to allow each school to design goals that align to their specific intervention, the SBOE must establish a minimum standard for all turnaround academies to ensure the students in each school receive the educational opportunity they deserve. That is why the new performance management system clearly states that every turnaround academy must commit to earning a 'D' or higher by the second year of the intervention, and meet the criteria to exit comprehensive status by the fifth year of intervention.

Differentiated Performance Monitoring: One theme that emerged from stakeholder feedback was the need to tailor expectations for ongoing performance monitoring to the unique intervention at each school. Currently, the IDOE uses a standardized tool to collect monthly data from all turnaround academies. While well-intentioned, the standardized tool often led to schools collecting and reporting data that did not align to the specific interventions they have put into place. In order to better align the expectations for ongoing performance monitoring, the SBOE and IDOE will develop unique expectations based on the school improvement plans developed annually by each school. Additionally, the SBOE and IDOE will work to use data that is already reported to the Department through other means, rather than require the school to submit additional data.

Sample Performance Agreement: Each turnaround academy will enter into a performance agreement with the SBOE that establishes two- and five-year benchmarks for student achievement. Each school will propose their own set of performance benchmarks based on the unique needs of their students. However, in order to be approved by the SBOE, each set of benchmarks will be required to demonstrate a commitment to achieving a 'D' or higher performance rating by the second year of intervention, and to meet the criteria to exit comprehensive status by the fifth year of intervention.



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

In order to establish a universal system for reporting out progress across all turnaround academies, these benchmarks must be aligned to Indiana’s A-F Accountability Model. That way each benchmark can be categorized in an effort to report out across all schools, despite each school having different benchmarks. For this, the SBOE will use the following categories along with a few example benchmarks:

Student Achievement/Proficiency

- Increase the percentage of students passing the state assessment in ELA and/or math
- Close the achievement gap between the school and the state average

Student Progress/Growth

- Increase the percentage of students earning typical/high growth on the state assessment
- Decrease the number of students earning low growth on the state assessment
- Increase the number of growth points earned for the bottom 25% and/or top 75%

Graduation (High School)

- Increase 4-year graduation rate
- Increase 5-year graduation rate
- Decrease the drop-out rate

College & Career Readiness (High School)

- Increase the percentage of students earning dual credit/AP/IB in high school
- Increase the percentage of students completing a career pathway or industry certification

Each turnaround academy will set their own benchmarks based on the school’s priorities and where students begin the year. The following table provides an example of two- and five-year benchmarks along with a set of annual leading indicators aligned to each:

Performance Benchmark	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5
1. Increase total student growth points for the bottom 25% in math	130 Points		115¹ Points		
<i>Increase attendance for students in the bottom 25%</i>	80%	85%	90%	95%	95%
<i>Decrease suspensions for students in the bottom 25%</i>	10%	5%	1%	1%	1%
2. Increase the percentage of students enrolled for 2+ years who are proficient on the state math assessment	42% Proficient		State² Avg		
<i>Increase the percentage of students enrolled 2+ years</i>	-	55%	60%	75%	80%
<i>Increase the percentage of students performing on grade-level on interim/benchmark assessments</i>	50%	55%	65%	70%	80%
<i>Increase the number of students with 95%+ attendance</i>	60%	75%	80%	85%	90%
Example High School Benchmark					
3. Improve 5-year graduation rate (after year 2) and 4-year graduation rate (after year 5)³	75% 5-Yr Grads		State Average 4-Yr Grads		
<i>Increase the percentage of 9th & 10th graders on track to graduate (credit accumulation)</i>	60%	70%	75%	80%	85%
<i>Retain students that do not graduate with their cohort for an additional year</i>	80%	85%	95%	95%	95%

¹ Based on the current Growth Table, points become more difficult to achieve as more students become proficient.

² The school has set a goal to meet or surpass the state average for math achievement.

³ This benchmark recognizes the time it takes to get students on track to graduate, setting a 5-year graduation rate goal at year 2 and then a 4-year graduation rate goal at year 5.