

**Spoke Committee Survey Results (25 responses)**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Total number</b>
Parent	4%	1
Teacher	0%	0
School building administrator	4%	1
District administrator	32%	8
Board member	0%	0
School organization representative	8%	2
Advocacy organization representative	28%	7
CDE staff	24%	6

<b>Work/Live</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Total number</b>
Urban	50%	12
Suburban	21%	5
Outlying city	8%	2
Rural	21%	5

<b>ESSA listening tour</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Total</b>
Yes	58%	14
No	42%	10

**Q1. Planning Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI):** Driven by school and reviewed by district. CDE will offer ways to document planning requirements within the UIP. Planning supports available from CDE. Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI): Driven by school within UIP and approved by LEA and CDE. Planning phase built in to overall timeline with thorough needs assessment, community engagement and intentional strategy selection. CDE supports available upon request or as a part of selected turnaround program. Some modifications can be made to tailor the UIP process to the unique needs of the CSI (e.g., quick cycle action planning). Menu of Supports TSI: Determined by LEA. Specialized supports and tools available from CDE and external partners. This may include supports around needs assessments, action planning, consultation on identifying aligned supports, evaluation and planning. Current examples include diagnostic reviews, planning supports, supports specific to ELL and special education students and promising family engagement strategies. CSI: Early incentives to engage with CDE and external providers in moderate and intensive supports. This may include supports around needs assessments, action planning, consultation on identifying aligned supports, establishing short-cycle performance management tools and monitor progress, and evaluation and planning. Current examples include Tiered Intervention grants, Turnaround Network, Connect for Success, Turnaround Leaders grant, Turnaround Learning Academy. Timeline TSI: Directed by LEA. Allow a maximum of four years before moving Additional Targeted schools into CSI designation. CSI: Implementation for three to four years (depending on length of planning phase) with progress monitoring and plan adjustments. Four years before moving to “more rigorous action.” More rigorous action should be aligned with state’s accountability clock and the required options (i.e., closure, charter, external management, innovation).

**Agree - 57% (12 responses)**

**Partially Agree - 38% (8 responses)**

**Disagree - 5% (1 responses)**

All comments (11 responses)

- Planning: Agree with planning year for CSI. Modifications to the UIP would need to be robust to truly support effective school improvement planning. Modifications should be made to the template, as well as to the process itself - especially timing and feedback. **Timeline is not clear, when does a plan start/end? Not conducive to school planning.** Shift the due date to prior to the start of a school year, with feedback provided quickly after the submission of the plan. That would allow a CSI school to implement a plan for a full school year. Template is not user-friendly and targets/action planning get lost in it. Feedback from CDE has not been very helpful - more compliance-drive and about the template than what the school should be doing to improve in terms of content. Can there be different options for UIP templates based on the needs of the school/type of school - CSI school, new schools, etc.? Menu of supports: There should be one, clear place that lists the available supports and what they are and how a district applies for them (and when). CDE should vet the external vendors and offer to help district negotiate contracts with partners. More understanding of what supports are better for schools earlier on the clock (our year 1/2 schools) than what we should be doing for Year 4 or 5 schools (e.g. innovation planning) would be useful to have.
- The current UIP template and planning timeline is not aligned to the proposed menu above. Flexibility in the planning format and review is key to enable easier incorporation of qualitative data and progress monitoring. The proposal above could also be strengthened by including incentives for earlier, more dramatic action on CSI (or TSI) schools.
- Definitions are not precise. In fact, I am unsure if definitions are even included. Unique characteristics of state supports are not identified. Timelines are not precise.
- I'm sure this is part of the plan of action for comprehensive supports, but CDE should be supporting schools in documenting planning requirements within the UIP here for these schools as well as targeted support schools. The only thing I would add is that I believe CDE is within their authority to make CDE support mandatory when writing comprehensive support plans. It seems like this would make it more likely that plans that are submitted to LEAs and CDE are approved. CDE planning support can/should be framed this way.
- I think TSI schools should only have 3 years before moving into CSI designation. Need more accountability around this so that the kids these schools are failing do not get passed along so many grade levels before getting support. The entire plan needs to be more clearly tied to data. Data collection and use to drive action planning, identify needs/gaps, etc. needs to be a requirement of TSI or CSI. Can there be more regulation/accountability in regards to CSI schools "engaging" with CDE/external partners? Why is this a choice? If schools are failing, they need to be taking action, action that is monitored to ensure they are doing what is best for their students and staff. How will all of this tie to the UIP? What will "CDE offer to document planning requirements within the UIP"? Does this not need to be defined within the ESSA draft plan? The "Planning" section should include a mention of a list of evidenced-based/foundational elements that need to be in place.
- My comments all apply to CSIs Planning: The UIP is not an effective tool for turnaround schools. These schools need a cycle that is more immediate. Is is also unclear if results from UIP reviews by the "state review panel" have aligned with the on-site state review panels. Menu of Supports: This section could have requirements for achievement benchmarks that allow districts to have flexibility within high expectations. Timeline: It is important that CDE takes their responsibility to

students and families seriously and prioritizes this above their commitment to maintaining the status quo and serving districts. In doing so, I believe the timelines should be shortened to 1-3 years as long as schools and districts are meeting high expectations. The research seems to be demonstrating that turnaround schools have the highest probability of succeeding when there is disruption of old systems. I urge CDE to take their responsibility to students and families seriously and buck the desire to maintain the status quo and continue to let students fail. This is a moral and ethical imperative. If schools are not meeting high bench-marked expectations CDE can best support those communities by helping them explore and have more options for their schools.

- 1. Four years is too long before schools receive more intensive or rigorous supports. 2. More clarity on the roles of the LEA v. the roles of CDE would be helpful. 3. In terms of timeline, it would be helpful to include when the supports begin - year of identification? The first year after identification?
- Planning; -TSI plans should also be approved by the LEA not just reviewed. The LEA may need to push for more aggressive improvement plans to prevent continued trend of performance -This reads that CSI turnaround interventions would be driven by the school, but there will be instances where the LEA needs to drive an intervention which could include bringing on a new principal. Allow for cases where LEA can drive turnaround actions. -The goal should be to have schools complete one plan and for Schoolwide Plans and Title I Addenda to be incorporated with UIP as well as plans for any other school improvement grant awards and allocations that require plans to be submitted. We need to make it easier for schools to plan and to have one document that is the source of record for tracking and reporting progress on their improvement plans. - Modifications such as quick cycle action planning should be available (as optional not required) to all schools not just CSI. -Also is the proposal to maintain the current federal definitions of turnaround? Would like to be able to give feedback on what CDE is proposing for that too. Menu of Supports: Ability to opt out of CDE or external partner supports and be given equivalent funding for a district to provide additional and intensive supports to schools, provided district services meet the same quality bar as external partners. What is the proposal for how external partners would be identified? Timeline: Can we provide feedback to the state accountability clock options? Innovation should be an option early on to support school improvement, not an end of clock option. Also add an end of clock option to 'restart' with a new district managed school that meets quality criteria.
- I don't think this language is strong enough in terms of ensuring that districts will actually do things differently to solve the problems that led to TSI/CSI status. I wish we could make funding more contingent on real genuine action.
- Menu of Supports needs reconsideration: Current examples not evidence-based Timeline: Progress monitoring should occur for TSI as well as CSI
- I agree with this proposal. My only comment is that the UIP should have enough flexibility that if a comprehensive school is using a planning tool with an outside partner, there should be a way to ensure that the two planning tools align to a reasonable degree. It is challenging for a school to engage in a planning process with an outside partner and then complete a different planning process for the UIP.

Q2 Pre-approved Intervention, Strategy and Partner List Pros Schools have stated if there are tools that “work,” they want guidance and direction Examples to learn from with clear road maps Can expedite the process for districts, rather than spending their time researching multiple partners Potential for state rates to address economy of scale Differentiate between CSI and TSI schools. CDE may pre-select/approve a small number of external partners to expedite the turnaround process. This would look similar to the state’s current programs (e.g., Turnaround Network, Turnaround Leadership Grant). Otherwise, tools would be available to help other schools. Cons Risk of reduced rigor in approving vendors CDE’s capacity is limited to negotiate with vendors on why they are not approved and would require significant maintenance over time Focus CDE’s efforts on creating tools to help schools/LEAs identify needed strategies, rather than vendors (e.g., training on selecting high quality partners and creating performance contracts) May lead to less planning/consideration from schools (focus on a program vs. practice/need) Limiting to a list could stifle and potentially weed out viable partners or discourage locally developed options May encourage schools to skip over the “needs assessment” and jump into solutions too quickly. Process would be needed for matching needs of schools with strategies.

**Preapproved intervention list by CDE - 55% (11 responses)**

**Pre-approved intervention list for some CSI schools only - 45% (9 responses)**

**No pre-approved intervention list - 0% (0 responses)**

All comments (15 responses)

- If the TSI or CSI schools select an "pre-approved" evidence based strategy, the action is automatically approved. If the TSI or CSI school wishes to go "off the list", they will be required to provide justification/support for their school improvement approach before it is approved by CDE (and financially supported with Federal dollars).
- In order to maintain the rigor of vendors, CDE would need to create a specific, intensive strategy to continuously manage this list of partners. In favor of doing it but not necessarily requiring use of vendors. Create options for local ideas so long as they rise to a certain criteria/level of quality.
- There should be verifiable, open, transparent, meaningful, inclusive consultation with schools/districts, parents and parent groups, expert groups, and advocates in the creation of the lists. The department of education staff should not be free of scrutiny in creating a pre-approval process and list. The list should be large enough to ensure true choice on the part of the impacted schools and districts.
- I think CDE should have a pre-approved intervention list. If CDE is supporting comprehensive schools as they are writing their plans, it would help schools and LEAs ensure that the plans have a high degree of success. I don't think anything about having a pre-approved intervention list should stop schools and districts from designing their own plans if they think they can come up with a more adequate intervention. Also there should be CDE support at every step of the way, especially for schools identified as needing comprehensive support, to work to eliminate some of these cons: support should ensure that schools and districts commit to an adequate amount of planning, should help schools understand the pros and cons of various vendors within the local context, and should be driving the needs assessments that schools are using to prevent them from jumping into solutions.
- The list should not be all encompassing, and a one-size fits all. There can be a list that schools MAY look to for guidance and reference but not the only required vendors a school or district may use. Capacity is going to be an issue for the state, how is this list going to be compiled? Who is going to maintain/update/notify of changes?

- Schools in Turnaround need definite guidance about strategies that are proven to be effective. A mixture of vendors and tools to help schools/LEAs identify needed strategies is needed.
- Can we do a pre-approved list with an option for a CSI/TSI school to still find their own vendor (maybe not on the list) and go through an approval process (same one vendors on the list go through)? I feel like anyone on the vendor list needs to follow the overall process: 1. Needs assessment 2. Awareness/Garner Buy-in 3. Foundational elements in place 4. Implementation Schools are not one size fits all. "Vendors" needs to be able to work with the unique needs of schools and districts. Needs to be a wholistic approach. Cannot focus on one content area, i.e. reading tutoring. Needs to look at wrap around services as well.
- If you set some benchmarks, you can offer a recommended list while also offering schools/districts the opportunity to have some flexibility. Thus schools/districts could choose off the list or implement their own reforms, with the expectation that they are meeting benchmarks. They can make a different choice for the school, for instance closure, if they fail to meet benchmarks. Again, if students are viewed as the consumers of this work, as opposed to districts or schools, the choices become much more clear. We should not ask students or families to attend failing schools just so we can give the schools and districts the opportunity to improve. Please make students the priority!
- Rather than pre-approved I believe it should be a published and highly recommended list but not exclusive. Also, district and school leaders who have improved schools within last few years should be involved in the creation of the list of interventions.
- I think it's important that services, vendors, and programs offered to low performing schools are not only vetted to ensure a demonstrated record of effectiveness, it's equally important to progress monitor and evaluate their performance. It might not have to be the state - maybe the state develops criteria that can be used to evaluate and monitor the performance of vendors or providers.
- I would need more information on these "Con's". The first one makes no sense to me, why would there be a risk of reduced rigor in approving vendors
- Pre-approved lists: Provide a CDE approved/vetted list but also build in flexibility where schools can use other partners, interventions or strategies, provided the school submits a plan for doing so meets an evidence bar. Limiting to existing lists will limit innovation or reduce options for schools that may have unique circumstances.
- I'd be fine with a pre-approved list as a starting point, but would also be okay with a district justifying a decision to go with another partner. If this is a partner CDE has turned down already, then the reasons they were turned down can be provided to the district to inform their decision (or funding withheld in extreme CSI cases where the partner clearly won't support a turnaround effort), and if it's a partner organization CDE hasn't vetted, the district could be the use case for them.
- A list is important to have especially if the state is aware of evidence based strategies, interventions and partners that are showing progress in districts. However schools should not be limited to the list if they have identified evidence based strategies, interventions and partners that work but are not on the list.
- For the comprehensive schools that are unable to meet some of the "prerequisites" for additional funding and support, I believe they would need to select from the pre-approved intervention list. Otherwise, if schools have shown the capacity to engage in a meaningful improvement process, they should have more liberty to identify interventions that are not on a pre-approved list.

Q3 In reserving 7% of the state Title I allocation to support identified schools, should the funds be distributed to LEAs through a formula or competitive process? Or a blend of the two (hybrid)?

**Formula only - 5% (1 responses)**

**Competitive only - 38% (8 responses)**

**Hybrid of formula and competitive - 57% (12 responses)**

All comments (8 responses)

- While I would prefer a competitive only approach in order to drive innovation and commitment by the LEAs & school leaders; the need for some ability to plan for districts struggling with funding schools in general, leads me to support the hybrid approach.
- What about awarding competitive grants that have a formulaic model attached to them. For example a grant that instead of awarding a block \$500k, a grant that awards something like \$3000/student? That could help ensure that grants are distributed equitably, with those with higher need or more students in need receiving more than schools with less need. At the end of the day the pot of money will not be large enough to make a meaningful difference at every school identified as needing comprehensive supports. CDE can, and does offer grant writing support to districts, and if CDE support is mandatory when schools create plans it should help ensure that even rural districts without grant writers are able to apply for funding as needed.
- Whether competitive or formula, can CDE give the funds in segments? Wondering if that would help with the "lack of urgency". If schools want all installments of the money (maybe that is given on an annual basis) then they need to meet their milestones written in their "approved plan" in order to receive additional dollars. I am wondering if the hybrid can work so that the formula gives an adequate amount of money to the highest needs schools, then the competitive grants are offered. Would schools who received money through formula be able to apply for more through the competitive? I think this is where partners like CEI can help. There is no way to fund all CSI and TSI schools. Other funders may want to come to the table, especially to help TSI schools. What would the competitive process look like? Would schools be filling out a grant application separate from their UIP plan that CDE must approve? Will all TSI UIPs be reviewed (even if the school is performing overall, i.e., not priority or turnaround status??) ? Are there any guidelines for how this money is used? What should be in the plan? What plans get approved and why? Dollars will not be used well without support and without data driven decisions. What are the underlying causes? Need to focus on the whole child if you want to make a difference in/improve achievement. What would the formula look like? FRL is not the best metric for need.
- Competitive with a supportive process. If schools/districts don't demonstrate readiness, huge amounts of money will not make a difference. If they are ready, small amounts of money can be used as levers to generate large-scale change. Additionally, if clearer "sanctions" or different pathways for schools are actually in place and accessible for communities then more schools might demonstrate readiness.
- Recommend a larger percentage of the funds be distributed as formula. Will we be able to provide feedback and the allocations between CSI and TSI schools?
- These are limited funds that need to be applied in a high enough quantity to do the most good. Regarding small districts claim that they don't have the capacity to write a grant, I am fine if the grant requirements are altered in some way to help alleviate that stress. But no district or school should be awarded any sort of funds unless they have a clearly spelled out plan on how they will use the money. Otherwise we risk throwing good money after bad.

- Initial dollars should be provided based on a formula. Then, based on effective use of funds and high quality implementation, schools should receive additional funds. For example, all schools in TSI and CSI should receive a small baseline amount of dollars. Those schools that use the money wisely, implement with fidelity, and demonstrate growth, should be made eligible for additional dollars. It is competitive, but not based on an application. It is competitive based on growth.
- I know that one argument against a competitive approach is that rural school districts do not have the same grant writing resources that bigger districts do. However, I believe there is a responsibility on the part of all districts (including small rural) to develop a viable plan before funds are made available. I do not think that funds should just automatically be distributed without first knowing that there is a good use for those funds.