SIG 1003(g) Successful Applications “By Design”

April 5, 2013
Agenda

• Application Scoring Process and Timeline
• How the Scoring Works
• Working Backward from the Rubric
• Resources
Whom Do You Represent?

• Please select one of the responses below
  – District administration
  – Building Administration
  – Teachers’ Union or Faculty
  – Lead Partner Organization
Application Process and Timeline

- Application’s Due to ISBE April 30, 2013, 4:00 p.m.
- External Reviewers Score Each Application Using the Rubric
- ISBE Consultants Document Level of Compliance with Requirements
- Consensus Session Reviewers Reach Scoring Consensus for Each Section of Every Application
- Consensus Session ISBE Consultants Document Comments and Develop Interview Questions
- ISBE Conducts Interviews with Schools that Earned ≥ 154 Capacity/Readiness Points
- ISBE Recommends Schools for Funding, Issues Conditions of Funding
- ISBE Notifies Schools That Have Not Qualified for Funding
How the Scoring Works: The First Eligibility Hurdle

- In order to be considered for funding, an individual school’s total Capacity and Readiness score must be $\geq 154$ points.

- General points are included in the ranking only after the reviewers have recommended funding based on meeting the cut score.
# Rubric Breakdown Handout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Portion</th>
<th>Capacity***</th>
<th>Pts</th>
<th>General Criteria</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overview and Rationale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Needs Analysis: Governance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Capacity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Identifying Principal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Transitions</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Operational Flexibility</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Pre-Implementation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Financial Incentives</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Extended Time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Extended Time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Alignment of Standards</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Professional Development</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Governance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Selecting Lead Partner</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Alignment of Other Resources</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Level of Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Level of Commitment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Stakeholder Consultation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community Engagement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Timeline and Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Budget</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Timeline</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sustaining After the Grant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table above outlines the rubric breakdown for various criteria related to the overview and rationale, proposed activities, and level of commitment. Each section is scored with a total possible of 220 points. The overall goal is to evaluate the capacity and readiness of a school for a proposed activity or project.
# Rubric Breakdown

**LEA Portion: Capacity*** Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Overview and Rationale</th>
<th>III. Level of Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Needs Analysis: Teachers and Leaders</td>
<td>2. Level of Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Needs Analysis: Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## II. Proposed Activities

| 1. Identifying Principal                                    | 6. Alignment of Standards          |
| 2. Operational Flexibility                                 | 9. Professional Development        |
| 3. Evaluation and Placement of Teachers                    | 10. Governance                     |
| 4. Financial Incentives                                     | 11. Selecting Lead Partner         |
| 5. Extended Time                                            | 12. Alignment of Resources         |

**17 Criteria X 10 Points**

**= 170 Possible Capacity Points**
Rubric Breakdown
Individual School Readiness**
Criterion

I. Overview and Rationale
   2. Role of the Lead Partner
   3. Staffing

II. Proposed Activities
   2. Data Driven Decision Making
   3. Curriculum and Assessment
   4. Instruction

5 criteria X 10 points = 50 possible readiness points
## General Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA General Criteria</th>
<th>Individual School General Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Overview and Rationale</strong></td>
<td><strong>I. Overview and Rationale</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Development of the Needs Assessment</td>
<td>1. Needs Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Attachment 4: Goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Proposed Activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>II. Proposed Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Transitions</td>
<td>1. Culture and Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Pre-Implementation</td>
<td>5. Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Monitoring</td>
<td>6. Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Communicating Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Level of Commitment</strong></td>
<td><strong>III. Budget</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Stakeholder Consultation</td>
<td>1. Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community Engagement</td>
<td>2. Timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Timeline and Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Timeline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sustaining After the Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Rubric Breakdown
### Capacity and Readiness Points Possible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>LEA Capacity ***</th>
<th>Individual School Readiness**</th>
<th>General LEA School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Overview and Rationale</td>
<td>5 criterion X 10 points = 50 points</td>
<td>2 criterion X 10 points = 20 points</td>
<td>2 X 10 = 20 1 X 10 = 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Proposed Activities</td>
<td>11 criterion X 10 points = 110 points</td>
<td>3 criterion X 10 points = 30 points</td>
<td>3 X 10 = 30 4 X 10 = 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Level of Commitment</td>
<td>1 criteria X 10 points = 10 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 X 10 = 20 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Timeline and Budget</td>
<td>No capacity criterion</td>
<td>No readiness criteria</td>
<td>3 X 10 = 30 2 X 10 = 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotals</strong></td>
<td>170 capacity points</td>
<td>50 readiness points</td>
<td><strong>220 Capacity and Readiness Points</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Let’s Do the Math: Consensus Scoring Options

• Reviewers discuss the scores they assigned.
• The group comes to consensus on the number of points to assign to each section, based on their evaluation of the associated criterion.
• Points between 0-10 per criterion may be assigned.
• Therefore, it may be useful to think in terms of reaching for an average of 7 points per criteria

7 points per criteria X 22 Criteria = 154 points
Working Backward From the Rubric: Getting Past First Base

• Emphasize **Capacity + Readiness**
• 154 cut score
• Capacity + Readiness possible points = 220
• Point distribution emphasizes LEA Capacity
• Target maximum scores, especially for LEA Capacity, in order to make the cut score
Caveats

• Our suggestions are only suggestions, we cannot guarantee that any application will earn a high score based on them.

• Employ ethical standards when reviewing the applications of other schools.
Working Backward From the Rubric: Deconstruct Each Criteria

- Carefully discern the difference between a score of ten and five for each criteria
- Next, carefully discern the difference between a score of ten and zero
- Finally, familiarize yourself with what a score of two entails
Example: III.2 Level of Commitment***
(10 points)

• Application includes five or more letters of support from leaders of organizations representing large constituencies that are clearly familiar with the specific plans for the school.
• Letters include specific support for the five most dramatic changes proposed at the school.
• Letter from union leadership includes specific description of all planned Collective Bargaining Agreement amendments and support for these amendments as part of the intervention.
Example: III.2 Level of Commitment***
(5 points)

- Application includes three or more letters of support from leaders of organizations representing large constituencies that are clearly familiar with the specific plans for the school.
- Letters include specific support for the five most dramatic changes proposed at the school.
- Letter from union leadership includes specific description of all planned Collective Bargaining Agreement amendments and support for these amendments as part of the intervention.
III.2 Level of Commitment***
0 points

• Application includes letters of support from **individuals** that are **not** familiar with the interventions at the school.

• Letter from union leadership includes **general** description of support.
Example: III.2 Level of Commitment***
(2 points)

• Application includes [no number specified] letters of support from leaders of organizations representing large constituencies that are clearly familiar with the specific plans for the school.

• Letters include general support for changes proposed at the school

• Letter from union leadership includes general description of all planned Collective Bargaining Agreement amendments and support for these amendments as part of the intervention.
Sample: III. 2 Letters of Commitment: East St Louis

• Application includes five or more letters of support from leaders of organizations representing large constituencies that are clearly familiar with the specific plans for the school.
• Letters include specific support for the five most dramatic changes proposed at the school.
• Letter from union leadership includes specific description of all planned Collective Bargaining Agreement amendments and support for these amendments as part of the intervention.
Polling Question 2

Assume that in addition to the two letters we read, the application also contains two more letters from large organizations. Four of the letters contain specific information about five major reforms and one refers generally to the reform effort.
Polling Question 3

Assume that in addition to the two letters that we read, there are seven more letters from individuals who demonstrated familiarity with at least 5 dramatic changes.
Working Backward From the Rubric: Deconstruct the Rubric

• Reviewers will choose the highest score for the category that is completely fulfilled.
• Pay close attention to minor distinctions between the scores.
Working Backward From the Rubric: Appendices

• Refer to the RFP for specific limitations to the LEA and Individual School Abstracts and Narratives

• There are no restrictions concerning the use of appendices
FY2012 CPS Application with Appendices

• LEA Portion
  – Attachments 1 through 4
  – Abstract (5 page limit)
  – Part III District Needs Assessment
  – LEA Narrative (33 page limit)
  – Attachment 5
  – (next slide)
FY2012 CPS Application with Appendices

• LEA Portion (cont’d)
  – Appendix A: Implementation Timeline, 3 –Year Overview
  – Appendix B: Existing and New Job Descriptions
  – Appendix C: LEA Letters of Support
  – Appendix D: Stakeholder Consultation Forms for the LEA
FY2012 CPS Application with Appendices

• LEA Portion (cont’d)
  – Appendix II.A.3. Human Capital Hiring Process
    • Interview Stages
    • Job Skills Demonstration
    • Student/Parent/Principal Interviews
    • Reference Checks
  – Appendix II.A.5. Principal Incentive Plan
  – Appendix II.A.11 Partner Evaluation Process Template MOU
FY2012 CPS Application with Appendices

• LEA Portion (cont’d)
  – Appendix IV.C. Sustainability Plan (Years 4-6)
  – Appendix D. Stakeholder Consultation Confirmation by School
Working Backward From the Rubric: Appendices

• Carefully label and cross-reference every portion of the document
• Use appendices to provide specific information that is referenced in the narrative
• Include signed documents as evidence within the appendices
Working Backward From the Rubric: Look For Commonalities

- I.2 Needs Analysis: Teachers and Leaders
- I.3 Needs Analysis: Instructional Support
- I.4 Needs Analysis: Time and Support
- L.5. Needs Analysis: Governance
Working Backward From the Rubric: Look For Commonalities

• The LEA describes clearly with detail, the actions the LEA has taken or will take to modify its practices or policies ____

• The response demonstrates a thorough understanding of key issues facing the LEA regarding ____ and addresses these issues directly with specific bold plans

• Collaboration with teachers union and school board are included in plan to address issues regarding ____
Working Backward From the Rubric: Evidence – Cahokia MOU

• Contract language defining terms, advisory options
• Teacher/Principal Evaluation
• New Governance Structure
• Extended Learning Time
• Incentive System
• Instructional support
Working Backward From the Rubric: Evidence

- MOU’s
- Letters
- Tables and Graphs
- Templates of MOUs,
Other Examples of Evidence

- New bell schedules which demonstrate how an increased use of instructional time will be used
- MOU and scope of work of the lead partner
- Tables and Graphs which may or may not be embedded in the narratives indicating job assignments or assessment schedule, or collaboration schedules
Working Backward From the Rubric: Narrative Construct Tips

• Describe what the LEA/School has done prior to receiving the grant
• Describe what it plans to do based on the Needs Assessment and/or data analysis
  – During Pre-Implementation
  – During Implementation
• Reference supporting detail
  – Responsible Persons. Participating Persons
  – Best Practices
  – Program Monitoring
  – Frequency and Timeline
• Reference supporting evidence
Narrative Tips: Cahokia - II. 6 Extended Time

• School day was reorganized during the previous school year.
• Describes the collaborative process, including the lead partner
• Explains in detail how the increase in time will be used
• Includes an clearly referenced appendix with a “mock” schedule
• Budget reflects teachers’ compensation for increased time
• Lead Partner’s MOU includes references to their participation in the planning and implementation of increased learning time.
Working Backward From the Rubric: Research Best Practices

- School Turnaround Learning Community
- Contact Other SIG Schools
- ISBE SIG 1003(g) Webpage Resources
- Lead Partner Expertise
Research Example
Principal Competencies

• CPS Application: Local Competencies and Protocols
• Public Impact: Competencies and Tool Kit for Interview Protocols
• Peoria School District – Habermann Model and Protocols
ISBE Resources

• Principal Consultants
  – Robin Staudenmeier estauden@isbe.net
  – Kurt Miller kumiller@isbe.net

• ISBE Webpage