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Instructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Recommended Data Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To identify, articulate, and communicate which district systems effectively supported school turnaround and transformation and which district systems may need to be refined, revised, or added to more effectively support rapid school improvement. | – Student Achievement Data  
– Data Predictive of MCAS  
– District Systems of Support Review Report  
– Monitoring Site Visit Report(s)  
– Original School Redesign Grant Proposal(s)  
– Implementation Benchmark Data  
– Conditions for School Effectiveness  
– Measurable Annual Goals (MAGs) Data  
– Administration, teacher, and staff observations  
– Parent, Student, Community Survey Data  
– Original School Redesign Grant Proposal  
– FY14 Amendments  
– Academic Return on Investment Analyses |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Product</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A clear and cogent response to each prompt drawing on directly relevant data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A candid, well-articulated statement of what worked, didn’t work, and what the district will do differently next year to effectively impact rapid improvement in its schools’ turnaround efforts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Two key “early evidence of change” benchmarks to be used to monitor the progress of your district systems for school support and intervention. (Refer to Appendix B.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be completed by the District Team, with school representation.

*Refer to Appendix A (Scoring Rubric) when completing this section.

Guidance

As a district team, use the District Systems of Support Analysis form to record the efficacy of the proposed district-level systems (structures, strategies, and policies) as they may have effectively supported or failed to support SRG schools, and provide key data and highlights of evidence supporting the analysis. One to three paragraphs in response to each question should be sufficient in providing ESE with the detail expected. Bulleted items are allowable. Refer to Section III: Guidance in the School Redesign Grant Renewal Application Directions before completing the District Submission Section.

Process Suggestion

Districts should develop responses to the listed questions based on existing reviews of district systems to support SRG school(s). If the district has not yet undertaken a formal review, the district is encouraged to convene key district office personnel and school leaders to engage in a review of the district’s systems (strategies, use of resources, practices, and policies) to foster and assist schools in their turnaround and transformation efforts. In this process, consider the following resources and data:

- Applicable progress monitoring and qualitative and/or quantitative data in relationship to the 2014-2015 identified implementation benchmarks, including Monitoring Site Visit report(s).
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- Outcome data from schools as impacted by district strategies, use of resources, practices and policies.
- Consider the six district standards\(^1\) that ESE has established as critical for effective district systems and how elements of the district’s support in these areas have or have not contributed to successful activities in SRG school(s).

\(^1\) Leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, assessment and program evaluation, human resources and professional development, student support, and financial management.
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District: <Insert District Name>
School(s): <Insert School Name(s)>

Renewal Year: (circle one) Two Three

1. What proposed district systems worked well this year and positively contributed to rapid improvement in the district’s SRG school(s)? And based on what evidence? *(Please refer to recommended data resources.)*

<Insert Narrative>

2. With regard to district systems, what didn’t work this year, or didn’t work as well as intended, for supporting rapid improvement in the district’s SRG school(s)? And based on what evidence? *(Please refer to recommended data resources.)*

<Insert Narrative>

3. Given what worked and what didn’t, which supports and policies will be refined, revised or added to your district’s system of support to accelerate the implementation of turnaround/transformation in your district? And what is the rationale for these refinements, revisions or additions? What do you expect to be different and why?

<Insert Narrative>

4. How is the district systematically differentiating support(s) to its lowest performing schools (SRG, Level 4 and/or Level3) to ensure all schools are successful in their turnaround efforts? (e.g. do Level 4 schools get priority access to district assistance? Through what process/structure?) Provide evidence to support the effectiveness of this system.

<Insert Narrative>

5. Based on your schools’ answers to the Budget Section, what processes has the district put in place to sustain successful school and district-level practices and programs after Year 3 of the School Redesign Grant? (For more support in sustainability planning, reference the Turnaround Sustainability Toolkit zip file via this link: http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/turnaround/grants/default.html)
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<Insert Narrative>

Please list two key early evidence of change benchmarks that will be used to assess progress in District Systems during the 2014-15 school year. (Refer to Appendix B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Evidence of Change Benchmark</th>
<th>Measurement Tool</th>
<th>Dates Assessed (monthly, quarterly, annually)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Name of Grant Program: School Redesign Implementation Grant

Fund Code: 511

District Name: LEA Code:

ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

The LEA must assure that it will—

1. Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school, or each priority school, that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
2. Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school, or priority school, that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
3. If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, or priority school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements;
4. Monitor and evaluate the actions a school has taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to recruit, select and provide oversight to external providers to ensure their quality;
5. Monitor and evaluate the actions schools have taken, as outlined in the approved SIG application, to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends and that it will provide technical assistance to schools on how they can sustain progress in the absence of SIG funding; and,
6. Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

Note: Most of the school-level data elements are already submitted via current data collections (e.g., SIMS). ESE will provide further guidance and assistance to minimize the data collection burden for any new elements.

WAIVERS: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA’s School Improvement Grant, an LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

- “Starting over” in the school improvement timeline for participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
- Implementing a schoolwide program in a participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.
- Do not wish to implement either waiver at this time.

Typed Name of Superintendent:

Signature of Superintendent:

Date: