

Archived Information

DEMONSTRATIONS OF COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM

Goal: To enable low-performing students to improve their achievement to meet challenging standards. Legislation: Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, Part E, 20 U.S.C. 6492, and Title X, Part A, U.S.C. 8001 and the annual Appropriations Acts for the U.S. Department of Education, (beginning with P.L. 105-78).	Funding History (\$ in millions)			
	Fiscal Year	Appropriation	Fiscal Year	Appropriation
	1985	\$0	2000	\$170
	1990	\$0	2001	\$210
	1995	\$0	2002 (Requested)	\$260

Program Description

Demonstrations of Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) was created through the Department's 1998 appropriations act. This program provides schools with funding to adopt and implement comprehensive school reforms based on reliable research and effective practices, which will enable children in participating schools to meet challenging state standards. These reforms must be structured to address nine critical components.

The nine components establish, among other things, that each participating school will base its proposed reforms on a comprehensive design that does three things: (1) employs innovative strategies and methods grounded in reliable research and practice; (2) aligns curriculum, instruction, professional development, parent involvement and school management into a comprehensive schoolwide reform plan; and (3) utilizes high-quality external technical support and assistance from entities with experience and expertise in school-wide reform and improvement.

The Department allocates the Title I portion of Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration funds to states based on their relative shares of the previous year's Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies funds. State educational agencies (SEAs) then make competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) on behalf of specific schools eligible for funds under Title I, Part A. Individual schools then use these funds to implement comprehensive school reform programs. The amount of an award must be at least \$50,000 for each school. Grants are renewable for up to three years. In addition, each SEA may reserve up to five percent of the funds it receives for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance, including expenses necessary to inform LEAs and schools about research-based approaches to comprehensive school reform.

In addition to the funds provided through Title I, states receive funds by formula from the fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE) based on each state's share of school-aged children. All schools may compete for the state's allocation of FIE funds, but only schools eligible for Title I may receive the Title I CSR funds.

Program Performance

OBJECTIVE 1: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN CORE SUBJECTS GENERALLY WILL SHOW MARKED IMPROVEMENT IN COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM DEMONSTRATION (CSR) PROGRAM SCHOOLS.

Targets and Performance Data							Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentages of schools reporting increasing percentages of students meeting or exceeding the proficient level on state assessments</i>							Status: Baseline established.	Source: Consolidated State Performance Reports. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> December 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> January 2002.	
Year	Actual Performance						Performance Targets	Explanation: Data for this indicator represent 816 schools for reading and 767 schools for mathematics in 24 states. The indicator signifies the percentage of schools reporting an increase in the number of students meeting or exceeding proficiency levels between the first year of Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration grant implementation and the year prior to receiving the grant award. For elementary schools, grade 4 data were used when available. If the state did not provide grade 4 data, the next closest grade (5 or 3 in that order) was used. For middle schools, grade 8 was used or the next closest grade (7 or 6 in that order). For high schools, grade 11 was used or the next closest grade (10, 12 or 9 in that order). Combined-grade schools (e.g., K-8 or K-12) may be included under more than one category.	National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 2000 (baseline). <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> 2000. <i>Date to be reported:</i> 2001. Validation Procedure: Data source verified by Department of Education attestation process and Department of Education <u>Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data</u> . Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The data for this indicator were self-reported by State Educational Agencies. A contractor assisted States in data collection and conducted the analysis for this indicator. Data from States that failed to meet the required submission deadline for the Consolidated State Performance Report could not be included in this analysis. Several States were granted extensions by the Department; others indicated that achievement data were not available due to internal delays.
	Reading			Mathematics					
	Elementary	Middle	High	Elementary	Middle	High			
1999:	No data available						N/A		
2000:	67%	56%	72%	62%	74%	61%	Baseline		
2001:							Increase		
2002:							Continuing increase		

OBJECTIVE 2: THE NUMBER OF SCHOOLS PROVIDING HIGH-QUALITY CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION AND IMPROVING STUDENT OUTCOMES WILL INCREASE EACH YEAR.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of principals in CSRD schools reporting they are in the initial stage of implementation and professional development</i>			<p>Status: Target met.</p> <p>Explanation: Schools demonstrated progress in implementing comprehensive reform programs in the second year of the program. Fewer schools reported being in the initial stages of implementation, while greater numbers reported that their programs were partially or mostly implemented.</p> <p>This indicator follows a cohort of schools through three years of implementing a comprehensive school reform program. Over the course of the three years, schools move from the initial implementation phase, to partial implementation to full implementation. In year two, more schools should be in the partial implementation stage than the initial stage. By year 3, no schools should still be in the initial stage, and the number reporting partial implementation should decrease while schools reporting full implementation increase.</p>	<p>Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999 (baseline). <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> 2000. <i>Date to be reported:</i> 2001.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data collected by Westat, Inc., and validated by internal procedures.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The data are based on a small sample of schools in the second year of implementation at the time the data were collected. Another limitation is that the indicator depends on self-reports from CSRD program schools about the level of reform implementation. The CSRD Field-Focused Studies, CSRD in the Field, and other in-depth case studies under way will examine the implementation process in CSRD schools through observations.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998-99:	26%	N/A		
1999-00:	5%	Continuing decrease		
2000-01:		0%		
2001-02:		New cohort—baseline to be established		
<i>Percentage of principals in CSRD schools reporting that they had partially implemented their chosen model</i>				
1998-99:	25%	N/A		
1999-00:	34%	Continuing increase		
2000-01:		15%		
2001-02:		New cohort – baseline to be established		
<i>Percentage of principals in CSRD schools reporting that their reform model is mostly implemented</i>				
1998-99:	36%	N/A		
1999-00:	59%	Continuing increase		
2000-01:		85%		
2001-02:		New cohort – baseline to be established		

Indicator 2.2 School improvement: Decreasing numbers of CSRD program schools will be designated as schools in need of improvement.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of schools identified as in need of improvement under Title I</i>			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	
1998-99:	41% (726 of 1,753)	N/A	<p>Status: Target met.</p> <p>Explanation: The percentage of CSRD schools identified by their state as in need of improvement under Title I decreased. Data represent 1,005 schools in 29 states.</p> <p>Source: The Southwest Educational Laboratory Database of Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program schools, 1999(baseline)/2000. <i>Frequency:</i> N/A. <i>Next collection update:</i> December 2001 (reported through Consolidated State Performance Reports). <i>Date to be reported:</i> 2002.</p> <p>Consolidated State Performance Reports <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> December 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> 2002.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data supplied by State Educational Agencies. No formal verification process applied.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The data for this indicator were self-reported by State Educational Agencies. A contractor assisted States in collecting and submitting this data and conducted the analysis for this indicator.</p>
1999-00:	33% (331 of 1,005)	Decrease	
2000-01:		Continuing decrease	
2001-02:		New cohort – baseline to be established	

Indicator 2.3 Impact on school improvement: The number of schools implementing comprehensive, research-based approaches to improve curriculum and instruction will increase annually.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Percentage of principals in Title I schools reporting that they are implementing a research-based school reform model</i>			<p>Status: Target met.</p> <p>Explanation: Increasing numbers of Title I schools are implementing research-based school reform models to improve curriculum and instruction. The Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program is meeting its purpose of increasing awareness of and support for comprehensive school reform among states, districts and schools, and acts as a catalyst for how Title I funds can be used in schoolwide programs to support the adoption of research-based comprehensive school reform programs.</p>	<p>Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999(baseline)/2000. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> 2000. <i>Date to be reported:</i> 2001.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data collected by Westat, Inc., and validated by internal procedures.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data are taken from a nationally representative sample of Title I schools; no data are available on all Title I schools.</p> <p>Because data are based on self-reports, it is difficult to judge the extent to which reform programs are comprehensive and research-based. An examination of school documents on a subsample of Title I schools will allow some indication of the quality of comprehensive school reform efforts in Title I schools in general.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998-99:	31%	N/A		
1999-00:	46%	Continuing increase		
2000-01:		55%		
2001-02:		60%		