

Archived Information

DEMONSTRATIONS OF COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM

Goal: Enable low-performing students to improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: The Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSR D) Program’s activities support Objectives 1.1 (implement challenging standards); 2.2 (reading); 2.3 (math); 2.4 (special populations) by using CSR D models; and 3.1 (college preparation) by helping schools serving various grade levels implement effective, research-based, comprehensive reforms intended to raise student achievement. In addition to a focus on basic academics, the program supports Objectives 1.4 (professional development for teachers and staff), 1.5 (family involvement), and 1.3 (safe, strong, disciplined schools).
 FY 2000—\$220,000,000
 FY 2001—\$240,000,000 (Requested budget)

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

Indicator 1.1 State and local assessments: Increasing percentages of students in CSR D program schools will meet or exceed the basic and proficient levels of performance on state and local assessments in reading and math.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Status: Data on changes in student performance not available until 2000. Progress toward target is likely.</p> <p>Explanation: The CSR D program began in 1998. This indicator is a change measure. Therefore, this indicator will be based on measuring each school’s progress against itself. As such, it is necessary to collect 2 years of data to establish a baseline student performance measure and evaluate changes in student achievement.</p> <p>Progress toward the goal of continuing increase in student achievement is likely. Findings from the Department’s study, <u>Special Strategies for Educating Disadvantaged Children</u> (1997), showed that students in schools using externally developed research-based school reform models tend to achieve greater academic gains than students in typical schoolwide programs. However, implementation research by RAND Corp. and others suggests that it takes 3 or more years for fully implemented models to yield achievement gains.</p>	<p>Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 2000 (baseline). <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>Consolidated State Performance Reports. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> December 2000.</p> <p>CSR D field-focused studies. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2001.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data source verified by Department of Education attestation process and Department of Education <u>Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data</u>.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: The baseline has been changed for this performance indicator from 1999 to 2000. This reflects the nature of the indicator as a change measure that requires 2 years of student achievement data for reporting.</p>
1999:	No data available	N/A		
2000:		Baseline to be established		
2001:		Continuing increase		

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
		<p>The data for this indicator will be self-reported by State Education Agencies. A contractor is currently exploring electronic formats in which state assessment data are available by school and will assist in data collection for the state performance reports.</p> <p>One of the limitations of this data is that state assessments are in a transition period. States are not required to have their final assessment systems in place until the 2000-01 school year. It will be a challenge to report trends in the context of changing state assessments.</p>

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

Indicator 2.1 Implementation: The number of CSRD program schools meeting objectives for implementation will increase annually.																	
Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality															
<i>Percentage of principals in CSRD schools reporting that they were involved in initial training and professional development around the model</i>	Status: Baseline data reported. Data for 1999-00 available fall 2000. Progress toward target is likely.	Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999 (baseline).															
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1998-99:</td> <td>26%</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999-00:</td> <td></td> <td>Continuing increase</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000-01:</td> <td></td> <td>Continuing increase</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001-02:</td> <td></td> <td>Continuing increase</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1998-99:	26%	N/A	1999-00:		Continuing increase	2000-01:		Continuing increase	2001-02:		Continuing increase	Explanation: The CSRD program began in 1998. The first year of data was 1998-99, which provided baseline data for this indicator.	<i>Frequency:</i> Annually.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets															
1998-99:	26%	N/A															
1999-00:		Continuing increase															
2000-01:		Continuing increase															
2001-02:		Continuing increase															
	Progress on this indicator is likely as schools have time and external assistance to implement comprehensive school reform programs.	<i>Next Update:</i> 2000.															
<i>Percentage of principals in CSRD schools reporting that they had partially implemented their chosen model</i>		Validation Procedure: Data collected by Westat, Inc., and validated by internal procedures.															
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1998-99:</td> <td>25%</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999-00:</td> <td></td> <td>Continuing increase</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000-01:</td> <td></td> <td>Continuing increase</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001-02:</td> <td></td> <td>Continuing increase</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1998-99:	25%	N/A	1999-00:		Continuing increase	2000-01:		Continuing increase	2001-02:		Continuing increase		Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: One of the limitations of these data is that the indicator depends on self-reports from CSRD program schools about the level of reform implementation. The CSRD field-focused studies, CSRD reports from the field, and other in-depth case studies under way will examine the implementation process in CSRD schools through observations.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets															
1998-99:	25%	N/A															
1999-00:		Continuing increase															
2000-01:		Continuing increase															
2001-02:		Continuing increase															
<i>Percentage of principals in CSRD schools reporting that their reform model is mostly implemented</i>																	
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Actual Performance</th> <th>Performance Targets</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1998-99:</td> <td>36%</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999-00:</td> <td></td> <td>Continuing increase</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000-01:</td> <td></td> <td>Continuing increase</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2001-02:</td> <td></td> <td>Continuing increase</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	1998-99:	36%	N/A	1999-00:		Continuing increase	2000-01:		Continuing increase	2001-02:		Continuing increase		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets															
1998-99:	36%	N/A															
1999-00:		Continuing increase															
2000-01:		Continuing increase															
2001-02:		Continuing increase															

Indicator 2.2 School improvement: Increasing numbers of CSRD program schools will no longer be designated as schools in need of improvement by their states.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Number of schools identified as in need of improvement under Title I, upon receiving their awards between July 1998 and November 1999</i>			<p>Status: Baseline data reported. Data for 1999-2000 available fall 2000. No change data will be available until 2000. Progress toward target is likely.</p> <p>Explanation: This indicator will track the status of the 726 schools identified for improvement under Title I when they received their CSRD program awards. The expectation is that increasing numbers of these schools will no longer be designated as in need of improvement. Data for 1999 and 2000 will be submitted in the state consolidated performance reports for the 1999-00 school year and the 2000-01 school year, due in December 2000 and December 2001, respectively. Progress toward target is likely because of implementation of a comprehensive school improvement effort in these schools, supported by expert external assistance.</p>	<p>Source: The Southwest Educational Laboratory Database of Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program schools, 1999(baseline)/2000.</p> <p><i>Frequency:</i> N/A.</p> <p><i>Next Update:</i> December 2000 (reported through Consolidated State Performance Reports).</p> <p>Consolidated State Performance Reports, 2000.</p> <p><i>Frequency:</i> Annually.</p> <p><i>Next Update:</i> December 2000.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data supplied by State Education Agencies. No formal verification process applied.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: There is a lack of consistent criteria across states for identifying Title I schools for improvement under ESEA Section 1116. In addition, states are not required to have their final assessment and accountability systems in place until the 2000-2001 school year. State processes for identifying schools in need of improvement are in a transition phase. In addition to these limitations, data are self-reported by State Education Agencies. A Department of Education contractor will assist State Education Agencies in submitting accurate and complete data and in analyzing the data.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998-99:	726 of 1,753 (41%)	N/A		
1999-00:		Continuing increase in the number of originally identified schools that are no longer designated as in need of improvement		
2000-01:		Continuing increase in the number of originally identified schools that are no longer designated as in need of improvement		

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: Baseline data are reported. Data for 1999-2000 will be available fall 2000. Positive trend toward target is likely.</p> <p>Explanation: Data for the 1999-00 school year will be collected from a nationally representative sample of Title I schools as part of the National Longitudinal Survey of Schools.</p>	<p>Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999(baseline)/2000.</p> <p><i>Frequency:</i> Annually.</p> <p><i>Next Update:</i> 2000.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Data collected by Westat, Inc., and validated by internal procedures.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998-99:	31%	N/A		
1999-00:		Continuing increase		
2000-01:		Continuing increase		
2001-02:		Continuing increase		

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
	Progress on this indicator is expected because of increasing awareness of and support for comprehensive school reform among states, districts, and schools. One of the purposes of the program is to act 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>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>

OBJECTIVE 3: FEDERAL LEADERSHIP, ASSISTANCE, AND GUIDANCE IN PARTNERSHIP WITH STATES AND LOCAL DISTRICTS WILL SUPPORT SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT AND IMPROVED SERVICES TO STUDENTS.

Indicator 3.1 Useful guidance: The percentage of state and local program coordinators who report that comprehensive reform implementation guidance and other assistance is helpful will increase over time.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percentage of state program coordinators who say that written information (e.g., guidance, mailings) was either "very helpful" or "helpful" in informing their understanding of the program</i>			Status: Baseline data are reported. Progress toward target is likely.	Source: Follow-Up Study of State Implementation, 1998 (baseline). <i>Frequency:</i> N/A. <i>Next Update:</i> N/A.	
Year	Actual Performance		Explanation: Progress toward continuing high levels of satisfaction with Federal guidance on the CSRD program is expected. The program has established a listserv of state program coordinators and keeps in regular contact with states and districts on relevant news and activities.	Validation Procedure: Data collected by Policy Studies Associates, Inc., and validated by internal procedures. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: There is no regular vehicle to collect district-level information to inform this indicator. A survey of state program coordinators is planned for 2000-01.	
	"Very Helpful"	"Helpful"			Performance Targets
1998:	60%	38%			
1999:	No data available				100%
2000:					100%
2001:					100%
<i>Percentage of state program coordinators who said that other contacts, such as conferences, workshops, on-line services, and telephone contacts, were either "very helpful" or "helpful" in informing their understanding of the program</i>					
Year	Actual Performance				
	"Very Helpful"	"Helpful"	Performance Targets		
1998:	49%	38%	Not applicable		
1999:	No data available		100%		
2000:			100%		
2001:			100%		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- ❖ To support adoption and implementation of effective comprehensive reform programs, the program will disseminate program guidance and information to assist states, districts, and schools.
- ❖ To design and carry out effective technical assistance strategies, the program will work with states, regional education laboratories, comprehensive centers, and other providers.
- ❖ To provide better information for program analysis and evaluation, the program will enhance the Southwest Educational Laboratory CSRD database.
- ❖ To gather and share lessons learned from states, districts, and schools, the program will continue the CSRD in the field initiative.

KEY STRATEGIES (CONTINUED)

Strategies Continued from 1999

- ❖ To disseminate information of interest to grantees and other interested organizations, the program will use its listservs and Web site.
- ❖ To improve the research base around comprehensive school reform, the Department will continue implementation of a high-quality national evaluation of CSRD and support additional research efforts on effectiveness of existing models.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- ❖ To ensure wide availability of useful research and information, the program will work with the Office of Educational Research and Improvement to support initial implementation of the new National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform.
- ❖ To allow CSRD schools to share information as they implement and evaluate comprehensive reforms, the Department will support the launch of a new lab-sponsored Web site.
- ❖ To support schools in adopting research-based strategies, the program will work with a regional lab to disseminate a new toolkit on comprehensive school reform and schoolwide programs.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- ❖ The Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program coordinates extensively with other programs and offices within the Department of Education, including other new initiative programs such as the Reading Excellence Act, Class-Size Reduction, and 21st Century Community Learning Centers.
- ❖ The program collaborates with Title I and Goals 2000 staff to strengthen schoolwide programs and district reforms via joint input on program guidance and strategy.
- ❖ The program works with Office of Educational Research and Improvement staff on coordination of technical assistance and on implementation and evaluation of new capacity-building and model design initiatives.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- ❖ States and districts have varying levels of experience in assisting schools with components of comprehensive reform.
- ❖ The initial capacity of schools to implement comprehensive reform varies.
- ❖ Many models have a limited research base and varying track records of effectiveness.

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- ❖ Indicator 2.3 (recognition for quality) was changed to last year's Indicator 2.3 (school improvement). The indicator now shows the number of schools no longer designated in need of improvement rather than schools designated as distinguished by their states. This change reflects the focus of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program on low-performing schools. In addition, data on school improvement are more consistently collected by states than data on distinguished schools. The Consolidated State Performance Report provides a mechanism for tracking all schools in the program. States will report if the status of any schools designated in need of improvement changes.
- ❖ Indicator 3.1 (useful guidance) was also adjusted. The wording of the indicator was changed from "the number of state and local program coordinators who report the comprehensive reform implementation guidance is timely, understandable, and informative" to "the number who report the guidance is helpful." The wording of the indicator was changed to more accurately reflect the survey question and ensure that data collected directly address the indicator.

Dropped—None.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- ❖ Indicator 1.1 (state and local assessments) has been adjusted to specify a focus on reading and math achievement.
- ❖ Indicator 2.1 (implementation)—last year's Indicator 2.2—has been adjusted. The word "their" has been removed from this indicator to more accurately reflect the measure of implementation level that will be assessed in the National Longitudinal Survey of Schools. This analysis of data will use a uniform framework for assessing level of implementation rather than each school's own benchmarks. This standard framework will provide a generic benchmark that will ensure valid data that directly address this performance indicator.
- ❖ Indicator 2.1 (research based) and last year's Indicator 3.2 (impact on local understanding) have been combined into the new Indicator 2.3 (impact on school improvement). This new indicator is a clearer, more accurate measurement of how the program is leveraging comprehensive school reform, beyond grantee schools. The new indicator measures the number of Title I schools implementing comprehensive, research-based reforms, rather than attempting to measure what schools and districts know, which would be more difficult to capture.

Dropped

- ❖ Indicator 1.2 (attendance) has been dropped. It is not expected to be a significant measure of program performance.

New—None.