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Outcomes …

- Discuss the elements of a comprehensive needs assessment.
- Learn about available resources when considering restructuring/alternative governance options for schools in Program Improvement (PI) Year 4 or Year 5.
- Hear about regional, Local Educational Agency (LEA), and school success after implementing Alternative Governance Boards to monitor and support Years 4/5 restructuring efforts.
- Begin the conversation about Year 4 and Year 5 restructuring options for school sites within your LEA.
Predictions …

- What percent of Riverside County Title 1 schools are in Program Improvement? 61%
- What percent of Riverside County Title 1 schools are in PI Years 4/5? 34%
- What percent of Riverside County PI schools are in Year 5? 49%
Title I Non-PI Schools Compared With PI Year 5 Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Non-PI schools</th>
<th>PI Year 5 schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English learners</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percent of Title I Schools in Program Improvement (PI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverside county</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino County</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of CA</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Percent of Title I Schools in Program Improvement (PI) Years 4 and 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Riverside county</th>
<th>San Bernardino County</th>
<th>State of CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Year 4 and 5 Schools Exiting Program Improvement (PI)

School Year

Riverside County
San Bernardino County
Comprehensive Needs Assessment

- Data Analysis: What has kept us in PI?
  - Academic Progress Report (APR)
  - Academic Program Survey (APS)
Sample APR

### 2002-2011 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ELA % Proficient

- **AMO Target**: 13.6, 13.6, 13.6
- **Schoolwide**: 9.6, 8.2, 8.2
- **African American**: 8.0, 15.6, 16.4
- **Asian**: 5.0, 8.7, 10.6
- **Hispanic**: 5.3, 10.9, 20.3
- **White**: 10.6, 18.8, 28.8
- **Socioeconomically Disadvantaged**: 8.5, 15.3, 28.8
- **English Learners**: 6.8, 11.8, 19.8
- **Students With Disabilities**: 5.4, 7.5, 1.5

### Math % Proficient

- **AMO Target**: 16.0, 16.0, 16.0
- **Schoolwide**: 15.9, 21.5, 26.3
- **African American**: 2.7, 19.3, 23.1
- **Asian**: 13.4, 22.9, 23.5
- **Hispanic**: 24.1, 33.9, 44.3
- **White**: 15.4, 27.5, 34.8
- **Socioeconomically Disadvantaged**: 14.2, 24.4, 33.3
- **English Learners**: 12.6, 24.4, 34.5
- **Students With Disabilities**: 6.1, 20.9, 7.6

### AYP Participation Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AYP Met for School Year

- **17 Year 1**

### AYP Participation Rate* for MA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Math % Proficient

- **AMO Target**: 16.0, 16.0, 16.0
- **Schoolwide**: 15.9, 21.5, 26.3
- **African American**: 2.7, 19.3, 23.1
- **Asian**: 13.4, 22.9, 23.5
- **Hispanic**: 24.1, 33.9, 44.3
- **White**: 15.4, 27.5, 34.8
- **Socioeconomically Disadvantaged**: 14.2, 24.4, 33.3
- **English Learners**: 12.6, 24.4, 34.5
- **Students With Disabilities**: 6.1, 20.9, 7.6
Adequate Yearly Progress Data Record Sheet From the Accountability Progress Report and Key Data Systems Three Year Profile Report for Elementary and Middle Schools

**Academic Progress Report**

1. Adequate Yearly Progress Components
   - a. Academic Performance Index (API)
   - b. Participation Rate in ELA and Math
   - c. Proficiency Rate in ELA and Math
   - d. Graduation Rate (for high schools)
   
   **Targets:**
   - a. Minimum of 710 API or 1 point growth.
   - b. 95% for each significant subgroup.
   - c. 67.6% in ELA 68.5% in Math or Safe Harbor.
   - d. Met or exceeded 90%, or met fixed or variable rate target.

2. 2011 Growth API ____ Made AYP Yes/No 10-11 API Growth ____ Made API? Yes/No  

3. Participation Rate Met in ELA? Yes/No  
   Participation Rate Met in Math? Yes/No

4. Proficiency Rate Met in ELA? Yes/No Which subgroups missed in 10-11?  
   Proficiency Rate Met in Math? Yes/No Which subgroups missed in 10-11?


6. Over the last three years which subgroups are missing most consistently in ELA?  
   Over the last three years which subgroups are missing most consistently in math?

7. Which subgroup outperforms the county mean in ELA?  
   Which subgroup outperforms the county mean in math?
The Academic Program Survey is required to be administered to all PI schools to identify which of nine essential components need to be improved. Based on Reading First studies and other research. Released in 2005. Revised in fall 2009. Is linked to the District Assistance Survey that measures district support for schools.
## 2009 9-12 Academic Program Survey Chart

### APS information for ____________________________ School

**Directions to complete this form**
- Fill in the column titled Rating (1-4) for each EPC.
- In the last column put an X next to any item rated 1 or 2.
- Use these to develop actions for revised SPSA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation of Instructional Materials</th>
<th>Rating 1-4</th>
<th>X any area that is 1 or 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 SBE-adopted basic core RLA/ELD programs/materials for all students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 SBE-adopted basic core ELD programs/materials for ELs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 SBE-adopted RLA/ELD intensive intervention programs/materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 SBE-adopted basic core Math/Algebra program for all students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 SBE-adopted 2007 Algebra Readiness program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Instructional time for core adopted RLA/ELD program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Instructional time for additional strategic support of core adopted RLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Instructional time for additional adopted ELD instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Instructional time for intensive intervention of adopted RLA program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Instructional time for core adopted Algebra I program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Instructional time for additional strategic support of adopted Algebra I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Instructional time for intensive intervention of Algebra Readiness I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Lesson pacing guides for adopted 9th and 10th grade level core and strategic intervention ERLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Lesson pacing guides for adopted intensive reading intervention instruction and assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Lesson pacing guides adopted Algebra I, Algebra Readiness, and Algebra I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial and Ongoing Professional Development and Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Administrator instructional leadership training in RLA/ELD and math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Administrator targeted professional development and practicum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Credential and highly qualified teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Teacher professional development in all RLA/ELD core and intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Teacher professional development in Algebra I and Algebra Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Support by content experts/coaches for 9th and 10th RLA/ELD teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Support by content experts/coaches for Algebra I/Algebra Readiness teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement Monitoring and Teacher Collaboration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Ongoing assessment and monitoring system RLA/ELD and intensive reading programs 9th &amp; 10th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Ongoing assessment and monitoring system for Algebra I and Algebra Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Monthly collaboration by grade/course level teachers for RLA/ELD programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Monthly collaboration by grade/course level teachers for Algebra I and Algebra Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 All general/categorical funds prioritized to support EPCs for RLA and ELD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2 All general/categorical funds prioritized to support EPCs for mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PI District Mandates for All Schools?

- District Level Mandates as Corrective Action District (Program Improvement Year 3).
- Implement Corrective Action 6: Defined as full implementation (2001 or later) of most recent SBE-adopted (K-8) and/or standards-aligned (9-10) English language arts (ELA) and mathematics curriculum, including intervention materials.
- Requires professional development for teachers and administrators.
District Mandate for All Schools? Title III Focus on ELs

At the school level, focus could be on:

- Implement staff development on EL needs.
- Scaffold instruction in all content areas in response to data.
- ELD time and materials meet state requirements.
- Teachers identify ELs by levels.
- Principals monitor several times a week walk-throughs.
Title III Mandates for All Schools?

- Year 2 = Improvement Plan Addendum.
- Year 4 = Action Plan.
- See your assistant superintendent or EL director about the specifics of Title III Plan.
District Priorities

What are your district’s:
- Instructional expectations.
- Priorities.
School Level Mandates

- Districts and schools work together to address No Child Left Behind (NCLB) mandates for PI schools.
## General PI School Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PI Year 1</th>
<th>PI Year 2</th>
<th>PI Year 3</th>
<th>PI Year 4</th>
<th>PI Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revise and implement local plan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide choice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide supplemental educational services</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District takes local corrective action</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for restructuring/alternative governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement restructuring/alternative governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

II-CE 15: CE PI Schools: corrective actions

Compliance Indicators

II-CE 15. For schools in PI Years 3–5, the LEA has implemented one of the corrective actions in PI Year 3, planned for alternative governance in PI Year 4, and implemented the alternative governance in PI Year 5.

15.1 In PI Year 3, the LEA selected and implemented one of the following corrective actions (20 U.S.C. § 6316 (b) (7)(C)(iv).):
(a) Replace the school staff who are relevant to the failure to make AYP.
(b) Institute and fully implement a new curriculum, including providing appropriate professional development, based on scientific research and offering substantial promise of improving educational achievement for low-achieving students and enabling the school to make AYP.
(c) Significantly decrease management authority at the school level.
(d) Appoint an outside expert to advise the school on its progress toward making AYP based on the SPSA.
(e) Extend the school year or school day.
(f) Restructure the internal organizational structure of the school.

15.2 In PI Year 4, the LEA plans for the implementation of one of the following alternative governance arrangements for the school and implements the plan in PI Year 5 (20 U.S.C. § 6316 (b)(8).):
(a) Reopen the school as a charter school.
(b) Replace all or most staff who are relevant to the failure to make AYP.
(c) Contract with an outside entity to manage the school.
(d) Turn the operation of the school over to the state.
(e) Identify other major restructuring of the school’s governance arrangement that makes fundamental reforms.

15.3 The LEA in PI Year 4 and Year 5 provides prompt notice to teachers and parents. (20 U.S.C. § 6316 (b)(8)(C) (i).)

15.4 The LEA in PI Year 4 and Year 5 provides teachers and parents with the opportunity to (20 U.S.C. § 6316 (b) (8)(C)(ii).):
(a) Comment before it takes action on alternative governance.
(b) Participate in developing any alternative governance plan.
Restructuring/Alternative Governance - The local educational agency shall implement one of the following alternative governance arrangements for the school consistent with state law.
Academic Assessment and Local Educational Agency and School Improvement [NCLB Section 1116(8)]

1. Reopening the school as a public charter school.

2. Replacing all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal) who are relevant to the failure to make adequate yearly progress.
Academic Assessment and Local Educational Agency and School Improvement [NCLB Section 1116(8)]

3. Entering into a contract with an entity, such as a private management company, with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the public school.

4. Turning the operation of the school over to the state educational agency, if permitted under state law and agreed to by the state.
5. Any other major restructuring of the school's governance arrangement that makes fundamental reforms, such as significant changes in the school's staffing and governance, to improve student academic achievement in the school and that has substantial promise of enabling the school to make adequate yearly progress as defined in the state plan under section 1111(b)(2).
What constitutes “other major restructuring of school’s governance”?

§1116(b)(8)(B)(v) of NCLB permits a Local Education Agency to choose “any other major restructuring of the school’s governance arrangements that makes fundamental reforms, such as significant changes in the school’s staffing and governance, to improve student academic achievement in the school and that has substantial promise of enabling the school to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) as defined by the state’s accountability system.”
How does the LEA select the “right” Alternative Governance option?

- “LEA leaders need to understand how and when each option works to improve student learning based upon the school’s strengths and weaknesses.”

- “The restructuring process must be substantial enough to transform and sustain change. … none should be applied as an isolated quick fix.”

NCLB Non-Regulatory Guidance
LEA and School Improvement
Revised: July 21, 2006 – Item G-10.
Alternative Governance Protocol

- Engages LEA and school staff in an honest, strategic analysis of the school’s history of school improvement efforts to uncover those areas most likely to be responsible for the school’s failure to meet AYP goals.

- Staff makes strategic decisions as to which alternative governance option will best enable the LEA and school to successfully address the identified areas of need. Year 4 Alternative Governance Protocol worksheets available.

http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/schoolpireq.asp/.
How have other districts addressed restructuring/alternative governance requirements?
What is an “Alternative Governance Board” (AGB)?

- An AGB is a team selected by the district that supports and monitors the implementation of actions included in the school’s restructuring plan.
- An AGB helps create consistency and focus that is district and data-driven.
- An AGB creates collaboration and shared knowledge with the district and school.
Why an AGB?

- “Alternative” means different.
- “Governance” means the combination of processes and structures implemented in order to inform, direct, manage and monitor the activities of the organization toward the achievement of its objectives.
- AGB does not take authority away from the local school board but, if approved, can act as a subcommittee of the Board of Education.
## Why an AGB?

### 2010 Success in Region 7: Kings, Fresno, Madera, Mariposa, Merced, Tulare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>PI Year</th>
<th>API gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firebaugh-Las Deltas Joint SD</td>
<td>Hazel M. Bailey Elementary</td>
<td>Exited Year 3</td>
<td>18 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Firebaugh Middle</td>
<td>Frozen Year 5</td>
<td>76 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanford Elementary SD</td>
<td>Lee Richmond Elementary</td>
<td>Exited Year 5</td>
<td>49 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roosevelt Elementary</td>
<td>Exited Year 4</td>
<td>77 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martin Luther King Elementary</td>
<td>Frozen Year 5</td>
<td>40 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Canyon Joint SD</td>
<td>General Grant Middle</td>
<td>Frozen Year 4</td>
<td>49 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Navelencia Middle</td>
<td>Frozen Year 1</td>
<td>51 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madera USD</td>
<td>Millview Elementary</td>
<td>Exited Year 5</td>
<td>10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced City USD</td>
<td>John Muir Elementary</td>
<td>Exited Year 5</td>
<td>37 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reef-Sunset USD</td>
<td>Kettleman City Elementary</td>
<td>Frozen Year 5</td>
<td>57 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia USD</td>
<td>Green Acres Middle</td>
<td>Frozen Year 5</td>
<td>30 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valley Oak Middle</td>
<td>Frozen Year 5</td>
<td>36 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Three year success in San Bernardino:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>PI Year</th>
<th>API gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelanto Elementary SD</td>
<td>Westside Park Elementary</td>
<td>Exited Year 4 (2007)</td>
<td>60 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Distinguished School 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adelanto Elementary</td>
<td>Exited Year 4 (2009)</td>
<td>38 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barstow USD</td>
<td>Crestline Elementary</td>
<td>Exited Year 5 (2009)</td>
<td>50 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hinkley Elementary/Middle</td>
<td>Exited Year 4 (2009)</td>
<td>45 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario – Montclair USD</td>
<td>Mission Elementary School</td>
<td>Exited Year 5 (2010)</td>
<td>29 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why an AGB?

District Success Stories:

- **Visalia Unified School District:**
  - Four year-5 elementary schools exited PI in the last three years.
  - All were using the AGB model with restructuring efforts.
  - San Bernardino used Visalia as a model when developing AGBs in San Bernardino County.

- **Sanger Unified School District:**
  - In 2005, seven schools and the LEA were in PI.
  - During the three years that Sanger Unified used AGBs, all but one of its schools exited PI, as did the LEA.
  - Currently Sanger USD has no schools in PI.
  - Perris Elementary School District in Riverside County visited Sanger to learn about their AGB process.
Average **ELA** increase in percent proficient, 2005-2010...

- **Statewide**: 12.0
- **Region VII AGB Schools**: 16.8
Average MATH increase in percent proficient, 2005-2010...

Statewide 11.3

Region VII AGB Schools 16.6
Average increase in API, 2005-2010...

- Statewide: 60.3
- Region VII AGB Schools: 83.6
AGB Partners
(a partial list)

Atwater Elementary
Central Unified
Dinuba Unified
Firebaugh La Deltas Unified
Golden Plains Unified
Hanford Elementary
Kings Canyon Joint Unified
Lemoore Union Elementary
Madera Unified
Merced City
Merced COE Alternative Ed
Reef-Sunset Unified
Sanger Unified
Visalia Unified

http://www.madera.k12.ca.us/eahs/site/default.asp
What are the functions of an AGB?

- The AGB guides the development of the Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) and restructuring plan.
- Meets regularly to discuss implementation of actions included in SPSA and restructuring plan.
- Conducts school/classroom visitations to monitor implementation of actions and instructional expectations included in plans.
- Can meet with teacher teams to discuss strengths and areas of need.
- Provides feedback, recommendations, and support to the school.
- Reports school progress to the Local Board of Education.
Do all districts implement AGB in the same way?

They are very diverse, depending on the needs and interests of the district:

- **Commonalities**
  - Subcommittee of district Board of Education.
  - Published agendas and minutes (recommendations/feedback).
  - Classroom observations.
  - Membership that includes external entities.

- **Differences**
  - District representation.
  - Numbers of members.
  - Number of schools.
  - Meeting schedules.
  - Meeting structure.
Alternative Governance Board Meeting

AGENDA

Wednesday, November 17, 2010

Chino Valley Unified School District
Chino, California

Meeting Location
Chino Valley Unified School District Board Room
5130 Riverside Drive, Chino

I. CALL TO ORDER: 3:00 P.M.
A. Roll Call
B. Pledge of Allegiance

II. COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

The Alternative Governance Board (AGB) welcomes comments and/or questions from visitors. Should you wish to make comments or ask questions, you may voluntarily complete a Speaker’s Comments Information Form located at the table by the door of the Board Room or obtain one from the Administrative Secretary to the Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum and Instruction. The form should be given to the Administrative Secretary before the Consent Information Calendar. Comments or questions from visitors on non-agenda items will be heard at this time.

Visitors wishing to comment on agenda items should request recognition by the AGB Chair at the time the AGB is considering the item. The AGB will hear such comments by visitors before the AGB members discuss the items and prior to the vote of the AGB.

All individual comments shall be limited to 3 minutes, unless the time limit is waived by action of the AGB. The maximum time allowed for the AGB to hear various comments on the same subject will be 15 minutes, unless such time limit is waived by action of the AGB.

Per Brown Act requirements, the AGB may respond briefly to public comments and cannot take action at the meeting on any item not on the agenda.

III. CONSENT
A. Minutes of the Alternative Governance Board Meeting of September 15, 2010
B. Revised 2010-2011 Alternative Governance Board Site Visitiation Schedule

IV. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION
A. AMAO Report
B. Trends and Patterns Observed During Site Visitations

IX. Alternative Governance Board Elections (approx. 15 minutes)

X. Public Input

XI. Adjournment
8. Who may be included in AGT membership?

Membership often includes several of the following individuals:

- Superintendent
- Associate Superintendent of Educational Services
- Director of Curriculum and Instruction
- Director of State and Federal Programs
- Director of Special Projects
- Director of Professional Development
- Director of Assessment
- Local Board of Education Trustee
- Bargaining Unit Representative
- Principal
- Content Coaches
- Teachers
- County Office of Education Representative
- External Support Provider/Technical Assistance Provider
- Parent
- Community Based Organization Representative

Prepared by Robin J. Hall, Ed.D., Executive Director, RSDSS -- Region 4
rhall@rsoe.org  www.r4sdss.org  510.670.4170

Adapted from Frequently Asked Questions About Alternative Governance Boards -- ACOE
Region IV FAQs

ALTERNATIVE GOVERNANCE FAQ

1. What is an Alternative Governance Team?
The AGT is a regularly meeting body of carefully selected school, district and community representatives charged with improvement plan implementation monitoring. The AGT provides ongoing policy recommendations to the school site council and local board of education, and ensures that SPSA actions to increase student achievement are reviewed for integrity of implementation and effectiveness through regularly occurring system-wide data analysis activities.

2. What is the relationship of the Alternative Governance Board to NCLB?
During Program Improvement (PI) Year 4, a school must form a district-school liaison/leadership team (DSL T) to guide the work required for restructuring the site should it progress to PI Year 5 designation. Using the state’s recommended self-assessment tools, as well as trend performance and demographic data, the DSL T works with school and district staff to rewrite the Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) and select at least one of the NCLB required restructuring/alternative governance options to be implemented the following year. An AGT is one restructuring/alternative governance option available for selection by the LEA for a PI Year 4/5 school site.

3. What are the options that a LEA may consider for selection and assignment to PI Year 4/5 schools?
All the restructuring options in PI Year 4 are considered to be opportunities for alternative governance. It is strongly recommended that PI Year 4 DSLTs engage in a restructuring/alternative governance option selection protocol (e.g. CDE PI Training Guide – PI Year 4 Protocol for Restructuring/Alternative Governance Option Selection) following the development of a data profile for the school (see the response to #2). The data profile and restructuring/alternative governance option selection protocols will assist the PI Year 4 DSLT to determine the most appropriate restructuring/alternative governance option to recommend to the local board of education for assignment to the school. The restructuring/alternative governance options are:

1. Close the school and reopen it as a charter school
2. Replace all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal) who are relevant to the failure to make AYP
3. Enter into a contract with an entity, such as a private management company with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the public school
4. Turn the operation of the school over to the SEA, if permitted under law and agreed to by the state. **(This is not an available option in California.)**
5. Implement any other major restructuring of the school’s governance arrangement that makes fundamental reforms and leads to improved student achievement

4. What is the relationship of the district’s LEA Plan to the school’s restructuring plan (SPSA revisions)?
The DSLT should analyze the LEA level of support for the PI school using the state recommended tools (DAS, LRE, ELSSA) as guidance. When the LEA has thoughtfully chosen an alternative governance option and approved the school’s revised SPSA (restructuring plan), the DSLT shall identify areas where the LEA should increase/modify its support to the school to ensure effective implementation of the selected restructuring/alternative governance option. The LEA Plan, including the budget, may require revisions to reflect the targeted support required by PI Year 4/5 schools.
Alternative Governance Board

The primary purpose of an AGB is to monitor and direct implementation of the Plan for Restructuring for schools in Program Improvement Year 5.

Other purposes of the AGB may include:

- Monitoring of Corrective Actions for schools in Program Improvement Years 3 and 4.
- Monitoring of Corrective Action and LEA plans for Districts in Program Improvement Year 3.

The AGB is a sub-committee of the District Governing Board, formally appointed by the Governing Board with express responsibility for oversight of the School and/or District Improvement Plans. Included in its responsibilities is to report annually to the Governing Board on progress of plan implementation.

An AGB may be established under the authority of ESEA Section 1116 (b)(8)(B):

“ALTERNATIVE GOVERNANCE—Not later than the beginning of the school year following the year in which the local educational agency implements subparagraph (A), the local educational agency shall implement one of the following alternative governance arrangements for the school consistent with State law:

(v): Any other major restructuring of the school's governance arrangement that makes fundamental reforms, such as significant changes in the school's staffing and governance…”

The AGB itself is not sufficient to constitute “major restructuring.” Its governance role is in oversight of a revised plan, “to improve student academic achievement in the school and that has substantial promise of enabling the school to make adequate yearly progress as defined in the State plan under section 1111(b)(2).” [ESEA Section 1116 (b)(8)(B)(v)]

(The fundamental dialogue of an AGB must be about results. It only addresses learning—not policy, personnel, facilities, etc. It collaborates around data: what do the Board’s strategic plan, the district’s LEAP, and the school’s SPSA identify as goals and actions to increase student achievement, and what the observation and assessment data show as the rate of progress. It is directive in that it will direct the school and/or district to develop an action plan to respond to incongruities between plans and reality.)
Important Considerations

- Consistency
  - Data
  - Instructional Focus
  - Common Agenda

- Brevity

- Precision

- Focus
District Responsibilities

- Specify a timeline for the establishment of an Alternative Governance Board.
- Provide technical assistance or external support including selection and training of AGB members.
- Ensure that the SPSA/Restructuring Plan are in alignment with LEA plan and reflect school’s needs.
Riverside County Office of Education  
Program Improvement Year 4/5 School Support  

Alternative Governance Board  
Planning Checklist  

LEA must identify which of the five options outlined in Year 4 Alternative Governance protocol is selected for each Year 4/5 school. LEA determines which Year 4/5 schools will participate in the development and establishment of an Alternative Governance Board.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> LEA develops a timeline for establishment of an Alternative Governance Board at participating school(s) including, but not limited to, items on this checklist.</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **2.** LEA assists school(s) leaders with creation of a plan to explain the purpose of the AGB. Plan should answer the following questions:  
- How will the LEA and AGB assist school(s) with addressing content area(s) that did not meet AYP targets?  
- How will the LEA and AGB assist school(s) with addressing subgroup(s) that did not meet AYP targets?  
- How will the LEA and AGB monitor and provide feedback to school(s) regarding the implementation of pre-established district and/or school programs and priorities? | |
| **3.** LEA identifies AGB lead and AGB members. Consider representation from various stakeholder groups (district leaders, teacher’s union representative, content experts, school board members) as well as outside experts (educational consultants, distinguished educators). May seek site input from school(s) leaders. | |
| **4.** LEA establishes roles and responsibilities for AGB lead and AGB team members. | |
| **5.** LEA (and/or AGB lead) presents an overview of AGB timeline, purpose, roles, and responsibilities to teachers and staff at school site. LEA seeks input from stakeholders prior to board approval. | |
| **6.** LEA presents AGB timeline, purpose, roles, and responsibilities to District Board of Trustees for approval. *(Presentation may include participation of school(s) leaders and AGB board members.)* | |
When developing your restructuring/alternative governance plan:

- Consider what happened in prior PI Years.
- Consider what was implemented (or not).
- Consider the gaps in the school’s program as reflected by your comprehensive needs analysis (data analysis, APS).

The restructuring plan should be developed in direct response to the school’s identified needs and be reflective of the strengths and priorities.
Next steps?

- Learn from LEAs with AGBs
- Visit the CDE’s Virtual Library:
  - Tools - Essential Program Components (EPCs), Academics Program Survey (APS), District Assistance Survey (DAS), Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), and English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment (ELSSA).
  - Strategies for improving schools.
  - PI training materials.
  - “Alternative Governance Protocol.”

http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/lp/.
Next steps?

Guide for Developing Alternative Governance Boards
Next steps?

“The purpose of this guide is to provide a protocol and pathway for Alternative Governance Boards to be formed and to operate in supporting districts and Program Improvement schools in need of corrective action or restructuring to increase student achievement and close student achievement gaps.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE OF CONTENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage One: Initial Contact with the District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Two: Meeting with District Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Three: Forming AGB – Team Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Four: Presenting AGB to District Governing Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Five: First Meeting (Training) of AGB After District Board Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Six: The AGB Lead Meets with the Superintendent to Discuss First Meeting Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Seven: Possible Additional Training and Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Eight: AGB Begins Their Work at District Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Nine: First Site Visitation – Discussion Between the AGB Members and the Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Ten: Informing the Staff of the Process Being Used with AGB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Eleven: Site Visitation Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Twelve: AGB First Report of Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Thirteen: AGB Lead Makes Formal Report to Governing Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Improvement

“The PI process should not be viewed as a punitive program of consequences and extra work for LEAs and schools. The PI process can be a real opportunity to address the issues that have had the most profound impact on students not meeting proficiency targets.”