High-need schools: then & now

The national conversation on high-need schools has changed over the past 40 years, from what schools cannot do to what schools can do—and how.

It is changing again--from emphasis on teacher quality to emphasis on instructional quality at scale (but slooowly).
Key Observations for Today (1)

• We need to continue to raise our expectations for student learning, particularly in bottom quartiles
• Improving school leadership is the most cost-effective means of improving student learning at scale
• Improving school leadership will require changes in higher education, school districts, and state agencies
Key Observations for Today (2)

- Medical education saw a similar transformation from 1910-20
- From non-selective programs, without partnerships with sites of practice, with little or no clinical experience, to today’s model
- Without similar changes in leadership preparation, very little else in school reform is likely to work: the necessary but not sufficient condition
The Logic Model for Reform

• Leadership ==> Org Capacity ==> Instructional Capacity ==> PreK-12 Student Learning

• What does it take to prepare and develop leaders who can build the organizational capacity of the school?
Culture of Shared Responsibility

1. Attract, enlist and develop a leadership team of highly qualified staff who see it in their self-interest to co-lead, with the principal, the building of a highly effective learning community capable of executing all the factors in this list.

2. Establish among students, parents and teachers a detailed set of expectations for the interpersonal conduct and academic performance of all parties who shape the school-wide and classroom culture of the school. This culture should make clear on a daily basis the correlation between academic success, effective habits and a productive and fulfilling life.

3. Establish grade-level and content-specific teams that develop goals, strategies, classroom assessments and tracking tools that are used on a daily or weekly basis by the team to document progress and modify practice for the purpose of measurably increasing the learning of all of the children in each grade level.
Necessary Structures and Systems

4. Develop written course outlines or curriculum maps for each grade level and content area that are based on state standards, test score analysis and teacher knowledge of student work. Curriculum and instruction for literacy, numeracy, and higher order cognitive skills receive heavy emphasis in these course outlines.

5. Develop structures, procedures, and tools to ensure that every teacher in the school is engaged in mastering a wide and deep range of instructional practices and classroom management strategies that ensure the high achievement of every child.

6. Establish a highly transparent, school-wide data tracking system to which everyone has the access and ability to analyze the implementation and results of all strategies intended to achieve school goals.
Tech and Human Supports

7. Develop the social and emotional supports needed by everyone to engage in the above efforts and achieve at the level defined. The school leadership team recognizes that human relationships are at the heart of sustainable school change, and that social and emotional learning [for students, staff, and administration] are important to achieving transformative school goals.

8. Integrate technology into the management and execution of instructional practice through strong learning communities.

9. Develop specific strategies for engaging parents as key allies in the daily support of their children’s learning development.

10. Be able to manage up and out as well as manage down. While school leaders must have the organizational skills to implement and sustain complex change at the building level, they must also have the political/interpersonal skills to work well with system level officers and community stakeholders to achieve school goals.
UIC Program Results

• First nine cohorts to complete residency: **98% admin. placement**

• Of 110 completers: **>78 principals in urban schools, 87% retained or promoted**; 22 APs; 8 system leaders (CPS, charter, and one other district); two returned to teaching

• Highest principal-eligibility pass-rate in CPS assessments

• First University program named to Exemplary Status by Bush Institute Alliance to Reform Education Leadership (along with NYC Leadership Academy, KIPP, Gwinnett County, NL: Why?)
UIC Program Results

• In 2010 ISAT scores (entire distribution of each school), **UIC-led elementary schools** were:
  • 3.5 x more likely to score **top 5%** in CPS val-add metrics
  • >2x more likely to score **top 40%** among schools <60% FRL

• From 2004-2011:
  • UIC-led elementary schools are twice as likely as other CPS schools to post 1.4 years of growth per school (36% to 18%)—a significant threshold for closing achievement gaps.
UIC Program Results

1-Year Changes in Student Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Schools in Group</th>
<th>UIC Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Quartile</td>
<td>Top Quartile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quartile</td>
<td>2nd Quartile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quartile</td>
<td>Bottom Quartile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom Quartile</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Of 96 completers:
  - 65 principals in urban schools, 86% retained
  - 24 APs
  - 6 system leaders

• High principal eligibility pass rate in CPS assessments

In 2010 ISAT scores (entire distribution of each school), UIC-led elementary schools were:

• 3.5x more likely than CPS to score top 5%
• 4x more likely to score top 10% in gain scores, high poverty Af Am
• All UIC schools (4) among top 6 gainers in 12 AUSL Af Am "Turnaround" schools
• >2x more likely to score top 40% among schools <60% poverty
UIC Program Results

- UIC-led high schools out-perform CPS comparison schools in “freshman on-track” and graduation rates.
- 81% of all UIC-led elementary schools out-performed system norms on state achievement exams in 2011.
- Among “90-90” Af Am elem. schools, all UIC-led schools out-gained CPS system norms.
- UIC-led schools outperforming in all school types at both ends of performance scale (e.g. “Blue-Ribbon”, S. Loop).
Growth in Average Overall Achievement in 2011

READING: All Grade Composite Compared with All Students Tested Statewide
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At mostly Black/mostly low-income schools, 1st-year UIC principals are 4 times more likely make gains in the top 10% of 184 comparable schools (4 of 10)
Data Used to Make the Case for Change

- Three Chicago programs showing improved student learning with residency-based principals: UIC, NL, and a district/Principal’s Association program (now closed)
State Plan for Change

- Erika’s timeline: 2005-2014—9 years!
- Establishing urgency (IBHE Commission)
- Convening stakeholders toward a common vision (Legislative Task Force and Leadership Redesign Teams)
- Wrangling the legislation and legislators against resistance of IHEs and other investors in the status quo
- Implementing in timely stages
The Essence of the Plan

- www.illinoisschoolleader.org
- Legislative Task Force Recommendations: System, sequence, and implementation
- State policies to set high bar for principal preparation and development
- Formal partnerships between districts and providers of principal prep programs
- Re-focused principal preparation programs
  1) Highly selective; 2) Clinically intensive
  3) Results-oriented; 4) State supported
Threats to Fidelity of Implementation

- IHEs gaming the system (only *some*):
  - Authentic partnerships vs. cronyism
  - Appearance vs. reality in selectivity in candidates and in rigorous internships
- On-line programs
- Failure of courage at review board level(s)
- Failure to re-allocate resources at state and district levels: e.g., support of clinical work
- Failure to build capacity at IHE level: e.g., programs vs. courses; not just experienced clinical faculty, but proven results-achievers
Impact of Policy Changes . . .

• On principal prep programs: Tuition revenues at stake, requiring alternative revenue streams, e.g., “master’s degrees that matter.”
• Also on principal prep programs: for those who embrace the spirit of the changes, significant collaborative program revision, re-culturing
• Sitting principals: grandfather clause, yet, but also elevation of expectations for all principals
• Student achievement: too soon to tell at state level
Contact

- Steve Tozer, Professor and Director, UIC Center for Urban Ed Leadership
- stozer@uic.edu
- 312-413-2414
Logic Model and Theory of Action

Leadership => Organizational Capacity => Instructional Practices => Student Learning

The principal is most effective as the leader of improvement – specifically improving student learning – when s/he engages key individuals in leadership roles, develops a climate of trust through strong relationships, creates a sustainable culture of high aspirations and expectations, and builds professional communities focused on improving both adult and student learning through collaborative data analysis and problem-solving. UIC views the process of transformational school leadership in terms of ten closely related factors (If X then Z because Y).
Morrill Elementary School—All Subjects/All Grades Tested

Achievement Change in Grade Equivalents: 2001-2005=+0.26; 2005-2008=+0.03; 2008-2010=+0.06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of All Students Tested</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Percent in Bottom Quartile of All Illinois Students Tested</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Percent Meeting or Exceeding Illinois Learning Standards</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Percent At or Above Illinois Grade Level Average</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Illinois Percentile of Average Scale Score</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Percent On-Track for ACT College Readiness in Gr11</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Percent Eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Percent African American and Latino Enrollments</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Percent Mobility</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G.E.M. Scores for Chicago Public High Schools, CIVITAS Charter Schools, and District 214 Schools