



Public Schools of North Carolina  
State Board of Education  
Department of Public Instruction

---

# Report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee

---

Restructure Assistance Program to  
Low Performing Schools

*Session Law 2006-66, Section 7.6 (b)*

*Senate Bill 1741, 2006 Budget Bill*

*Part VI. General Provisions*

---

**Date Due: January 15, 2007**

Report #31

DPI Chronological Schedule, October 5, 2006

## **STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

**HOWARD N. LEE**  
Chairman :: Raleigh

**SHIRLEY E. HARRIS**  
Troy

**JOHN TATE III**  
Charlotte

**JANE P. NORWOOD**  
Vice Chair :: Charlotte

**MELISSA E. BARTLETT**  
Raleigh

**PATRICIA N. WILLOUGHBY**  
Raleigh

**KATHY A. TAFT**  
Greenville

**ROBERT "TOM" SPEED**  
Boone

**BEVERLY PERDUE**  
Lieutenant Governor :: New Bern

**MICHELLE HOWARD-VITAL**  
Wilmington

**WAYNE MCDEVITT**  
Asheville

**RICHARD MOORE**  
State Treasurer :: Kittrell

**EDGAR D. MURPHY**  
Durham

## **NC DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION**

**June St. Clair Atkinson, Ed.D., State Superintendent**  
301 N. Wilmington Street :: Raleigh, North Carolina 27601-2825

In compliance with federal law, NC Public Schools administers all state-operated educational programs, employment activities and admissions without discrimination because of race, religion, national or ethnic origin, color, age, military service, disability, or gender, except where exemption is appropriate and allowed by law.

**Inquiries or complaints regarding discrimination issues should be directed to:**

Dr. Elsie C. Leak, Associate Superintendent :: Office of Curriculum and School Reform Services  
6307 Mail Service Center :: Raleigh, NC 27699-6307 :: Telephone 919-807-3761 :: Fax 919-807-3767

**Visit us on the Web:: [www.ncpublicschools.org](http://www.ncpublicschools.org)**

**Report to the  
Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee  
and the  
Joint Legislative Commission on Governmental Operations**

**Restructure Assistance Program to Low Performing Schools  
SL 2006-66, Section 7.6(b) (SB 1741, 2006 Budget Bill  
Part VI. General Provisions)**

**Legislation**                      The legislation allowed the State Board of Education during the to use funds appropriated to the Department of Public Instruction and to the State Public School Fund to establish a consolidated, comprehensive program through which to provide assistance to low-performing schools. In addition, the State Board of Education is directed to report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee and the Joint Legislative Commission on Governmental Operations by January 15, 2007, on any restructuring of the assistance program.

**Background**                      The School-Based Management and Accountability Act of 1995 Authorized the selection and training of the State Assistance Team Members to serve schools designated by the State Board of Education as low-performing. There was a realization that just labeling schools was not sufficient. Schools that were so labeled were provided the support and guidance necessary to improve student academic performance through the work of the teams. The State Assistance Team Program has worked well for our schools since the implementation of the ABCs of Public Education in the 1996-97 school year.

The passage of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in January 2002 brought to the forefront the need to identify another set of schools eligible for additional support. These schools were Schools in Title I School Improvement. The greatest amount of support was provided for those moving into corrective action and missing the greatest percentage of their Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets. The number served by State Assistance Teams varied according to the number of schools designated as low-performing because these schools were top priority for the State Assistance Teams.

We now have an expanded need to develop a District Assistance Program. There are two major functions of the District Assistance Program: one is to help Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) improve their performance composite scores and the other is to assist districts not meeting the NCLB requirements for AYP. The NCLB requirement that all schools and districts make AYP will significantly increase the number of schools and districts requiring assistance. Since there are not enough resources for the State to assist an expanding number of schools, there now has to be a focus on building capacity at the district level. Enhancing and strengthening the capacity at the central office level will enable District staff to better support their own schools. District help will particularly be beneficial to districts with limited resources.

In 2005-06, another component of assistance has been identified – a focus on struggling high schools in the State. These high schools have been brought to the forefront by Judge Howard Manning as he spotlights the high schools that have not demonstrated that their students have the opportunity to obtain a sound basic education. These schools have ABC performance composites below 60% and some consistently have performed below 55%. Governor Easley has taken a lead role in addressing the needs of high schools achieving below 60% by calling for Turnaround Teams. Members of these teams serve as coaches with the principals at the individual schools to address specific needs and assist them with a planning process that leads to restructuring in order to improve the effectiveness of the schools. These schools will get continual support and guidance throughout the school year.

(Appendix A)

## **Blueprint for North Carolina Consolidated Comprehensive Assistance Plan**

Mandates for technical assistance for both individual schools and school districts come from multiple sources – state legislation (ABCs, Assistance Teams), federal legislation (NCLB, AYP, school and district assistance) and judicial influence (High School Turnaround Teams). Although each mandate has a unique focus and specific requirements, best practice for any technical assistance effort makes the design for a consolidated and comprehensive assistance plan a logical approach to strategic help to struggling schools and schools districts.

### **Core unifying assistance processes**

- Assessments
- Reviews, recommendations, revisions
- Capacity building (Professional Development)
- Monitoring
- Reporting

### **Strategic Actions**

#### Assessments:

- Teacher evaluations
- Walk-through (class-room assessments)

#### Reviews, recommendations, revisions:

- School, school district data review
- School Improvement Plans
- Operations, processes, procedures:  
(schedules, discipline, handbooks)
- Budgets, resource allocation

#### Capacity Building:

- Professional development
- Coaching
- Co-teaching
- Study groups
- Collaborative planning
- Peer observations
- Learning communities

#### Monitoring:

- Benchmark testing
- Change in Teacher behaviors
- Change in Administrator behaviors
- Change in school support structures  
(operations, processes, procedures)

- Teacher Working Conditions Survey
- EOG/EOC Test Results

Reporting:

- Reports from Assistance Teams
- On-going reports from Leadership Coaches
- Department reports to State Board of Education
- Department reports to Legislative bodies

**Consolidated Comprehensive Assistance Plan Delivery System  
(Organizational Structure)**

Phase I: Transition (July, 2006 – April 2007, projected)

- Unification of High School Assistance into Turnaround Initiative Department
- Establishment of Core Unifying Assistance Processes
- State Board of Education approval of DPI reorganization plan creating new Associate Superintendent for Leadership for Innovation and School Transformation (including Technical Assistance division and move of the Raising Achievement and Closing Gap section to support improvement efforts)
- Collaborative efforts between current assistance efforts and new High School Turnaround efforts

Phase II: Full Reorganization (no later than April 2007) (Appendix B)

- Hiring complete for new Associate Superintendent for Leadership for Innovation and School Transformation, Turnaround staff,
- Organizational shifts complete
- Assistance team model redesigned and aligned K-12 for 2007-08 school year

## **Technical Assistance Staffing**

### **Phase I:**

- LEAAP teams – 29 part-time contracted personnel serving 10 School Districts
- Assistance Teams – 54 team members serving 3 elementary, 5 middle, and 4 high schools
- Turnaround initiative\* – 1 director, 2 portfolio managers, 2 professional developers, 8 curriculum specialists (2 maths, 2 sciences, 2 social studies, 2 writing/English), 1 community liaison and 1 technology specialist

\* Five positions are funded by grant funds

### **Phase II**

- Assistance model K- 12 will be consolidated for the 2007-08 school year under the Turnaround initiative model to insure consistency. LEAAP will continue as designed to meet mandates of No Child Left Behind.

## **Comprehensive Consolidated Assistance Plan Budget**

The Budget (on the following page) will be modified to reflect the organizational adjustments as identified in Phase II. The State Board has established a new Associate's area within the Department and that area will finalize the Phase II structure/needs. At this time, we do not anticipate a Budget need in excess of FY 2006-07 levels and we plan on working to lower the total required budget during consolidation. (see next page)

Annualized Funding Needs for North Carolina District and School Assistance Program for 2006-07

	# of Members	Total Salary & Benefits	Total Support Cost/Activity Cost	Total Annual Cost
Assistance Team Members				
Teachers, etc.	54	\$ 4,365,878	\$ 1,492,506	\$ 5,858,384
High School Turnaround				
Director	1	\$ 129,218	\$ 11,820	\$ 141,038
Portfolio Managers	2	\$ 191,360	\$ 23,640	\$ 215,000
Professional Development Coordinators	2	\$ 191,360	\$ 23,640	\$ 215,000
Curriculum Specialists (math, science, social studies, writing/English)	8	\$ 692,058	\$ 94,560	\$ 786,618
Community Liaison	1	\$ 118,643	\$ 11,820	\$ 130,463
Technical Specialist	1	\$ 80,434	\$ 11,820	\$ 92,254
Assessment Teams/Support (Contract cost ... \$971,000 Coaches, \$260,000 PEP, \$360,000 assessment)			\$ 1,591,000	\$ 1,591,000
State and Federal District Assistance (LEAAP)				
On-Loan Position	1	\$ 80,434	\$ 11,820	\$ 92,254
Part-time Contractors (retired Central Office)	29	\$ 852,484	\$ 217,500	\$ 1,069,984
Contractors	2	\$ 160,867	\$ 23,640	\$ 184,507
Title 1 School Improvement				
Reading & Math Specialists	4	\$ 323,398	\$ 47,280	\$ 370,679
Part-time Contractors for Charter Schools	10	\$ 684,112	\$ 99,687	\$ 783,799
Additional State Board Activities and Reserves				
Middle school initiatives that might be effective in leading to middle school and high school reform. Probable contract with All Kinds of Minds	<b>** FY 2006-07 Only **</b>		\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000
Reserve for Unexpected Cost			\$ 207,488	\$ 207,488

\$ 12,488,468

Federal (Title I funding for School Improvement)

\$ 494,718

Gates grant (Supplemental funding that will phase-out over 3 years)

\$ 943,750

Appropriation funds needed

**\$ 11,050,000**



# Leadership for Innovation and School Transformation Area

## Office of the Associate Superintendent



