



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

Report to the North Carolina General Assembly

ANNUAL REPORT Evaluation of the Implementation and Effectiveness of the North Carolina Innovative School District (ISD)

SL 2017-57 (SB 257) SECTION 7.26E.(d)

Date Due: March 1, 2019

Report # 1

DPI Chronological Schedule, 2018-2019

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

SBE VISION: Every public school student will graduate ready for post-secondary education and work, prepared to be a globally engaged and productive citizen.

SBE MISSION: The State Board of Education will use its constitutional authority to lead and uphold the system of public education in North Carolina.

ERIC DAVIS

*Chair
Charlotte – At-Large*

JILL CAMNITZ

Greenville – Northeast Region

TODD CHASTEEN

Blowing Rock – Northwest Region

ALAN DUNCAN

*Vice Chair
Greensboro – Piedmont-Triad
Region*

REGINALD KENAN

Rose Hill – Southeast Region

WAYNE MCDEVITT

Asheville – Western Region

AMY WHITE

Garner – North Central Region

PATRICIA N. WILLOUGHBY

Raleigh – At-Large

DAN FOREST

*Lieutenant Governor
Raleigh - Ex Officio*

OLIVIA OXENDINE

Lumberton – Sandhills Region

J.B. BUXTON

Raleigh – At-Large

DALE FOLWELL

*State Treasurer
Raleigh – Ex Officio*

JAMES FORD

Charlotte – Southwest Region

MARK JOHNSON

*Secretary to the Board
Raleigh*

NC DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Mark Johnson
State Superintendent
301 N. Wilmington Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27601-2825

In compliance with federal law, the NC Department of Public Instruction 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:

Eric Hall, Ed.D, Deputy State Superintendent of Innovation
6312 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, NC 27699-6312 / Phone: (919) 807-3435 / Fax: (919) 807-4065

Visit us on the Web: www.ncpublicschools.org

Contents

Background and Introduction	1
Organizational Structure of the ISD	1
External Evaluation of the ISD	3
Evaluation Areas of Focus	3
Evaluation Questions and Related Measurable Outcomes	1
Evaluation Questions	1
Data	2
Data Collection and Analysis	3
Data Collection	3
North Carolina Administrative Data	3
Surveys	5
Student Surveys	5
Parent Surveys	5
Practitioner Surveys	6
North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey	6
Practitioner Focus Groups	6
Interviews with Neighboring LEA Staff/Superintendents	7
School-level Annual Reports	7
Timeline and Budget Considerations	8
Timeline	8
Budget Considerations	9
Appendix A: Evaluation Outcomes Required by the Enacting Legislation	10
Appendix B Literature Review of State-Led Turnaround Initiatives	12

Annual Report on Innovative School District

Report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee

SL 2017-57 (SB 257) SECTION 7.26E.(d)

Pursuant to SL 2017-57 (SB 257) SECTION 7.26E.(d) *The State Board of Education shall contract during the 2018-2019 school year with an independent research organization to evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the following:*


(1) The Innovative School District in turning around low-performing schools beginning with the 2018-2019 school year through the 2022-2023 school year, including the innovation zone established in Section 4.5 of this act. The State Board of Education shall require IS operators to provide the independent research organization with requested data to conduct the evaluation. The independent research organization shall include an analysis on the impact of public versus private funding in the effectiveness of the Innovative School District.

(2) Innovation zones in turning around low-performing schools beginning with the 2017-2018 school year through the 2022-2023 school year. The State Board of Education shall require local boards of education granted innovation zones to provide the independent research organization with requested data to conduct the evaluation.

Background and Introduction

Created in 2016 and amended in 2017, the North Carolina General Assembly approved the establishment of a new statewide school district, under the administration of the State Board of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction called the North Carolina Innovative School District (ISD).

Organizational Structure of the ISD



The founding Superintendent, Dr. Eric Hall, was hired in May 2017 to launch and implement this new statewide intervention focused on improving student outcomes in low-performing schools.

On September 17, 2018, the ISD named a new Superintendent, LaTeesa Allen. Ms. Allen replaced founding Superintendent Eric Hall, who was promoted to Deputy State Superintendent of Innovation.

Ms. Allen brings a wealth of relevant expertise and experience to DPI's leadership team. Her experience working with education systems and partners in North Carolina and several other states offers valuable perspectives in how to accelerate student growth and achievement in low-performing schools.

Based on statute, the ISD shall select no more than five (5) qualifying elementary schools to be transferred for operation as innovative schools under contract with a qualified and/or credible innovative school operator for a period of five years.

Schools which qualify for the ISD must meet the following criteria:

- Schools that earned an overall school performance score in the lowest five percent (5%) of all schools in the state in the prior school year and
- Include all or part of grades K-5 and
- Did not exceed growth in at least one of the prior three school years and did not meet growth in at least one of the prior three school years and
- Did not adopt one of the established reform models in state statute for the immediate prior school year

Local school boards that transfer a qualifying school to the ISD may request to the State Board of Education an opportunity to create an Innovation Zone (I-Zone). An I-Zone, if requested and approved, would allow local school boards to operate other low-performing schools in their local district with the same exemptions from statutes and rules as authorized for charter schools. This flexibility may also include exemptions from local school board rules and policies to ensure autonomy with guidance being provided by a dedicated I-Zone team under the local authority to manage schools within the zone.

Districts with an innovative school, with less than 35% of their schools being low-performing, may establish an I-Zone to include up to three (3) additional low-performing schools in the local district. Districts with an innovative school, with 35% or more of their schools designated as low-performing, may establish an I-Zone for all low-performing schools in the local district if requested and approved by the State Board of Education.

Reoccurring funds of \$400,000.00 are appropriated for the operation and administration of the ISD. In addition, a reoccurring allocation of \$450,000.00 is available for grants up to \$150,000.00 per established I-Zone for local school boards to use in managing and operating the zone. These funds must be matched with non-state funds and the grant may be used to help hire a proven leader for the I-Zone and the support staff needed to improve outcomes of the low-performing schools in an established zone.

The General Assembly has allocated \$500,000.00 for an external evaluation of the ISD and the results that are achieved during the initial five years of operation. The State Board of Education contracted with an external research organization to complete this evaluation with reports provided to the State Board of Education by February 15 annually. The State Board of Education shall provide a report of the research and recommendations for legislative changes annually by March 1, beginning in 2018 until submission of the final report in 2024.

External Evaluation of the ISD

To ensure that progress in its schools is evaluated effectively, the ISD partnered with an independent evaluation development team—composed of staff from the Friday Institute at North Carolina State University and RTI International—to develop a multi-year plan for assessing outcomes of the initiative. This report presents the evaluation plan, which includes recommended evaluation questions, indicators, data sources, an evaluation timeline, and evaluation budget considerations. Note that, while the ISD is implementing both strategies described above (Innovative Schools and I-Zones), the scope of this evaluation is limited to the first strategy—third party management by an ISO. This evaluation plan does not include any evaluation of I-Zone schools, though it does recommend inclusion of I-Zone schools as comparison schools for the quantitative analyses.

NOTE

Full Evaluation Plan is available upon request.

Evaluation Areas of Focus

The evaluator will be responsible for providing four reports for external stakeholders, each to be completed by November 15 each year, beginning in 2019. These reports will include information related to student performance, school-level operation, and overall ISD operation and management, with a focus on the following measured outcomes, as identified by statute.

- Public school student **enrollment** in each ISD School, including student demographics (Headcount);



Evaluation Team

The Friday Institute for Educational Innovation, North Carolina State University

- Trip Stallings
- Laura Rosof
- Elizabeth Halstead

Plan Developers

RTI International

- Laura Knapp
- Olivia Rice

The Friday Institute for Educational Innovation, North Carolina State University


- Allison Black-Maier
- Suzanne Branon
- Trip Stallings

- Public school student **admissions processes** and the number of students enrolled under the admissions category at each partnering ISD school (Compliance Monitoring);
- Student **achievement data**, including school performance grades and student achievement scores and student growth scores, at each ISD school (Longitudinal Academic Monitoring [Raw Values over Time]);
- Student **academic progress** in each ISD school as measured against the previous school year and against other schools located in the local school administrative unit and statewide (Quantitative Analysis);
- Student **discipline** data in each ISD school as measured against the previous school year and against other schools located in the local school administrative unit and statewide (Longitudinal Academic Monitoring)
- **Best practices** resulting from ISD school operations (Qualitative); and
- Other information that is considered appropriate by the ISD superintendent, State Superintendent, and State Board of Education.

The four public reports will be based entirely on four parallel internal stakeholder reports, due on the same schedule. The contents of these reports will include evaluations of items outlined in a logic model (below) which related to the following areas:

- Non-test score-based student performance
- School-level operation
- Overall ISD management and operation

External Evaluation Logic Model



Evaluation Questions and Related Measurable Outcomes

Evaluation Questions

The enacting legislation requires an evaluation of the ISD and outlines several key outcome measures for that evaluation (**Appendix A**). The legislation charges the selected ISO to:

- Set clear goals related to higher academic outcomes for students
- Create safe and positive learning environments for children
- Ensure parent and community engagement
- Efficiently and effectively use taxpayer dollars
- Empower and equip teachers and school leaders to meet the goals
- And hold ISD teachers and school leaders accountable to meet those stated goals

The ISO is directed to enter into an agreement with each school principal regarding specific goals for each school.

The evaluation development team worked with the ISD superintendent and his team to construct an evaluation strategy that retained all the required ISO goals and integrated additional goals to enable evaluators to arrive at a richer and more complete understanding of the outcomes of the initiative. Through multiple meetings with the ISD superintendent and the ISD team, the evaluation development team identified specific program goals and outcomes.

Through an overall mission and vision statement for the ISD initiative, the superintendent and his team expanded the ISD's legislatively-required commitments, and the evaluation development team incorporated that vision into a logic model for the overall initiative that graphically represents how ISOs and schools will fulfill those commitments. The ISD superintendent and the ISD team identified short- and longer-term goals for ISD schools related to student academic outcomes, learning environments, parent and community engagement, school culture, leadership, and academic and fiscal accountability.¹

Using the overall ISD logic model, the evaluation development team constructed a set of questions to guide the evaluation:

1. Does the ISD improve student- and school-level academic growth and achievement?
2. Does the ISD improve learning conditions, including changes in student behavior?
3. Does the ISD contribute to changes in school-community engagement?
4. Does the ISD contribute to changes in the culture of schooling both in and outside of the ISD?

¹ The evaluator should conduct a similar process with each ISO to construct school-level logic models.

Legislatively-Required Components

1. Does the ISD improve student- and school-level academic growth and achievement?
2. ISD schools achieve and maintain **performance scores at or above a C.**
3. ISD schools' academic outcomes **compare favorably** to eligible but non-identified schools.
4. ISD schools **demonstrate academic growth.**
5. Does the ISD improve learning conditions, including changes in student behavior?
6. ISD schools establish a **safe and positive learning environment.**
7. Does the ISD contribute to changes in school-community engagement?
8. **Community engagement** grows in ways that are attributable to the ISD.
9. **Parent engagement** grows in ways that are attributable to the ISD.
10. ISD **school staff feelings of empowerment** grow in ways that are attributable to ISD school-community engagement efforts.
11. Does the ISD contribute to changes in the culture of schooling both in and outside of the ISD?
12. ISD schools create an effective structure for **holding staff accountable.**
13. ISD schools exhibit **fiscal efficiency and effectiveness.**

Data

The evaluation development team next identified potential indicators for each evaluation question. Thoroughly addressing these questions requires a mixed-methods approach that incorporates quantitative and qualitative data from a variety of sources. While some of the questions focus on the performance of students in these schools, others examine the ways in which these schools operate and the extent to which they engage their local communities.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data Collection

Multiple data sources will be required to fully respond to the evaluation questions and provide evidence for each indicator. The evaluator will collect data from the sources and tools listed below:

- North Carolina Administrative data (including North Carolina Report Card data)
- Student surveys
- Parent surveys
- Practitioner surveys
- Practitioner focus groups
- North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions survey
- School-level annual reports

Data collection commenced with the opening of the first ISD school, Southside Ashpole Elementary in Rowland, NC on August 27, 2018. Due to contract finalization timelines, the evaluation team's work will not begin until spring 2019. Data from the 2018-19 school year is categorized throughout as "inaugural year" data; data from the 2019-20 school year is categorized as "baseline year" data.

North Carolina Administrative Data

Answering some evaluation questions—particularly those related to statutorily-required components of the evaluation—will require using administrative data routinely collected by the state.

For each student in North Carolina public schools, administrative data include information about their demographic characteristics, school enrollment, and performance on all statewide assessments, such as early-grade reading diagnostics, End-of-Grade (grades 3 through 8) tests, and End-of-Course (available for some high school courses) tests. Separate files include information about attendance and disciplinary infractions. All student files can be linked. Because unique student identifiers permit tracking students over time, an evaluator will be able to track each student's academic performance before and after enrollment in an ISD school (i.e., over time and across North Carolina public schools).

All files identify the school in which a student enrolled, and all data can be aggregated to the school or LEA level. In addition, the state School Report Card data include various accountability ratings for each school.

Note that the administrative data only become available to researchers several months after the end of each school year (usually no earlier than December); therefore, analysis and reporting of results from administrative data can occur no earlier than spring of the following school year. The table below shows an estimated timeline for administrative data analysis. As noted above, only one ISD school plans to open in the inaugural year

(2018-19); baseline-year outcomes (i.e., initial outcomes for all ISD schools from school year 2019-20) that rely on administrative data likely will not be reportable until **spring 2021**. Any administrative data reported for the inaugural year (possible by spring 2020) should be characterized as **preliminary** and **formative** in nature.

Timing of Analysis of Administrative Data

	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Inaugural School (opens 2018-19)	—	C ₀	C ₀₋₁	C ₀₋₂	C ₀₋₃
Additional ISD Schools	—	—	C ₁	C ₁₋₂	C ₁₋₃
Comparison School Analysis	—	✓	✓	✓	✓
Key: C=Collect and Analyze; Subscript #=Student Cohort (0=Inaugural [2018-19], 1=Baseline [2019-20], 2 [2020-21], and 3 [2021-21])					

With administrative data, the evaluator will address many questions about ISD schools. The specific indicators used will depend on the grade level of the students served by the school. Before grade 3, in order to capture early reading growth, reading diagnostic examinations (such as mClass or another equivalent instrument) may be included, though it should be noted that these formative instruments are not designed for summative assessment, so, if referenced, results will be reported with all appropriate caveats. For students between grades 3 and 8, end-of-grade examinations will be included. Should the ISD expand to include high schools, end-of-course examinations should be included. These data will be reported at both the student and school levels. Depending on the way in which a given ISD school manages subject-area grading, academic grades could be included as well. Reporting at the school level will include Education Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS) scores and School Report Card grades.

Because the North Carolina administrative data include all students in the state's public school system, the evaluator will have several different options for defining comparison groups. The team can compare ISD schools to overall results from the LEA or state, but also should identify statistically-defensible ways to create comparison groups that are as similar as possible to the students in ISD schools. Because many ISD school students will come from low-performing feeder schools, it may be statistically possible to compare their outcomes to those of students in the feeder schools. Once there are enough students enrolled in ISD schools to allow for meaningful student-level outcomes analyses, propensity score-matching or some other statistical matching technique may permit identifying comparison students in schools across the region.

As always, over-subscription for any school will create a natural control group, but there is no evidence yet that such over-subscription will occur; accordingly, the evaluator will assume and prepare for an evaluation that does not include a natural control group.

Surveys

To compensate for the limitations in administrative data, the evaluation will benefit from the inclusion of multiple qualitative data sources, the most efficient and dynamic of which will be survey instruments developed for multiple audiences. The evaluator will develop a common pool of survey items from which to create student, practitioner, and parent surveys. While each survey audience likely will not be able to respond to each item, development of a common pool of questions will enhance opportunities to conduct cross-survey analyses for items included in two or more survey instruments. The Evaluation Team will conduct each survey twice a year and provide raw results.

Student Surveys

The evaluator will develop a survey instrument to be completed by students at ISD schools (and middle schools where grade 5 ISD students matriculate, if permitted by the final budget allocation) during the spring and fall of each academic year.

The questions to be included in the student survey will be selected at the discretion of the evaluator. Questions about the proportion of students who feel safe at school will capture information about all aspects of a safe learning environment, including students' feelings about physical safety as well as social and emotional safety. Questions about positive perceptions of the learning environment will reveal whether students feel adequately supported and challenged to interact with teachers, principals, and other students in a fashion conducive to learning.

The ISD's first schools will be elementary schools; as a result, survey developers may want to limit surveys to older students (grades 4 and 5), though creation of valid and reliable survey instruments for pre-readers and early readers could provide important early-grade information, if the evaluation budget allows for their development.

Because survey data will be immediately available, they will be analyzed annually. For all students attending ISD schools who attend for at least one full year, change over the course of the year should be identifiable via comparison of fall and spring survey responses. In cases when a student attends an ISD school for multiple years, longer trajectories of growth should be considered. If surveys also are collected from students at middle schools where ISD students matriculate, responses from these students will provide a useful comparison of student impressions at various points in time across the implementation period. Where possible, survey data also should be linked to administrative data, providing an opportunity to qualify changes in response with changes in pertinent school-level features and student outcomes.

Parent Surveys

To determine the extent to which parents understand the ISD concept and are satisfied with their families' experiences, the evaluator will develop a survey instrument to be administered to each ISD school's parent/guardian population each spring. As with the student survey, questions will be selected at the discretion of the evaluator, and responses will be analyzed annually.

The parent/guardian survey will focus on parents' perspectives on learning conditions, including changes in their own students' behavior, awareness of perceived changes in school-community engagement, and changes in school leadership. Questions about school safety will capture information about parents' perceptions of the physical as well as social and emotional well-being of their children while at school. Questions about a positive learning environment will probe for responsiveness of leadership to parents' concerns. Questions about school-community engagement will reveal parent knowledge about academic expectations and standards, opportunities for student engagement, level of parent engagement, and perceptions of school leadership.

Practitioner Surveys

The evaluator will develop a practitioner survey instrument to be administered to administrative staff and teachers at each ISD school during the spring of each academic year. The practitioner survey will focus on ISD contributions to school-community engagement, as well as ISD approaches to sustainable, high-quality staffing and school leadership. Questions about school culture and school-community engagement will capture information about staff perceptions of ISO-provided support for implementation of best practices and for dealing with parents and the community. The survey will also gather information about staff perceptions of accountability, culture of professional learning, and both school and teacher leadership. Where possible, survey data also will be linked to administrative data, providing an opportunity to qualify changes in response with changes in related school-level outcomes.

North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey

The North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions survey² is administered statewide in the spring of every even-numbered year by NCDPI and can supplement the data collected in the recommended practitioner survey with additional data that are comparable over time with responses from other schools. The survey gauges teacher perceptions of the levels of support they receive at the school level in several areas, including Facilities and Resources, Community Support and Involvement, Management of Student Conduct, and School Leadership. The survey is available as part of the North Carolina K-12 administrative data but for reasons of confidentiality is not linked to individual teachers (though it is linkable to schools).

The Evaluation Team will add in school-level Teacher Working Conditions data to other planned analyses.

Practitioner Focus Groups

Based on the available evaluation budget, to supplement practitioner survey data, the Evaluation Team will conduct focus groups of a representative sample of the practitioners who are involved in ISD school operations **once per year at each**

² <https://ncteachingconditions.org/>

school. Practitioners may include classroom educators, school staff, school administrators, and other relevant practitioners as determined by the evaluator. These focus groups should allow the evaluator to address more deeply questions about school culture, leadership, accountability, empowerment, parental and community engagement, and the learning environment created through ISD schools (and how those environments serve students' needs).

Questions about leadership will focus on the potential for advancement and teacher leadership opportunities, the school staff accountability process, supports received by teachers, and teachers' perceptions of administrators' capabilities.

Questions about engagement will focus on perceptions of parent and community empowerment that result from the implementation of the initiative over time. Focus groups will be conducted at the end of each academic year.

<i>Interviews with Neighboring LEA Staff/Superintendents</i>
--

<i>To the extent possible under the available evaluation budget, to better understand the impact ISD schools may have on neighboring LEAs/schools, the evaluation will include interviews of a representative sample of neighboring superintendents, school leaders, educators, and other staff who can attest to potential changes in neighboring LEA/school policies, operations, or theoretical approaches. These interviews will allow the evaluator to better understand whether the existence/presence of the ISD, or particular policies and practices enacted by the ISD, had any impact on neighboring schools (particularly their "culture of schooling").</i>
--

School-level Annual Reports

One of the goals of the ISD is for its schools to be places for experimentation and learning about what works best for each targeted student population. For example, participating schools may adopt different pedagogical strategies for addressing the academic needs of low-performing students, or they may develop different approaches to overcoming implementation challenges. In order to capture these unique policies and practices, and for sharing this information more broadly, the Evaluation Team recommends that each participating school submit an annual report. Based on the current evaluation budget, responsibility for administering and monitoring these reports will fall to ISD leadership, but the Evaluation Team will advise with respect to content and timeline.

The reports should provide a descriptive narrative that captures implementation strategies, challenges, and successes, as well as anything else an individual school may opt to include.

Timeline and Budget Considerations

Timeline

Should the final budget and scope allow the evaluator to follow all aspects of the approach outlined above, the table below an estimated timeline for data collection and analysis across all data collection tools and school settings.

Evaluation Timeline

	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Inaugural School (opening 2018-2019)				
North Carolina Administrative Data	—	C ₀	C ₀₋₁	C ₀₋₂
North Carolina Report Card Data	—	C ₀	C ₀₋₁	C ₀₋₂
Student Surveys	C ₀	C ₀₋₁ , L ₀	C ₀₋₂ , L ₀₋₁	C ₀₋₃ , L ₀₋₂
Parent Surveys	C ₀	C ₀₋₁	C ₀₋₂	C ₀₋₃
Practitioner Surveys	C ₀	C ₀₋₁ , L ₀	C ₀₋₂ , L ₀₋₁	C ₀₋₃ , L ₀₋₂
Practitioner Focus Groups	C ₀	C ₁	C ₂	C ₃
NC Teacher Working Cond. Survey	C _{all} [*]	—	C _{all} [*]	—
School-level Annual Reports	C ₀	C ₁	C ₂	C ₃
All Other Schools (opening 2019-2020ff)				
North Carolina Administrative Data	—	—	C ₁	C ₁₋₂
North Carolina Report Card Data	—	—	C ₁	C ₁₋₂
Student Surveys	—	C ₁	C ₁₋₂ , L ₁	C ₁₋₃ , L ₁₋₂
Parent Surveys	—	C ₁	C ₁₋₂	C ₁₋₃
Practitioner Surveys	—	C ₁	C ₁₋₂ , L ₁	C ₁₋₃ , L ₁₋₂
Practitioner Focus Groups	—	C ₁	C ₁₋₂	C ₁₋₃
NC Working Cond. Survey	C _{all} [*]	—	C _{all} [*]	—
School-level Annual Reports	—	C ₁	C ₁₋₂	C ₁₋₃
Comparison School Analysis				
North Carolina Administrative Data	—	✓	✓	✓
North Carolina Report Card Data	✓	✓	✓	✓
NC Teacher Working Cond. Survey	✓ [*]		✓ [*]	
Interviews (Other LEAs)	—	C [^]	C	C
Document/Policy Scans (Other LEAs)	—	C [^]	C	C
Key: C=Collect and Analyze, L=Linkable to administrative data during the four-year implementation window; Subscript #=Student Cohort (0=Inaugural Cohort [2018-19; inaugural school only], 1=Baseline Cohort [2019-20], 2 = Cohort 2 [2020-21], and 3 = Cohort 3 [2021-22]) [*] Teacher Working Conditions (TWC) Survey is administered in the spring, every other year (2018, 2020, 2022); TWC 2018 data = pre-ISD year, collectable for all ISD participant schools; TWC 2020 data = only post-ISD TWC data available during the planned evaluation period [^] Pending ISD determination of timeline re: expected measurable impacts in non-participating LEAs				

Budget Considerations

This evaluation plan was developed under the assumption that state funding for the evaluation will be limited. Per discussions with ISD leadership, the state will have about **\$100,000** available each year for evaluation. The evaluation plan described in this document has been developed so that it can be customized to fit within this small budget; realization of the full plan likely will require more than \$100,000 in annual funds.

According to the Evaluation Team, a more reasonable estimate for a budget that would allow for a complete evaluation is between **\$200,000** and **\$250,000** annually. Also, because of the varying size of the implementation (e.g., only one school will open in 2018-19; no administrative data will be available for analysis until December 2019; etc.) and the variety of evaluation tasks across years, the Evaluation Team recommends that the ISD seek flexibility for the use of all evaluation funds. For example, if overall state allotment for the full evaluation is \$500,000 for five years, the funding should not be provided annually in equal proportions but instead as a lump. If annual appropriation is required, funding should be identified as non-reverting, so that the evaluator can plan for an appropriate and differentiated budget for each year of the evaluation.

Appendix A:

Evaluation Outcomes Required by the Enacting Legislation

The enacting legislation is Session Law 2016-110 (House Bill 1080),³ which created North Carolina General Statute §115C-75 (Article 7A).⁴ Outcome measures below were identified in §115C-75.11 and §115C-75.12.

1. School academic growth, performance scores and grades
 - a. School overall performance score (target: C or better)
 - b. School-level overall growth score (annual)
 - c. School-level annual percentage growth (year-to-year)
 - d. School-level overall performance scores (ISD vs comparison schools)
 - e. School-level overall growth scores (ISD vs comparison schools)⁵
 - f. School-level mathematics performance and growth by subject area (ISD vs comparison schools)
 - g. School-level reading performance and growth by subject area (ISD vs comparison schools)
2. Schools establish a safe and positive learning environment
 - a. Proportion of students who feel safe at school
 - b. Proportion of students with positive perceptions of learning environment
 - c. Proportion of staff who feel safe at school
 - d. Proportion of staff indicating positive impressions on related Teacher Working Conditions Survey items
 - e. Proportion of parents who feel school is safe
 - f. Proportion of parents who feel that the school is responsive to their concerns
3. Community engagement grows in ways that are attributable to the ISD
 - a. Description of the process of identifying valuable external partners
 - b. Annual list of partners and description of services they provide, including level of partnerships (time commitment, financial commitment)
4. Parent engagement grows in ways that are attributable to the ISD
 - a. Description of the process of identifying valuable external partners
 - b. Parent perceptions of the school academic expectations and standards

³ <https://www.ncleg.net/Sessions/2015/Bills/House/PDF/H1080v6.pdf>

⁴ https://www.ncleg.net/EnactedLegislation/Statutes/HTML/ByArticle/Chapter_115C/Article_7A.html

⁵ Note: Legislatively-mandated target: exceeds average growth of all other qualifying schools

- c. Parent perceptions of connections between student engagement and academic outcomes
 - d. Parent perceptions of their own participation in academic life of their students
- 5. ISD school staff feelings of empowerment grow in ways that are attributable to the ISD school-community engagement efforts
 - a. Staff perceptions of empowerment
 - b. Parent perceptions of empowerment
- 6. ISD school creates an effective structure for holding staff accountable
 - a. ISO protocol for teacher evaluation
 - b. Staff perceptions of staff accountability process
- 7. ISD schools exhibit fiscal efficiency and effectiveness
 - a. Annual school operating costs compared to average operating costs for similarly-sized new schools and/or new charter schools

Appendix B

Literature Review of State-Led Turnaround Initiatives

The evaluation development team conducted a literature review of state-led turnaround initiatives in other states to identify potential measurable outcomes and methods. The initiatives include:

- Louisiana's Recovery School District (RSD)
- Tennessee's Achievement School District (ASD)
- Michigan's Education Achievement Authority (EAA)
- Nevada's Achievement School District (ASD)
- Mississippi's Achievement School District (ASD)⁶

⁶ As of the development of this appendix (July 2018), progress on the Mississippi ASD remains on hold pending appointment of a superintendent; the Mississippi Department of Education plans to move forward with two school districts for the 2018-19 school year.