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August 8th, 2017 Boston, MA
Legislative Role Under NCLB

- Federal law prescribed specific actions at each step in the process
- Legislative role was very limited

* Table borrowed from the Foundation for Excellence in Education
Your SEA is submitting a state plan to US Dept. of Education this year (may have already submitted)
- Includes a detailed plan for improving struggling schools
What Feds Require Now

Schools targeted for evidence-based intervention:

- Schools scoring in the bottom 5% based on your state’s school performance measurement
- High schools with a graduate rate under 67%
- Schools with underperforming subgroups of students
Now What?

What We’ll Cover Today:

- What the research says works
- On-the-ground successes
- Creating a policy environment for success
Why Do Some Schools Persistently Underperform?

It’s Complicated!
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Students not College and Career Ready

Low School Performance Rating
Step 1:
• Organize the cards into your own categories
• If it helps, use blank cards to name categories, or to create additional factors

Step 2:
• Lay the cards out onto your table creating a map that shows how each factor contributes to schools that continuously receive low school performance ratings
Many Things Influence Achievement Gains

Variance in Achievement* (10th grade Mathematics)

- Student background factors, 60.0%
- Teacher factors, 8.5%
- Classroom level factors, 4.2%
- School level factors, 8.6%
- Unexplained, 19.0%

• Model Controls for Prior Achievement
• 95% of school, classroom, and teacher effects were unobservable (i.e. could not be controlled with specific variables)
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Framework for Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education (ESE) Accountability and Assistance

1. Voluntary Engagement With ESE Resources and Assistance
2. ESE Suggests Resources and Assistance
3. Prioritized for Resources and Targeted Assistance
4. Intensive Collaboration and Targeted Assistance
5. Increasing ESE Assistance and Accountability

Levels:
- Level 1
- Level 2
- Level 3
- Level 4
- Level 5
Successful Turnaround in Action

Turnaround Practices

1. **Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration** - The school has established a community of practice through leadership, shared responsibility, and professional collaboration.


3. **Student-Specific Instruction and Supports to All Students** - The school is able to provide student-specific supports and interventions informed by data and the identification of student-specific needs.

4. **School Climate and Culture**. The school has established a climate and culture that provide a safe, orderly, and respectful environment for students and a collegial, collaborative, and professional culture among teachers that supports the school’s focus on increasing student achievement.
SEA Response to 2014 Report

Aligned our state system of support to the turnaround practices by revising

- State assistance to drive schools to focus on what has been shown to work
- State turnaround plan requirements
- Turnaround school monitoring protocol
- School Improvement Grant (SIG) application and renewal processes

Developed tools and resources to support school and district implementation of the turnaround practices:

- Provided on-site targeted support through liaisons and DSACs
- Developed five videos of successful schools
- Developed a turnaround practices self-assessment
Impact Study Findings

**ELA Achievement Score Effect Sizes**

Equivalent to one additional year of schooling in both ELA and math

**Math Achievement Score Effect Sizes**
Impact Study Findings

• **Overall**: Students in the SRG schools performed better on the ELA and mathematics state assessment compared with students in comparison schools in years 1, 2, and 3 of the grant.

• **Reducing the achievement gap**: SIG was associated with a decrease in the achievement gap.
  - ELL and non-ELL students in ELA and Math for all three years.
  - Students who did and did not have FRPL status for all three years.
  - Students with special education status and students without a special education status in year 2 and 3 in ELA and only in year 2 in math.
## Turnaround Practices and Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice Area</th>
<th>Practice Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration</strong></td>
<td>1.1 Use of Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 High Expectations and Positive Regard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Vision/Theory of Action and Buy-In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Monitoring Implementation and School Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Trusting Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 Time Use for Professional Development and Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7 Communication With Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.8 Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction</strong></td>
<td>2.1 Instructional Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Instructional Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Identifying and Addressing Student Academic Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Classroom Observation Data Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 Student Assessment Data Use (for Schoolwide Decision Making)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6 Student Assessment Data Use (for Classroom Instruction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7 Structures for Instruction Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students</strong></td>
<td>3.1 General Academic Interventions and Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Teacher Training to Identify Student Needs (Academic and Nonacademic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Determining Schoolwide Student Supports (Academic Interventions and Enrichment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 Multitiered System of Support (Academic and Nonacademic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 Academic Interventions for English Language Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6 Academic Interventions for Students With Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. School Climate and Culture</strong></td>
<td>4.1 Schoolwide Behavior Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Adult–Student Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Expanded Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 Wraparound Services and External Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 Family and Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mission

To have children engage and learn in school by connecting each student with the tailored set of prevention, intervention, and enrichment services s/he needs to succeed and thrive
Current landscape

- Codes of discipline
- Psychological Testing
- Special education
- Pupil services
- Violence & crime prevention
- Social & family services
- Mental health services
- Community-based organizations
- Pregnancy prevention
- Drug services
- Counseling
- Afterschool programs
- Physical education
- Health education
- Drug prevention
- Nutrition education
- School lunch program
- Juvenile court services
- Health services
- Staff health & wellness
- Child protective services
Personalized supports & opportunities
City Connects core practice
Every student, every teacher, every year
Students in City Connects elementary schools close 2/3 of achievement gap on 8th grade Math MCAS

*Students leave City Connects after grade 5
Dropout

City Connects students are less likely to drop out of high school

Proportion of students who drop out in grades 9-12

Comparison students: 15.2%

City Connects: 8%
City Connects students have lower probability of chronic absenteeism

*Students leave City Connects after grade 5*
Negative Factors

Positive Factors

Center on the Developing Child, Harvard University
Center on the Developing Child, Harvard University

Negative Factors

Positive Factors
Return on investment

Factoring in costs of City Connects only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dollars invested</th>
<th>Dollars returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factoring in costs of City Connects and services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dollars invested</th>
<th>Dollars returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dollars invested

Dollars returned
Principles of Effective Practice

- Customized
  - individualized
  - universal

- Comprehensive
  - whole child
  - multi-tiered

- Coordinated
  - intentional
  - organized

- Continuous
  - systemic
  - accountable

Translate what works into policy
For Questions, contact:

Josh Cunningham

Josh.Cunningham@ncsl.org

303-856-1354