

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS DISTRICT TURNAROUND PLAN JUNE 29, 2010

INTRODUCTION

In January 2010, the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education identified 35 underperforming schools across the Commonwealth, which they refer to as Level 4 schools. Twelve of those schools are in the Boston Public Schools, and each requires immediate and intensive intervention.

Each of these schools is eligible to compete for federal School Improvement Grant (SIG) funding. School eligibility for SIG funds hinges on a school district's implementation of one of four federal intervention models at each school. Those four federal intervention models are the transformational model, turnaround model, restart model, and closure (see appendix 1). Regulations governing the four federal intervention models dictate that in districts with more than 9 identified underperforming (Level 4) schools, the transformational model cannot be used in more than half of those designated schools. Upon review of both quantitative and qualitative data, the Superintendent will use the intervention models at our Level 4 schools in the following way:

- Agassiz Elementary School (Transformational)
- *Blackstone Elementary School (Turnaround)*
- *Burke High School**¹*
- Dearborn Elementary (Transformational)
- *Dever Elementary (Turnaround)*
- Elihu Greenwood Elementary (Transformational)
- English High School (Transformational)
- *Harbor Pilot Middle School (Turnaround)*
- Holland Elementary School (Transformational)
- John F. Kennedy Elementary School (Transformational)
- *Orchard Garden K-8 Pilot School (Turnaround)*
- *Trotter Elementary School (Turnaround)*

To turn each school around and put them on track for success within a three-year period, we propose a turnaround plan that builds on empirical research and field knowledge. Our analysis of what works to turn around schools revealed that seven (7) areas are vital to success. Those seven areas are:

¹ Burke High School is not included in the body of this proposal. It was not previously identified as underperforming by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, and therefore is ineligible to participate in an expedited turnaround plan creation process according to the Act Relative to the Achievement Gap.

1. Transformational leadership
2. Effective teachers
3. Culture of high expectations and shared ownership for results
4. Focus on instruction
5. Social and emotional supports
6. Family and community engagement; and
7. Accountability

The plan we put forward addresses each of these areas and also aligns with the legislatively defined elements specified in *An Act Relative to the Achievement Gap*. Our goal in intervening in each Level 4 school is to: increase proficiency rates, reduce existing access and achievement gaps, and raise graduation rates (in high schools). With our eyes fixed on the future of these students, we will direct our will, finances, and collective agency so that they have the promising future they deserve.

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERS

The Boston Public Schools (BPS) has recruited a team of experienced leaders to lead our Level 4 schools. We have included the name of each principal and headmaster, their 2010-11 assignment, and their date of hire.

Principals and Headmasters Returning to Their School

Leader's Name	School	Effective Start Date
Maria Cordon	Louis Agassiz (K1-5)	July 1, 2008
Jose Duarte	Henry Dearborn Middle School (6-8)	July 1, 2009
Jeichaël Henderson	John P. Holland (K1-5)	July 1, 2009
Sito Narcisse	Boston English High School (9-12)	July 1, 2009
Mairead Nolan	William Monroe Trotter (K1-5)	July 1, 2008
Maud Wright	Elihu Greenwood (K1-5)	July 1, 2009

Principals Newly Assigned to Their School

Leader's Name	School	Effective Start Date
Andrew Bott	Orchard Gardens Pilot School (K1-8)	July 1, 2010
Waleska Landing-Rivera	John F. Kennedy (K2-5)	July 1, 2010
Robert Martin	Harbor Pilot School (6-8)	July 1, 2010

Michael Sabin	Paul A. Dever (K1-5)	July 1, 2010
Stephen Zrike	William A. Blackstone (K1-5)	July 1, 2010

Each leader comes to their post with a wealth of experience. We have compiled a brief profile of each selected principal and headmaster, highlighting their accomplishments, leadership skills and educational experiences.

Andrew Bott

Andrew Bott has served as principal of the Rogers Middle School since 2006, where he has increased student achievement through initiatives such as Grade 8 Algebra. Prior to that, he served as principal of the Mather Elementary School for several years. Mr. Bott has been with BPS since 1999, serving as an Administrative Intern at the Rafael Hernandez School and then as Assistant Principal at the Charles Sumner School. Prior to coming to the BPS, he taught bilingual education with the Houston Independent School District. Mr. Bott received his Master's Degree in Education from Harvard and a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Sociology from Rice University.

Maria Cordon

Maria Cordon has served as principal of the Agassiz since 2008. Prior to that, she was Director of Instruction at the Tobin K-8 School, where she led and supported efforts to improve teaching and learning for all students. She began her teaching career at the Winthrop Elementary School in Roxbury before coming to teach first and third grades at the Tobin, where she also served as Assistant Principal and Acting Principal during the principal's maternity leave. She co-chaired the School Site Council, chaired the Parental Involvement Committee, and served as the language acquisition coach and literacy coordinator for the school. A native of Dorchester and a product of the Boston Public Schools, Ms. Cordon holds a bachelor's degree from Emmanuel College, a master's degree from Cambridge College, and an administrative degree from Northeastern University.

Jose Duarte

Jose Duarte was appointed principal of the Dearborn Middle School in 2009 after serving as Headmaster of The English High School for many years. Mr. Duarte began his career in school administration while serving as assistant principal at the Umana-Barnes Middle School and later as principal of the Grover Cleveland Middle School. He went on to serve as a cluster leader, participating on the Superintendent's Leadership Team. Mr. Duarte earned a bachelor's degree from the University of Rhode Island and a master's degree from Eastern Nazarene College.

Jeichael Henderson

Jeichael Henderson was appointed principal of the Holland Elementary School in July, 2009 after serving as assistant principal at both the Holland and Lee Elementary Schools. He began his career at the Holland in 1997 as a student teacher and accepted a full-time teaching position at the school. Mr. Henderson is a product of the Boston Public Schools and holds a bachelor's degree as well as two master's degrees from the University of Massachusetts.

Waleska Landing-Rivera

Ms. Waleska Landing-Rivera, a native of Puerto Rico, came to Boston in 1990 with a Bachelor's Degree from the Universidad de Puerto in Accounting. During this transition, she started volunteering and substitute teaching at the Agassiz School in Jamaica Plain and at the Sarah Greenwood School in Dorchester. Ms. Landing was soon recruited by Principal Isabel Mendez for a kindergarten teaching position at the Sarah Greenwood School where she immediately developed a strong interest in education and where she has remained ever since.

Immersed in education and with such a keen interest in this field, Ms. Landing switched careers and received a Master's Degree in Special Needs Education from Eastern Nazarene College. In addition, she received intensive training in Reading Recovery and other specialized reading programs enabling her to work as a regular education, special needs, resource room, and Reading Recovery teacher. Most recently, she has worked as Literacy Coach, Assistant Principal and Director of Instruction. Along with Principal Mendez, Ms. Landing has been a forward thinking presence at the Sarah Greenwood School.

Robert Martin

Dr. Robert Martin has served as principal of the Hugh R. O'Donnell Elementary School since 2003, where he led an improvement effort that resulted in the school achieving among the highest student growth rate in the entire state. He began his teaching career at the Dearborn Middle School in 1973 and was appointed principal of the school in 1978. In 1981 he was appointed principal of the John W. McCormack Middle School, where he served until 1999. He then moved to the Seven Hills Charter School, where he served as Superintendent for three years before returning to the Boston Public Schools. Dr. Martin completed his undergraduate work at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst in 1973, earned a Master's degree from Antioch University in 1979, and returned to the University of Massachusetts to complete his doctorate in 1996.

Sito Narcisse

Dr. Sito Narcisse was appointed headmaster of The English High School in 2009. He came to the Boston Public Schools from Pittsburgh University Prep at Millones School, where he was the founding principal. Prior to this position, Mr. Narcisse was an assistant high school principal, a high school French teacher and the chair of the French Department. He has also been a guest

lecturer at the University of Pittsburgh Department of Administrative and Policy Studies. Dr. Narcisse holds a bachelor's degree from Kennesaw State University, a master's degree from Vanderbilt University, and a doctorate from the University of Pittsburgh.

Mairead Nolan

Mairead Nolan of Jamaica Plain has served as principal of the Trotter since 2008. Prior to that, she was the principal of the Joyce Kilmer K-8 School for six years, where she supported teachers in creating high-performing collaborative teams that increased student performance and worked with parents to build a strong welcoming community. Previously, Ms. Nolan served for four years as Director of Instruction for the Rafael Hernandez Two-Way Bilingual School. She taught for seven years in the Washington, D.C. Public Schools and in the Republic of the Marshall Islands. She earned a bachelor's degree from The Catholic University of America and a master's degree from Harvard's Graduate School of Education.

Michael Sabin

Michael Sabin is currently the principal of the Arthur D. Healy School in Somerville, MA, a position he has held since 2008. Prior to that, Mr. Sabin spent a year teaching algebra and ancient history at Colegio Los Nogales, a bilingual private school in Bogota, Colombia. He served as principal of the Edwards Middle School in Charlestown from 2002 – 2007, where he led successful school improvement efforts and implemented a new Extended Learning Time Program and a Boston Teacher Residency teacher training program. Mr. Sabin came to the Edwards after more than a decade in various leadership and teaching positions in Cambridge and Lawrence, MA. He holds a master's degree in Education with a concentration in Administration, Planning, and Social Policy from the Harvard Graduate School of Education and a bachelor's degree in Social Studies from Harvard College.

Maudlin Wright

Maud Wright was appointed principal of the E. Greenwood in July, 2009. Ms. Wright, an alumna of the Boston Public Schools, has worked as an educator in the district for her entire professional career. She began as an art teacher at the John Marshall Elementary School. She also taught at several other elementary schools, as well as the Edwards Middle School. Ms. Wright was lead teacher at the Josiah Quincy Elementary School before becoming an assistant principal for two years. Before her leadership of the E. Greenwood, she served as principal of the Pauline A. Shaw Elementary School for nine years. She earned a bachelor's degree from Dartmouth College, a master's degree from Boston University, and C.A.G.S. from Bridgewater State.

Stephen Zrike

Stephen Zrike currently serves as an Inquiry Coach for several of the district's K-12 school leaders and teams across the district. Prior to that, he served as principal of the Ohrenberger Elementary School from 2007-2009 after serving as principal of the Philbrick Elementary School for several years. As Principal, he has worked to raise math achievement, to develop interventions to support struggling learners and to engage the parent community in the educational process. His teaching career began in the Andover Public Schools as a 5th-grade teacher. Mr. Zrike is enrolled in the Urban Superintendents' Program at the Harvard Graduate School of Education and is working on his dissertation. Mr. Zrike's doctoral work focuses on the principal's role in teacher retention. Mr. Zrike holds a Bachelor's Degree in history from Dartmouth College and a Master's Degree in Education from the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

In choosing each leader, BPS looked for a leader that demonstrated:

- Commitment to and emphasis on spending significant time in classrooms;
- Consistent and constant focus on results;
- Use of data to monitor student progress and target specific areas for improvement;
- Elimination of distractions to maximize time spent on instruction;
- Alignment of professional development to school-wide goals and problems of practice;
- Establishment of a cohesive culture among teachers and staff;
- Experience reorganizing resources to attain achievement targets; and
- Engagement of families in the education of their children.

These practices reflect a combination of BPS leadership values and the Institute of Education Sciences' findings about what effective turnaround leaders do.

RECRUITMENT AND SCREENING

In our efforts to recruit a school leader with this profile both internal and external candidates were considered. Local intermediary organizations were contacted and internal leadership team members were solicited to develop a list of possible candidates. That initial list was vetted and a primary candidate pool was created.

BPS developed a general profile for each Level 4 school detailing what its next principal or headmaster required to help that school turnaround. Profiles were shaped by prior student achievement levels, instructional walkthroughs, teacher input, and consultation with parents and/or the local school site council. That profile informed the screening of candidates. Possible candidates were contacted for informational interviews, followed by more rigorous interviews with academic superintendents and later the superintendent herself to determine turnaround readiness as well as the candidate's fit for the school. References for finalists were checked and personnel files reviewed (for internal candidates). Information yielded from interviews, reference checks, and personnel file reviews was shared amongst academic superintendents and

the superintendent, and a final hiring decision was made. We recognize that in most cases we have asked experienced leaders to leave a successful school environment they had created to take on the more formidable challenge of turning around a school with persistent underperformance.

SUPPORT AND SUPERVISION

Each principal and headmaster will be supervised and supported by the Office of Accountability with an Assistant Superintendent. Support and supervision will include opportunities to intersect with other experienced and successful leaders, a cohort of leaders working in similar situations, and regular visits by district staff. In addition, there will be regular monitoring of school-level indicators including, but not limited to: attendance rates, disciplinary referrals, student grades, student assessment scores in ELA, mathematics, and science (for high schools), and the number of students on or off-track for graduation (high school). These periodic data reviews will be complemented by instructional walk-throughs with an assistant superintendent and other instructional support staff to observe and support instructional improvements in each classroom. External turnaround coaching will be provided as requested by the principal/headmaster or as needed on the recommendation of the assistant superintendent or Office of Accountability.

EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

An Act Relative to the Achievement Gap permits a school district to require all staff in Level 4 schools to reapply for their positions. BPS intends to fully leverage this provision upon final approval of this turnaround plan by the Commissioner of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. To date, we have been able to reach an agreement with the Boston Teachers Union to ask teachers to reapply for their positions in seven schools: the Blackstone, Burke**, Dever, Harbor, JFK, Orchard Gardens, and Trotter. Teachers at the remaining 5 schools will be asked to undergo a similar process. Through this process:

- Teachers not interested in participating in the turnaround work will be encouraged to exercise the option of voluntarily excessing themselves from the building.
- Each teacher choosing to stay at the school will be asked to submit a letter of interest as a formal act of recommitment to the school.
- Each staff person submitting a letter of interest will then be notified in writing of whether they will be asked to return to the school.
- All teachers not retained will be allowed to seek another position in the district in accordance with the new law.

Tenured teachers not retained will be allowed to seek another position via the excess pool. Provisional teachers not retained will have an opportunity to interview where vacancies may

occur, but without guarantee of rehire. In all cases, staff will be reassigned in accordance with the conditions and terms of existing bargaining agreements.

Use of the turnaround federal intervention model requires that no more than 50% of staff be retained. In schools where either the turnaround or transformational intervention model is being used, new teachers will be recruited to fill vacancies through multiple methods. All vacancies will be advertised and filled in accordance with the Joint Resolution Committee's decision. Both tenured BPS teachers and provisional BPS teachers will be eligible to apply, as well as candidates from outside of our school system. The superintendent or her designee will have sole discretion to fill all vacancies.

RECRUITMENT

Some vacancies will also be filled from programs that have existing partnerships with teachers. A cohort of teachers trained in our Boston Teacher Residency program, designed specifically for success in urban settings, will be placed, as will teachers recruited from Teach for America, Teach Plus, and other colleges and universities. These cohorts will work actively with school leadership and returning staff to accelerate the school's turnaround.

BPS has also created a pool of turnaround-ready veteran teachers. This group of teachers will work 210 days, receiving additional compensation and responsibilities. A cohort of these veteran teachers will also be placed at three schools.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Additional time will be created to support adult learning and collaboration. The use of that time will be aligned to demonstrated student learning needs and the school's identified problem of practice. However, given the large numbers of English language learners and students with disabilities in most of these schools, as well as our district focus on a multi-tiered model of instruction, a heavy emphasis will be placed on every teacher being trained to effectively scaffold content instruction for diverse learners.

CULTURE OF HIGH EXPECTATIONS AND SHARED OWNERSHIP FOR RESULTS

STANDARDS & EXPECTATIONS

It is important that we be explicit about what we want our children to achieve. Likewise it is equally important to have equally high expectations (or beliefs) about what they can achieve. Stated differently, we want to set the bar high for students' achievement and expect every student to achieve that standard. This combination of standards and expectations is the spring board for all of the work to follow. Standards and expectations will be articulated in at least three areas:

- The quality and quantity of work;
- Work habits; and
- Interpersonal behavior.

Collectively, these expectations convey to students, families, and the overall student community what good work looks like, the underlying daily habits that will be taught and supported to produce increasingly higher levels of work, and how one interacts with students and other adults in the school community. Having these items spelled out and continuously repeated for students and staff is important, as is having these standards and expectations set consistently high from classroom to classroom.

COMMUNICATION &

How teachers, administrators, and staff convey and operationalize these standards to students and families is just as important. Communication of our standards will be through our actions, as well as our words, on a daily basis. Through our actions and words we must *directly*, *specifically*, and *repeatedly* communicate what the standard is for school work, daily habits, and inter-personal behavior. Through the display of exemplars of good work, verbal explanation, and on-going instruction, we will communicate and help students and families track their progress toward proficiency. The frequency, intensity, consistency, and methods of communication must signal that these standards are a priority for the school.

Consistent messages at school and at home simultaneously convey that our standards are high and that we have *confidence* that “you can do it.” Just as important is that we convey a sense of *caring* by unequivocally communicating that “we won’t give up on you.” These dual messages of *you can do it* and *we won’t give up on you* signal our commitment to students and their academic success. Research on achievement gaps indicates that all students are aware of teacher expectations, but respond to them differently. Therefore, we must continuously examine our beliefs and practices, and if need be adopt new ones, to move the work forward. The district will continue to support and provide professional development that integrates strategies for delivering high quality instruction and conveying a belief that all students can succeed.

Effectively communicating one consistent set of standards and expectations to a diverse audience of families and educators with different cultures, languages, beliefs, and histories is the first step toward cultural proficiency.² A school that is culturally proficient values and builds capacity around those differences, acknowledges their presence as a strength, and has generally worked

² One definition of cultural proficiency is seeing cultural differences and responding positively and reaffirmingly to those differences (Lindsey et. al., 2003). We will use this definition as a point of reference in work toward culturally proficient schools.

through a process of transforming the school culture to educate all of the children. This work is vital in surfacing our beliefs about who succeeds and whom we believe will succeed.

BELIEFS & THE GROWTH

The foundation for these actions is in our beliefs about success and who succeeds. The Boston Public Schools has adopted a view that attributes success to access and effort. In doing so we acknowledge that there are theories that assert that success is innate, based on your genes. We acknowledge theories that assert that success is based on past performance, such that where you start pre-determines where you finish. We know there are theories that some kids, because of where they come from or the first language that they speak, just won't make it. We reject each of those assertions and those like them. In August 2008, the entire school district was exposed to a concept that success is not based on who you are, but what you do. That idea, expressed by Carol Dweck in her book *The Growth Mindset*, was shared with principals, teachers, and central office administrators. Embedded within the growth mindset are the teachings and values of Jeff Howard and the Efficacy Institute which states "you aren't born smart, you get smart" through consistent effective effort. Effective effort can be and will be taught to students and expected of them in preparation for their attainment of proficiency.

FOCUS ON INSTRUCTION

Perhaps the most important aspect of this plan is what happens inside of the instructional core, where students and teachers engage each other in the midst of content. It is our instructional work that will lead to closing achievement gaps for our students. Our turnaround schools currently enroll a large number of special needs students, English language learners (ELLs), and students yet to reach proficiency. They are in most, if not all instances, the majority of students enrolled, and therefore we must rethink and recreate our instructional approach to help them succeed and to help schools improve.

Within our focus on instruction, we have identified *key instructional elements* for closing persistent achievement gaps. These instructional strategies for closing access and achievement gaps are not a component of our instructional plan, but rather the very substance of our acceleration agenda. These elements are as follows:

- **Casting a new instructional vision**
 - Providing a *continuum of services* to support all students.
 - Aligning and integrating the services from general education, special education, and education for ELLs in a way that preserves (or creates) protections for children while providing a common instructional experience that is accessible and appropriate for all students.

- **Instituting Massachusetts standards aligned to a common core curriculum**
 - Literacy K-5
 - Mathematics K-12

- **Intensifying teacher development**
 - Creating additional time for adult learning and collaboration
 - Integrating cultural competence within instructional skill development to teach content
 - Aligning professional development with student needs and assets
 - Strengthening job-embedded professional development through the use of peer to peer advising, classroom observations and model lessons, and instructional coaching
 - Providing summer teacher learning/planning seminars

- **Extending time & learning opportunities**
 - Creating a longer school day
 - Providing summer enrichment and skill-building opportunities to reverse summer learning loss
 - Developing programs for before- and after-school support
 - Continuing school vacation acceleration academies

- **Using data to inform interventions**
 - Identifying our most vulnerable students through analysis of MCAS performance, classroom grades, attendance, and formative assessment results
 - Administering diagnostic assessments to surface specific learning needs and areas of academic strength
 - Consistently monitoring their academic performance, engagement, and overall well-being

- **Implementing a multi-tiered system of support**
 - Targeting interventions with varying levels of intensity (Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3) to allow for differentiation of support
 - Identifying assessments and a screening process to be used across all grades to determine student eligibility for specific tiers of instruction;
 - Establishing general eligibility criteria for Tiers 1, 2, and 3
 - Using diagnostic assessments in particular skill areas to show student skill level and need
 - Selection and purchase of district curricula and materials for Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 instruction and intervention
 - Clarifying, training on, and supporting Tiers 1, 2, and 3 intervention strategies at the classroom level
 - Scheduling at the school level to provide Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 instruction during the school day and/or during out-of-school time opportunities.
 - Ensuring that every student gets access to Tier 1 supports with differentiation
 - Aligning the specific student need with the right intervention, in the right amounts, for a long enough period of time to achieve student target goals
 - Using formative assessment to determine whether students are making progress toward their target goals

- Compiling regular student data and implementation reports (are interventions working? Why or why not?)
- Directing the necessary district resources to support this new infrastructure

ALTERNATIVE ELL

The *Act Relative to the Achievement Gap* also outlines that district turnaround plans may include alternative English language education programs that can disregard the requirement that limited English proficient (LEP) students be educated through Sheltered English Immersion (SEI). In other words, the district has the option of creating programs, such as Transitional Bilingual Education, which are not currently permitted under Ch. 71A without a waiver.

BPS will pursue this option in our Level 4 schools. Planning of these programs will take place during Year 1 of our turnaround efforts. The planning steps we have adopted will be based on guidance provided by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education³, and will build on work already under way by our Office of English Language Learners in every school in the district. Those steps are as follows:

1. **Review of student enrollment.** Identify the number of limited English proficient (LEP) students, and the total enrollment in the school. (Total enrollment/LEP percentage ratios would indicate most likely program models. For example, schools with a very high percentage of ELLs of one particular language group would be likely candidates for a Transitional Bilingual Education model).
2. **Identification of language groups.** Identify the language groups represented and approximate percentages of each in the Level 4 school. (This would indicate whether TBE and/or models specifically designed for low-incidence populations would be applicable at this school. Schools with a high percentage of one language group would more likely be candidates for a TBE model).
3. **Analysis of MEPA Proficiency Levels and growth data for all ELLs.** Identify the proficiency levels and growth data for each grade of ELL students. (What are the patterns and trends? Have certain groups of ELLs been stagnant at one proficiency level for several years? Why?).
4. **Identification of ESL teachers.** Identify the ESL teachers employed in the Level 4 school. Gather licensure information for each teacher (e.g., licensed, unlicensed, waived).
5. **Review of general education teachers' credentials and training.** Gather licensure information and identify the Category trainings that each general education teacher

³ Steps taken and quoted from the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's Offices of Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement *Alternative ELE Programs for Level 4 Schools* guidance documents..

has completed. This review will be coupled with consideration of how teachers will be supported in completing Category training.

6. **ESL curriculum audit:** Is the ESL curriculum based on the ELPBO? Do ESL teachers create yearly, monthly, and/or weekly curriculum maps based on the ELPBO?
7. **Identification of current ESL models being used in your school:** Describe which program(s) are in use: Sheltered English Immersion, Transitional Bilingual Education, Two-Way/Dual Immersion, or another program
8. **Alternative or revised program proposal.** Provision of a school-level program proposal that describes:
 - a. The rationale for the specific population of students served, accompanied by data specific to your district, and recent research that supports this model.
 - b. Staff being assigned to the alternative ELE program and why.
 - c. How the district has involved stakeholders in the development of the alternative ELE program.
 - d. Components within the new program that will contribute to closing existing achievement gaps for English Language Learners.
9. **Identification of measurable annual goals.** Identify the goals established for assessing progress of LEP students, and the reduction of achievement gaps among different groups of students, as required by the Act.
10. **Professional development and planning.** Describe how professional development and planning time for teachers and administrators at the school will include specific strategies and content designed to “maximize the rapid academic achievement of limited English proficient students,” as required by the Act.
11. **Parent Advisory Council.** If the school operates a limited English proficient program or programs for limited English proficient students in any one language group, it must establish, with district support, a limited English proficient parent advisory council.⁴

⁴ The parent advisory council (PAC) shall be comprised of parents or legal guardians of students who are enrolled in LEP programs within the school. Each PAC shall have at least one representative from every language group in which a program is conducted in a given school. Membership shall be restricted to parents or legal guardians of students enrolled in LEP programs within the school. The duties of the PAC shall include, but not be limited to: advising the school on matters that pertain to the education of students in LEP programs, meeting regularly with school officials to participate in the planning and development of a plan to improve educational opportunities for LEP students, and participation in the review of school improvement plans established under section 59C of chapter 71 as they pertain to LEP students. Any PAC may, at its request, meet at least once annually with the school council. The PAC shall establish bylaws regarding officers and operational procedures.

Additionally, as part of our redesign of services for English Language Learners across the district we will:

- Redesign budgeting, scheduling, and staffing processes to align them to the needs of ELLs enrolled and any new ELE programming;
- Revisit instructional approaches, curriculum selection and student monitoring strategies; and
- Develop and implement practices that support the successful transition of ELLs from LEP settings to “general education” settings.

SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL

Many students that attend our turnaround schools are struggling with issues beyond the classroom that impact their academic success. We plan to provide school-based supports in partnership with community agencies specifically designed to:

- Enhance student support services;
- Increase the accuracy of special education referrals;
- Ensure student thriving; and
- Raise student academic achievement.

This model will be implemented in elementary and K-8 schools in partnership with Boston College as part of their City Connects program. In the middle and high schools, the BPS Office of the Department of Extended Learning Time, and After-school Services (DELTAS), will provide a similar function.

This coordination of services will be provided by highly-trained professionals (counselors or social workers) who will act as a hub for all student support activities. They will connect students to needed services and resources inside and outside of school, working closely with school staff to create an environment where teaching and learning can take place. These professionals will:

- Assess key areas of student development;
- Work with teachers to identify children's unique strengths & needs;
- Co-create individual plans for each student;
- Connect children to tailored sets of support services & enrichment opportunities;
- Collaborate with child welfare offices to broaden the network of resources, supports, and advocates available to children and their families;
- Reach out to families, in collaboration with Family and Community Outreach Coordinators, to engage families as partners in the support of their children;
- Follow up to ensure service delivery and effectiveness;
- Track each student’s progress towards achieving their goals; and
- Support individual students when necessary and appropriate.

Each school will be linked to a network of health care institutions and other neighborhood-based service providers to increase students' and families' access to the necessary supports they may need.

In high schools, BPS will continue to partner with the Boston Private Industry Council (PIC) to sustain business partnerships and workforce development opportunities for students, including career exploration, skill development, job shadowing, summer internships, and school-year employment. These workforce initiatives and opportunities are facilitated by full-time PIC staff assigned to each high school to make individual connections between students and local businesses and institutions.

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY

Building strong partnerships with families, community based organizations and/or higher education institutions is a critical component of establishing the conditions for successfully eliminating achievement and access gaps. Research has revealed correlations between the engagement of families and student achievement, regardless of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status or English language proficiency. Specifically, it is family engagement that is linked to student learning and that builds parent and student efficacy that yields the greatest impact. At the core of our work with families, students and the community is a set of family engagement standards that provide guidance for the development of effective family and student engagement practices in a school.

Additionally, community partners are an important resource and provide an essential link to the communities and the lives of our families and students. Extended learning time and after-school supports, tutoring for students, extracurricular/enrichment activities, and social and mental health services are some of the critical areas of support provided by our community partners. The alignment of these partnerships to the schools' priorities and to the unique needs of the students and families in these school, as well as effectively managing coordinating these partnerships, will be a component of eliminating access and achievement gaps.

The Office of Family and Student Engagement will provide support for family engagement planning and implementation through central staff, family community outreach coordinators (FCOCs) or existing parent engagement positions at schools. These deployed staff people, in partnership with school leadership, will:

- Develop a plan for communicating with parents regarding programmatic changes and improvements, student progress and interventions, and access to resources and supports. These communication efforts will be crafted to reach the specific populations enrolled in the school, particularly the families of English Language Learners and students with special needs.
- Engage 10% of their families in Parent University activities. Level 4 Schools will be prioritized as satellite sites for Parent University offerings throughout the school year to facilitate their families' participation.

- Reach out to parents to achieve a parent return rate of 60% or higher on the district climate survey.
- Establish the presence of the 5 core elements of Family Engagement for establishing family engagement practices in the school.
 1. Home – School Compact
 - a. developed in conjunction with parents and school staff and approved by the School Site Council
 - b. rate of return for signed compacts – minimum 60%
 - c. protocol established to use the family engagement plan to promote partnership (such as reaffirming the agreements in compact at the parent teacher conferences).
 2. School Parent Council
 - a. active School Parent Council as evidenced by elected officers that meet regularly
 - b. participation of SPC members in developing home-school compact and/or the school’s family engagement plan
 3. School Site Council
 - a. functioning school site council as evidenced by membership that includes teachers, parents and students at the high school level that reflect school diversity
 - b. a set of bylaws, adherence to the MA Open meeting law (meeting dates, notes and agendas on file)
 4. Redesign Planning
 - a. a family engagement strategy with measurable outcomes will be developed for the school’s Redesign Plan
 5. Family Engagement Plan
 - a. utilizing the data from the district climate survey and the family and student engagement rubric schools to develop a family engagement plan focused on improving school climate and building strong relationships with families.
 - b. plan is developed in conjunction with parents and school staff and approved by the School Site Council

COMMUNITY

The Office of Family and Student Engagement (OFSE) will work with school staff, City Connects staff, and staff from the DELTAS office to support community mapping to assist schools with the identification of potential partners and services offered in the school’s surrounding communities as well as the communities where their students and families live. OFSE will work with schools to facilitate a periodic meeting with all of the school’s partners to affirm alignment with the school’s mission, priorities and the unique needs of its students and families.

ACCOUNTABILIT

The new state law requires the district to monitor progress and performance of every Level 4 school. In accordance with this requirement, we will monitor several measurable annual goals as part of this plan in the following areas:

Student Rates (Baseline Year: 2009-10 school year)

- Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) student attendance rates
- Truancy rate
- Exclusion (i.e. expulsion rate)
- Out of school suspension rate
- Number of drug, weapon, or violent incidents
- Student retention rate
- Dropout rate

Student Achievement (Baseline Year: 2000-09 school year)

- 4-year graduation rate
- Composite Performance Index (CPI) ELA – Aggregate
- Composite Performance Index (CPI) ELA – High Needs
- Composite Performance Index (CPI) Math – Aggregate
- Composite Performance Index (CPI) Math – High Needs
- Percentage of students scoring warning/failing on MCAS ELA - Aggregate
- Percentage of students scoring warning/failing on MCAS ELA – High Needs
- Percentage of students scoring warning/failing on MCAS Math - Aggregate
- Percentage of students scoring warning/failing on MCAS Math – High Needs
- Median Student Growth Percentile (SGP) ELA – Aggregate
- Median Student Growth Percentile (SGP) ELA – High Needs
- Median Student Growth Percentile (SGP) Math – Aggregate
- Median Student Growth Percentile (SGP) Math – High Needs
- Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO) targets for MEPA

College Readiness and School Culture (Baseline Year: 2009-10 school year)

- % of all students in grades K-3 reaching grade level benchmarks on DIBELS
- % students scoring C or higher in at least four MassCore subject areas (ELA, mathematics, science, social studies,)
- % of sophomores who participate in PSAT examinations
- % of parents participating in at least one teacher-parent conference per year
- % of parents participating in Parent University

- % of parents returning signed home-school compacts
- % parents reporting meaningful opportunities to engage with and/or contribute to the school – BPS Climate Survey
- Students’ mean score on student engagement index – BPS Climate Survey
- % students reporting that they are thinking about going to college and understand what it takes to get there – BPS Climate Survey
- % of students reporting that effort and good work are recognized by their school – BPS Climate Survey
- Mean score for collective teacher efficacy – BPS Climate Survey
- % teachers reporting using results from formative/interim assessments to improve and/or differentiate their instruction to meet student needs – BPS Climate Survey

Baseline data for students provided by the state will guide this process. The baseline year for student achievement indicators will be the 2008-09 school year. The baseline year for student rates, college readiness, and school culture indicators will be the 2009-10 school year. The latter set of data is still being collected and organized by the district. Baseline data and targets for Years 1, 2, and 3 will be provided by September 1, 2010.

CHANGES IN WORKING AND LEARNING

Successful implementation of the plan as described will require amendments to our bargaining agreements. We have engaged each of our bargaining units – BTU, BASAS, and Guild – in good faith bargaining to seek working conditions conducive to our students’ accelerated achievement, and adults’ collaboration, learning, and effectiveness. We were able to reach agreements through that process with the Guild. We were unable to reach comparable agreements with leadership of the BTU or BASAS. In accordance with the *Act Relative to the Achievement Gap* we then entered into two separate joint-resolution processes with each bargaining unit. Below are the decisions that resulted after participation in that process with the BTU (by area) and their implications for the collective bargaining agreement and/or working conditions in the eleven Level 4 schools participating in the expedited turnaround planning process:

1. WORK-DAY, WORK YEAR and SCHEDULE

RESOLVED:

The Principal/Headmaster in an Underperforming School shall establish the master schedule.

B. Instructional Leader

RESOLVED:

- i. BPS may establish the position of “Instructional Leader” and assign these individuals to Underperforming Schools.
- ii. “Instructional Leaders” shall be BTU positions.
- iii. An Instructional Leader’s work year shall be 210 days.
 1. Compensation for instructional leaders will be by stipend in the amount of \$6000.
- iv. The Instructional Leaders’ schedules and duties shall be established by the Principal of the Underperforming School in consultation with the Instructional Leaders and as provided for in the attached job description.
- v. The appointment of Instructional Leader shall be year-to-year. BPS shall notify an Instructional Leader if his/her appointment will continue for the following year *prior to the posting of the transfer list*. This position is a specialist assignment. The appointment to this assignment shall be at the sole discretion of the Superintendent or her designee and shall not be grievable or arbitrable.

C. Work Day for BTU Members

RESOLVED:

The Principal/Headmaster shall establish the work-day and work-year for BTU staff at underperforming schools. Teachers will be notified of their work-day and work-year for the next school year by January 15.

RESOLVED

On the 180 student days per school year, the workday for those employees identified in Appendix B shall include thirty (30) additional minutes per day of direct instructional time to students.

RESOLVED:

On the 180 student days per school year, paraprofessionals at underperforming schools shall also work up to and including thirty (30) additional minutes each day.

SC 5/12/10 PROPOSAL

v. Teachers at underperforming schools may be required to schedule and maintain a minimum of 45 consecutive minutes of open office time during the week; open office time schedules are subject to approval by the Principal/Headmaster.

RESOLVED:

[Accepted, but no change to contract needed; office hours provided at Article V. E. 8, page 82.]

RESOLVED:

Except for the first year a school is designated as underperforming, teachers at schools designated as underperforming will be notified by January 15th regarding any additional summer hours.

RESOLVED:

Teachers at underperforming schools shall teach no more than 312 minutes per day at elementary schools and no more than 270 minutes per day at secondary schools, and may teach 180 consecutive minutes.

SC 5/12/10 PROPOSAL

viii. BTU representatives at Underperforming Schools shall address any Union issues before or after the work-day.

RESOLVED:

The School Committee proposal to change Article IX, D. is rejected.

RESOLVED:

Consistent with Article VI, G. Collaborative Coaching and Learning, teachers are expected to model *up to and including three* (3) lessons for fellow staff members per school year. (Instructional Leaders shall not be subject to this cap).

SC 5/12/10 PROPOSAL

x. Elementary teachers at underperforming schools may be assigned bus duty *during their work-day*.

RESOLVED:

Article V., A., 4. (a), Relief from Non-teaching Tasks, (a) Elementary Schools, change “after school” at the end of the paragraph to “after the teacher workday.”

D. Professional Development

RESOLVED:

i. Employees listed in Appendix B may be required to work up to and including one hundred (100) additional hours to be scheduled beyond the regular school day for professional development, teacher training time, collaborative teacher planning, and small group instruction. These one hundred (100) hours shall be in addition to the professional development hours required by Article V. E.1 of the collective bargaining agreement.

ii. The content and schedule of one hundred (100) hours shall be established by the

Principal/Headmaster after consultation with the staff.

iii. Employees listed in Appendix B may be required to attend up to and including five days (six hours per day) of professional development during the summer scheduled by the Principal/Headmaster. Any required professional development hours during the summer count toward the one hundred (100) hours described above in D. i. The content of the professional development shall be determined by the Principal/Headmaster.

E. Classroom

RESOLVED:

The School Committee proposal to change SEI class sizes is rejected.

F. SEIMS

SC 5/12/10 PROPOSAL

i. The SEIMS language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement shall not apply to underperforming schools.

RESOLVED:

The School Committee proposal to change the application of the SEIMS language is rejected.

G. Inclusion Model of Instruction

RESOLVED:

When implementing an inclusion model, the Principal/Headmaster shall determine the class composition and staffing, provided that impacted teachers receive notice by January 15.

H. Planning/Assessments

RESOLVED:

Teachers shall develop individual student intervention plans based upon MCAS results and classroom assessments, provided the teacher is not required to do so on their own time. These plans shall be made available to the Principal/Headmaster upon request at times during the school day when the teacher is not using such plans.

I. SEI Training

RESOLVED:

Teachers at underperforming schools shall be licensed in ESL or complete SEI category training by June 30, 2011. Teachers shall be responsible for obtaining this licensing or training

on their own time.

J. Common Planning Time

RESOLVED:

The School Committee proposal regarding common planning time is rejected.

K. Parent Teacher Conferences

RESOLVED:

All teachers at schools in Appendix A will engage in frequent contact with parents and shall schedule parent/teacher meetings with the Principal/Headmaster. These shall be part of a teacher's regular work year and in addition to the existing parent/teacher conferences required by Article V., E., 8 of the parties' collective bargaining agreement.

L. Staggered Start Time

RESOLVED:

Staff in the building may have a staggered start and end time to their workday provided the employee's starting time is within one hour of the regular start, the time is continuous and is otherwise consistent with the collective bargaining agreement, and the teachers receive notice on or before January 15 of the preceding year. The notice requirement does not apply to any employee who accepts a position with a staggered schedule for the 2010-2011 school year.

2. STAFFING

A. Reassignment

RESOLVED:

By January 15, the Principal/Headmaster will notify those teachers whose assignment for the following school year is expected to change.

RESOLVED:

All staff shall reapply for their positions during the first year a school is designated by the DESE as "underperforming" (see April 12, 2010, Letter of Agreement, between the parties).

RESOLVED:

All staff shall reapply for their positions during the first year a school is designated by the DESE as "underperforming" (see April 12, 2010, Letter of Agreement, between the parties).

RESOLVED:

Principals may excess teachers and paraprofessionals from schools designated as “underperforming” by February 1st.

RESOLVED:

Teachers and paraprofessionals can voluntarily excess themselves from an underperforming school by giving notice by February 1st for the subsequent year.

B. Vacancies

RESOLVED:

No BTU member may be laid off as a result of the existence of the schools designated as Underperforming.

3. COMPENSATION

A. “Pay-for-Excellence”

RESOLVED:

Compensation

I. For the 2010-2011 school year, teachers will receive a stipend of \$4100.00 each year for the extended work-year (190 total additional hours). This stipend will be annualized and retirement-worthy. In subsequent years, any increase from the 2010-2011 work-year shall be compensated at the contractual hourly rate.

Pay-for-Excellence

A. Subject to available funds, beginning in the 2010-2011 school year, each employee represented by the BTU at an underperforming school listed in Appendix A shall receive an award(s) based upon students’ performance at each underperforming school listed in Appendix A as measured by the Composite Performance Index (“CPI”) and median student growth percentile, (as well as graduation rates for high schools and attendance rates for elementary and K-8 schools) established by the DESE. Such award(s) shall be paid in accordance with the schedule below.

B. For purposes of the schedule, “teacher” shall include all those individuals identified in Appendix B.

C. The first such award(s) will be based upon CPI data from the 2010-2011 school year as compared to CPI data from the 2009-2010 school year, and shall be available for distribution by December 1, 2011.

	Attainment of <i>annual CPI</i> turnaround target in <i>ELA</i> for the overall student body (in the aggregate)	Attainment of <i>annual CPI</i> turnaround target in <i>Math</i> for the overall student body (in the aggregate)	Attainment of <i>annual median Student Growth Percentile</i> turnaround target in <i>ELA</i> for the overall student body (in the aggregate)	Attainment of <i>annual median Student Growth Percentile</i> turnaround target in <i>Math</i> for the overall student body (in the aggregate)	Attainment of <i>annual graduation rate</i> turnaround target for the overall student body (in the aggregate)	Attainment of <i>Attendance rate</i> turnaround target for the overall student body (in the aggregate)
					HIGH SCHOOLS ONLY	ELEMENTARY AND K-8 ONLY
\$750 Maximum Per Teacher	\$225	\$225	\$125	\$125	\$50	\$50
\$225 Max. Per Paraprofessional	\$50	\$50	\$50	\$50	\$25	\$25

B. Step Increases

SC 5/12/10 PROPOSAL

B. Step Increases

Beginning on September 1, 2011, teachers at Underperforming Schools shall not advance a salary step unless that teacher's most recent evaluation prior to September 1st reflects a rating of overall "Meet Standards."

RESOLVED:

The School Committee proposal to change Article VIII, A. 5. Step Advancement, is rejected.

4. EVALUATION

A. Process

SC 5/12/10 PROPOSAL

i. The Parties acknowledge that the attached process shall be used to evaluate teachers at Underperforming Schools.

RESOLVED:

[The School Committee proposal for a modified evaluation process for the underperforming

schools has been superceded by the parties' negotiation over this issue in the ongoing successor contract bargaining].

B. Instrument

RESOLVED:

Beginning September 1, 2010, and until a new evaluation instrument is negotiated, the existing performance evaluation instrument will include the following "Turnaround Indicator" under the Overall Rating for Dimension 7 (above Dimension 8):

1. Teacher's instruction has resulted in significant student achievement as demonstrated student assessment data maintained by BPS. Teachers will be rated on the Turnaround Indicator but the Turnaround Indicator will not be a factor mark in determining the overall rating for Dimension 7.

RESOLVED:

[The School Committee proposal for subcommittee negotiations on the evaluation instrument beginning September 1, 2010, has been superceded by the parties' negotiation over this issue in the ongoing successor contract bargaining].

5. CHANGES TO THE PLAN

RESOLVED:

The Superintendent reserves the right to request bargaining regarding a change to a working condition or provision in the collective bargaining agreement not addressed in this plan should the Superintendent feel that such a change to the collective bargaining agreement is necessary to maximize the rapid achievement of students in underperforming schools.

6. UNDERPERFORMING DESIGNATION VERSUS PILOT SCHOOL DESIGNATION

RESOLVED:

A. Excluding The English High School, a Boston pilot school shall not lose its pilot school status as a result of its designation as "underperforming." Except as altered by the turnaround plan, a pilot school's working conditions shall continue to apply. Nothing in this agreement shall restrict the Superintendent's authority to alter the governance of the pilot school.

B. During the effective period of the turnaround plan for each pilot school listed in Appendix A, there shall not be an election to work agreement and neither teachers nor the Governing Board may change the school schedule or professional development schedule.

7. WORKSHOP

RESOLVED:

Teachers at an underperforming school will receive at least one (1) and up to three (3) workshop days per year to visit the classrooms of high achieving schools to share best practices. Principals and teachers will consult about scheduling workshop days, but final approval will be at the discretion of the Principal/Headmaster.

8. DURATION

RESOLVED:

Once a school loses its designation as “underperforming” the changes in working conditions and changes to the collective bargaining agreement established herein shall no longer apply. In any event, these changes in working conditions and the collective bargaining agreement are effective only for the three years this turnaround plan is in effect (consistent with Section 3 (j) of the Act Relative to the Achievement Gap).

UNION PROPOSAL

RESOLVED:

The Union proposal regarding Social/Emotional/Academic Support For Students is rejected.

RESOLVED:

The Union proposal regarding Reading Intervention Program/PE Program is rejected.

STRATEGIC USE OF RESOURCES

The plan put forth will require additional federal funds to be executed. The primary areas of investment the district will prioritize are:

- Additional time for instruction;
- Additional professional development for adult learning and collaboration;
- Multi-tiered supports for students;
- Formative and diagnostic assessments to inform instructional interventions;
- Partnerships for increased out-of-school time academic and co-curricular supports; and
- Collaborations to expand access to social and emotional supports;

These investments will be supported with a combination of state and federal grants. Specifically, each school received an Early Implementation Grant for up to \$125,000 to support their summer planning and preparation for the upcoming schools year. Each school is guaranteed at least \$100,000 in state “bridge funding” to support their Year 1 turnaround efforts. Each school will apply for a multi-year federal School Improvement Grant for up to \$3 million dollars total to support their school-level turnaround efforts. Lastly, the district has invested a total of \$4.2 million dollars in American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds to support data use, out-of-school time interventions and opportunities, and development of a multi-tiered system of supports. Collectively these funds are able to seed the core of district efforts. In order to sustain these efforts beyond the initial 3-year period of level 4 status, the district will rely on additional outside resources and an improved financial picture in the Commonwealth.

PLAN DURATION

This plan being presented is a three-year plan. During Year 1, a school-based redesign team chaired by the Principal will develop more specific design features for Years 2 and 3 to propose to the Superintendent as amendments to the Turnaround Plan. Some of the features may require changes in collective bargaining agreements. The Superintendent will utilize the process and timetable prescribed in *An Act Relative to the Achievement Gap* to develop amendments to the Turnaround Plan to propose to the Commissioner.