



Report on the Expanded Learning Time Grant: Costs and Expenditures

February 2016
Chapter 46 of the Acts of 2015, Line Item 7061-9412

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906
Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Relay 800-439-2370
www.doe.mass.edu



This document was prepared by the
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.
Commissioner

Board of Elementary and Secondary Education Members

Mr. Paul Sagan, Chair, Cambridge
Mr. James Morton, Vice Chair, Boston
Ms. Katherine Craven, Brookline
Dr. Edward Doherty, Hyde Park
Dr. Roland Fryer, Concord
Ms. Margaret McKenna, Boston
Mr. Michael Moriarty, Holyoke
Dr. Pendred Noyce, Boston
Mr. James Peyser, Secretary of Education, Milton
Ms. Mary Ann Stewart, Lexington
Mr. Donald Willyard, Chair, Student Advisory Council, Revere

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D., Commissioner and Secretary to the Board

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, an affirmative action employer, is committed to ensuring that all of its programs and facilities are accessible to all members of the public.

We do not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex, gender identity, or sexual orientation.

Inquiries regarding the Department's compliance with Title IX and other civil rights laws may be directed to the Human Resources Director, 75 Pleasant St., Malden, MA 02148-4906. Phone: 781-338-6105.


© 2015 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Permission is hereby granted to copy any or all parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes. Please credit the "Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education."

This document printed on recycled paper

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906
Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Relay 800-439-2370
www.doe.mass.edu





Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education

75 Pleasant Street, Malden, Massachusetts 02148-4906

Telephone: (781) 338-3000
TTY: N.E.T. Relay 1-800-439-2370

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.
Commissioner

January 29, 2016

Dear Members of the General Court:

I am pleased to submit this Report to the Legislature on Extended Learning Time Grants (MA ELT), pursuant to Chapter 46 of the Acts of 2015, line item 7061-9412:

“...provided further, that the department shall file a report with the clerks of the house and senate and the house and senate committees on ways and means, not later than January 29, 2016, outlining the cost and expenditures for schools in the initiative...”

In FY16, 22 schools in 11 districts received funding for expanded learning time (ELT) through this line item, resulting in additional time for learning for more than 12,000 students. Because the grant criteria prioritize funding for schools serving high poverty populations, over half of the students served are categorized as economically disadvantaged, nearly twice the state average.

Based on annual reapplications, performance agreements, site visits – all standard components of our grant accountability system – as well as reports from school leaders and ELT teachers, we know that additional time is invaluable. Additional time allows for high-quality implementation of research-based curriculum and intervention, for team approaches to each student’s learning challenges, for integrated enrichment opportunities that link students with their communities and broaden the scope of options for their futures, and for targeted use of technology and data for students and for teachers.

As corollary benefits to an expanded day, many of our MA ELT schools have been able to offer breakfast in the classroom, often with the help of private funding, which provides reliable nutrition to start the school day in addition to academic support. Many students and families have also talked about safety when asked about the benefits of ELT.

The work that remains in order to close achievement gaps requires a steady and concerted effort, to be sure. However, providing students with the individual attention and support that will allow each to overcome academic deficits and establish a strong foundation for learning, especially

when students needing extra attention comprise 50-75% of a school's population, simply demands time beyond a 6-hour school day. Expanding the school day is now a standard part of formal turnaround efforts for chronic underperforming schools and districts.

Thank you for providing this opportunity to share our work on this grant.

Sincerely,

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.
Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Funding and Accountability Procedures	4
Costs and Expenses Funded by the MA ELT Grant	7
Expenditures and Compensation Models for \$800 Per-Pupil Schools	8
School Compensation Models: \$800 Per-Pupil Schools	9
Contractual Services	11
Conclusion	11
Appendix A: Expanded Learning Time Expectations for Implementation.....	12

Introduction

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (Department) respectfully submits this Report to the Legislature on Extended Learning Time Grants, pursuant to Chapter 46 of the Acts of 2015, line item 7061-9412:

“...provided further, that the department shall file a report with the clerks of the house and senate and the house and senate committees on ways and means, not later than January 29, 2016, outlining the cost and expenditures for schools in the initiative...”

In response to the Legislature’s request for a report and recommendation on sustainable and lower cost expanded learning time (ELT) models in its FY15 budget, the Department last year submitted an extensive analysis of the use of grant funds over the first nine years of the grant based on grant budgets, focus group interviews with stakeholders (superintendents, principals and other administrators (including charter school leaders of schools with expanded time), teachers, community partners, union representatives, and other professional networks), review of teacher contract language and salary schedules for teachers participating in expanded time, as well as analyses conducted by contracted researchers. That document, *Report on the Expanded Learning Time Grant: Costs, Expenses and Recommendations for Sustainability (2015)* (“Sustainability Report”), resides on the Department’s website.¹ This report on costs and expenses, in addition to providing FY15 and FY16 (projected) use of ELT grant funds, reports on some developments with respect to some of the challenges and opportunities introduced in the Sustainability Report.

In summary, in the current school year (2015-2016), over twelve thousand students are experiencing the additional support, challenge, opportunity, and enhanced instruction that the Massachusetts ELT grant initiative (MA ELT) affords. The grant continues to reach students with among the highest needs in the state: 6 MA ELT schools fall in the top 10% of schools by percentage of economically disadvantaged students enrolled; all MA ELT schools rank in the top 30%. ELT schools fall similarly on the continuum when measuring percentages of high needs students enrolled.²

If there is any doubt that expanded time, well used, can lift a school’s performance, the experience of the Carlton M. Viveiros Elementary School (Viveiros) in Fall River lays it to rest. Nearly seven of every ten students at Viveiros are economically disadvantaged; more than one of every ten students has a disability. When Viveiros received its ELT grant to start the 2008-2009 school year, it was not making adequate yearly progress and was experiencing declines in

¹ <http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/reports/2015/03ELT-Sustainability.pdf>

² As defined on the Department’s website: “A student is high needs if he or she is designated as either low income (prior to School Year 2015), economically disadvantaged (starting in School Year 2015), or ELL, or former ELL, or a student with disabilities. A former ELL student is a student not currently an ELL, but had been at some point in the two previous academic years.” <http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/help/data.aspx?section=students#selectedpop>, accessed December 22, 2015.

performance, rather than progress. After receiving ELT funds as well as wraparound support through the Department's Race-to-the-Top Wraparound Zone initiative, Viveiros started a steady road to improvement that culminated this fall in a second year as a Level 1 school (the highest of the state's accountability system) and being named one of just 45 commendation schools statewide.³ Viveiros is a real and current example of what can be done to close achievement gaps: staff and leadership are committed to continuous improvement (for themselves as well as for their students), supportive and individualized attention to the learning and emotional needs of students while promoting a culture of high expectations for all students, and providing time to allow teachers to develop the tools needed for each student to flourish. Other examples:

- A.C. Whelan Elementary School (Level 2) in Revere has instituted "Fun Fridays" when teachers engage in two hours of uninterrupted school-based professional development while students have condensed academic classes, enrichment and physical education. During Fun-Friday time, students are taught by specialists, teachers without homeroom assignments, and community partners. Teachers who teach during Fun-Friday time alternate schedules to allow them to participate in PD as well.
- Many ELT elementary schools use a portion of their extended day to include science and social studies as separate classes in early grades, which has resulted in many realizing impressive achievement and low achievement gaps on MCAS science testing (for example, Revere and Fall River ELT elementary schools have closed achievement gaps and exceed statewide average for percentage of students scoring proficient or higher in science).
- Newton Elementary School (Level 2) has developed a music focus for enrichment periods, including ukulele, cello and violin instruction, based on their research indicating these activities improve student readiness to learn and early brain development.

As the Department's experience with Viveiros and other successful ELT schools has taught, the refrain heard from veteran ELT proponents that "time is a necessary but alone an insufficient component of school improvement" is well founded. While expanding the day is key, that expansion merely provides additional time to complete the hard work of good teaching and engaged learning. Schools and districts that have the best results use every minute to the advantage of their teachers and their students. Through its long-term partnership with Mass2020 and a targeted accountability system (see below), the Department provides both technical assistance and clear objectives for grant funds that guide ELT implementation without mandating particulars.

Since the Legislature first funded the MA ELT grant in 2006, 15 districts have received grant funds for 1 or more schools (see Table 1). Not all schools and districts have been continuously funded since their initial year. Some have voluntarily withdrawn from the initiative, while others have been unable to make or sustain sufficient progress to warrant continued funding through

³ Commendation Schools are Level 1 schools that have high levels of achievement, have made strong progress, and/or have substantially narrowed proficiency gaps.

this performance-based grant.⁴ However, as the charts show, instances of districts leaving the initiative are infrequent.

Because the MA ELT initiative is entirely dependent on an annual allocation from the Legislature, growth of the program relies principally on a corresponding increase in that allocation. In recent years the per-pupil grant allocation has been fairly static (with a decrease last year), so any new opportunity for funding has depended on an existing school losing its funding. The budgetary language allows grants to be awarded in amount not to exceed \$1,300 per pupil, and all schools prior to FY15 were funded at approximately this amount⁵ (\$1,300 per-pupil schools). However, to encourage sustainability and increase the reach of grant dollars, for FY15 the Department announced a priority for applications for school redesign supported by \$800 per pupil or less (\$800 per-pupil schools). As a result, four schools have been funded at \$800 per-pupil level and are now halfway through their second year of implementation. Some observations about these schools' use of grant funds compared to counterparts funded at \$1,300 per pupil are shared below.⁶

Finally, while the Department is asked to report on costs and expenditures for schools in the initiative, the information in this report is limited to districts' allocations of MA ELT funds in ten categories tracked by the Department:

- Administrators
- Instructional/Direct Services Staff
- Support Staff
- Fringe Benefits
- Contractual Services
- Supplies
- Travel
- Other
- Indirect Costs
- Equipment

While districts are allowed to amend their MA ELT budgets in certain instances, they do so infrequently and usually in relatively small amounts. Therefore, the information used for this report relies on grant budgets that are initially authorized by the Department without regard to whether a later amendment is allowed, except in one instance where major amendments occurred. Finally, amounts spent by districts and schools to support their ELT programs almost always exceed their MA ELT allotment.⁷ However, these additional expenses, which are funded

⁴ See discussion section entitled, Funding and Accountability Procedures, *infra*, p. 4.

⁵ Last year, due to a decrease in the Legislature's appropriation, rather than drop any existing ELT school from the initiative, the Department reduced the per-pupil funding for all schools previously receiving \$1,300 per pupil to approximately \$1,240 per pupil.

⁶ See section entitled, Expenditures and Compensation Models for \$800 PP Schools, p. 9.

⁷ O'Reilly, Fran and Tammy Kolbe. 2011. "Where Does the Money Go? Expenditures for the Massachusetts Expanded Learning Time (MA ELT) Initiative." O'Reilly and Kolbe reported that nine of 15 ELT schools in FY10 spent appreciably more than \$1,300 per pupil on ELT programs, with the grant covering from 60-94% of total ELT

from another source, are not tracked by the Department and are not often separately tracked by schools and districts as distinct ELT expenses.

Table 1. Districts Participating in MA ELT, FY07 - FY16

District	Years of Participation
Boston	SY2007 – Present
Brockton	SY2013 – Present
Cambridge	SY2007 – Present
Chelsea	SY2009 – SY2014
Chicopee	SY2008 – SY2009
Fall River	SY2007 – Present
Fitchburg	SY2008 – Present
Framingham	SY2009
Greenfield	SY2008 – Present
Lawrence	SY2015 – Present
Malden	SY2007 – Present
Revere	SY2009 – Present
Salem	SY2015 – Present
Southbridge	SY2009
Worcester	SY2007 – Present

Source: MA ELT grant records.

Funding and Accountability Procedures

The legislative language accompanying the MA ELT budget allocation sets the broad parameters of ELT redesign:

“ . . . the department shall approve implementation proposals that include an appropriate mix of additional time spent on core academics, additional time spent on enrichment opportunities, such as small group tutoring, homework help, music art, sports, physical activity, health and wellness programs, project-based experiential learning and additional time for teacher preparation or professional development...”

When funding allows, the Department holds a grant competition open to all district schools wishing to add a minimum of 180 hours to their schedules for a total of at least 1365 for

costs, p. 13. *Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education*. Accessed on December 23, 2015 <http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/reports/2011/12ELT-Expenditures.doc>.

elementary schools and 1425 for secondary schools.⁸ All applicant districts⁹ compete for available grant funding through submission of grant application materials that include descriptions of redesigned school schedules for each prospective ELT school; an articulation of academic, enrichment and professional time goals; materials from districts in support of their ELT schools; and detailed budgets for the intended use of grant funds if the applicant is successful.

Successful grant applicants then work with the Department to create three-year performance agreements that establish measurable goals for the three key elements of ELT: academic performance, enrichment and professional development (a fourth goal, school culture, is optional). Currently, the academic goals are automatically set at a cumulative Progress and Performance Index (PPI) of 75 for all students as well as all subpopulations of students tracked by the Department. Cumulative PPI measures a group's progress on MCAS as well as a statistical equivalent on PARCC,¹⁰ toward meeting its proficiency goals and, when data is available, it represents a trend over four years. A cumulative PPI of 75 or more indicates that the group being measured is on track to meet its proficiency goals. The performance agreement is also informed by ELT Expectations for Implementation – eight standards developed by the Department for use and support of additional time for all key stakeholders (See Appendix A). Each school's performance agreement serves multiple purposes over the three-year term of the agreement: articulating priorities to all stakeholders, allowing schools and districts to self-monitor progress, and providing a standard for holding the school accountable for its performance over time and for decisions to continue funding.

Annually, each district that has received funding in the prior year must submit a noncompetitive reapplication in order to be eligible for the next year's grant funding, subject to legislative appropriation. The reapplication, while less strenuous than the original competitive grant application, requires the district to submit a proposed budget for each of its MA ELT schools, as well as self-evaluation of performance across program objectives for the preceding school year and identification of key targets for improvement for the coming school year. Over time, the Department's support and accountability tools and practices have been refined to promote continuous reflection and improvement, rather than concentrating effort mainly at times of high-stakes decisions.

⁸ In 2015, the Department refined its measure of an "additional 300 hours on a mandatory basis for all children," as required by the budgetary language. The total annual hours for elementary and secondary schools represent adding 300 hours to the regulatory learning time requirements of 900 and 990 hours annually, respectively, plus time for transitions, recess and other nonacademic uses of time. Because districts have calendars with varying annual hours before adding 300 hours (e.g., in school year 2014-2015, elementary schools receiving a MA ELT grant provided a range of hours from a low of 1356 to a high of 1476 annually), adopting this definition levels the playing field so that the minimum number of hours provided is uniform across the state. Applicants for the grant are nevertheless required to add at least 180 hours (approximately an hour per day) to their existing schedules (or more in order to meet the number 1365/1425 minimums, if necessary) to allow substantial school-day redesign to conform with the learning goals and opportunities of the grant.

⁹ Districts, rather than schools, apply for and are awarded ELT grant funding, although funding decisions are made on a school-by-school basis.

¹⁰ Dropout and graduation rates are also included in cumulative PPI for high schools.

Prior to the expiration of its three-year performance agreement, each ELT school hosts the Department for a 1.5-day site visit, which is conducted pursuant to the Department’s ELT site visit protocol (which can be found at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/redesign/elt/>), also derived from the Expectations for Implementation discussed above. The Department assembles a site visit team of Department and peer reviewers who conduct focus groups of key stakeholders, classroom observations, and meetings with key school teams and committees to observe first-hand how well each school is using additional time to advance learning, culture and professional goals. The site visit culminates in initial findings provided orally on some of the ELT Expectations for Implementation, and then a written site visit report with final finding and ratings for all Expectations supported by evidence gathered in conjunction with the visit. The Department also schedules shorter, less formal check-in visits at its discretion in between full visits, especially for newly implementing schools and schools that are struggling with progress toward their performance goals.

Table 2. Allocation of MA ELT Grant Funds, FY16

District	School	Grades	School Type	FY16 Projected Enrollment (Based on 10/15 SIMS data)	Total Grant Funding by School	Total Grant Funding by District
Boston	Boston Arts Academy	9 to 12	High	432	\$ 535,539	\$ 1,873,722
	Clarence R. Edwards Middle School	6 to 8	Middle	418	\$ 518,183	
	Young Achievers Science and Math Pilot K-8	PK-8	PK-8	502	\$ 401,600	
	Paul A. Dever Elementary School	PK-5	PK-5	523	\$ 418,400	
Brockton	Huntington School	K-5	Elementary	488	\$ 604,960	\$ 604,960
Cambridge	Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. School	PK-5	Elementary	267	\$ 330,993	\$ 658,266
	Fletcher Maynard Academy	PK-5	Elementary	264	\$ 327,274	
Fall River	Matthew J. Kuss Middle School	6 to 8	Middle	746	\$ 924,796	\$ 2,721,082
	Frank M. Silvia Elementary School (North End)	K-5	Elementary	798	\$ 989,259	
	Carlton M. Vivieros Elementary School	K-5	Elementary	651	\$ 807,027	
Fitchburg	Longsjo Middle School	5 to 8	Middle	468	\$ 580,167	\$ 580,167
Greenfield	Greenfield Middle School	4 to 7	Middle	496	\$ 614,878	\$ 870,250
	The Newton School	K-3	Elementary	206	\$ 255,373	
Lawrence	Guilmette Middle School	5 to 8	Middle	512	\$ 409,600	\$ 409,600
Malden	Ferryway School	K-8	K-8	903	\$ 1,119,424	\$ 2,483,064
	Salemwood School	K-8	K-8	1100	\$ 1,363,640	
Revere	Garfield Middle School	6 to 8	Middle	511	\$ 633,473	\$ 2,184,303
	Staff Sargent James J. Hill Elementary School	K-5	Elementary	561	\$ 695,456	
	A.C. Whelan Elementary School	K-5	Elementary	690	\$ 855,374	
Salem	Francis X. Collins Middle School	6 to 8	Middle	594	\$ 475,200	\$ 475,200
Worcester	City View Discovery	K-6	Elementary	526	\$ 652,068	\$ 1,219,838
	Jacob Hiatt Magnet School	K-6	Elementary	458	\$ 567,770	
				12114	\$ 14,080,453	\$ 14,080,453

Note: Schools appearing in red received \$800 per pupil, the others received approximately \$1,240 per pupil in FY16 (\$1,300 in prior years).

Source: MA ELT grant records.


Provided schools are making expected interim progress, funding decisions are generally reviewed on a three-year rotation, and renewals are based principally on academic achievement, performance agreement success, and site visits. Historically, most schools have been eligible for

renewed funding. If the Commissioner determines that continued funding is not warranted, the defunded school has traditionally continued ELT funding through the school year in which the decision is made, in order to allow orderly transition to an alternative schedule or source of funding.

Costs and Expenses Funded by the MA ELT Grant

As in past years, on average the largest category of grant expense for ELT schools is instructional staff salaries. For FY14, for those schools receiving approximately \$1,300 per pupil, the average for this category was 71%, whereas the FY15-FY16¹¹ average rose to 74.4% (Table 3). The increased percentage may be attributable in part to the fact that the per-pupil amount of the grant was reduced by \$60 this year, in addition to the likelihood that salary expense has increased in general. In the next highest category of grant expense for FY15 and FY16, on average, was support staff salary at 9.7%, followed by administrators (6.6%), contractual services (4.1%), supplies (2.8%) and fringe benefits (1.2%). The remaining categories, travel, indirect costs, equipment and other were negligible (<1.0%). While use of averages here masks some of the variation between schools, between districts, and even between years for the same school, it does allow a sense of trends in fund use.

Table 3. Average Grant Allocation by Category for \$1,300 Per-Pupil Schools: FY15 & FY16 Combined.



Source: MA ELT grant records.

¹¹ As stated above, the cost and expenditures for ELT are taken from budgets prepared by districts for each school prior to the school year, as part of the district's reapplication. Because amendments, although allowed, are sufficiently rare and generally in such small amounts, we have presented only the expenditures originally budgeted, except in one instance where amendments were substantial.

Last year's legislative report included expansive discussion on the variation in and most sustainable models for teacher compensation as well suggestions for improving ELT funding to support more sustainable arrangements. Generally, staff salaries at ELT schools increase steadily over time absent staff turnover (senior teachers being replaced by more junior teachers) or a reduction in teacher time. One of the phenomena that we reported based on stakeholder focus groups was the budgetary pressure felt by more senior ELT districts due to years of rising salaries but a static or declining grant. These districts also generally report a lack of success in renegotiation of contractual compensation for ELT teachers, for example to institute a stipend rather than percentage of salary for ELT teachers. In response to a relatively slight cut in the per-pupil grant allocation for students from \$1,300 to \$1,240 for FY16, one of these senior districts was forced to reduce the amount of time for ELT teachers by approximately 45 hours annually, rather than reduce the relatively small percentage of funds used for other aspects of the expanded school day. Some of the possibilities offered in last year's report for sustainably financing adult time for ELT schools:


- Differentiating compensation for active teaching time versus time for teachers (collaboration, professional development, planning), the latter being a fixed amount, such as a stipend.
- To establish predictability and greater sustainability, creating incentives for teacher stipends for additional time rather than percentage of salary.
- For new ELT schools, limiting the percentage of the grant that can be use for direct instruction to encourage early local investment in ELT.
- Including budgetary information and goals as part of the planning process for ELT school redesign, along with programmatic objectives.

As stated above, two years ago the Department's MA ELT grant competition prioritized schools applying for \$800 per pupil or less. As a result, four schools receive this lesser per-pupil allocation and are in the second year of implementation of their expanded days and years. Three of the four have alternative compensation models (and the fourth has hiring autonomy granted by the district), which provide examples of some of the above suggestions.

Expenditures and Compensation Models for \$800 Per-Pupil Schools

Schools receiving \$800 per pupil (since FY15) are separately analyzed, not only because three of the four schools have models that reduce their staff cost for expanded time, but also to determine how their expenditures/priorities differ when grant amounts are smaller. Notably, Table 4 below shows a much smaller share of ELT funds allocated to instructional staff (36.6% versus 74.4%) and a much larger share of funds allocated to contractual services (39.8% versus 4.1%) than at \$1,300 per-pupil schools. In real dollars, on average approximately \$290 per pupil is spent on instructional staff and \$318 per pupil on contractual services at \$800 per-pupil schools, whereas \$923 per pupil is spent on instructional staff and \$51 per pupil on contractual services at \$1300 per-pupil schools.

Table 4. MA ELT Grant Allocation: \$1300 Per-Pupil Schools vs. \$800 Per-Pupil Schools



Source: MA ELT grant records.

School Compensation Models: \$800 Per-Pupil Schools

Level 5 School: Because the Paul A. Dever Elementary School in Boston was designated a Level 5 school (chronically underperforming), the Commissioner appointed a receiver (Blueprint School Network) and adopted a turnaround plan that now includes each teacher working up to 45 hours per week and up to 210 days per year as part of their regular schedule, for which they are paid in accordance to a career ladder system that assured no teacher continuing to teach at Dever would receive less than his or her salary in the prior year.¹² The powers granted by law to receivers for Level 5 schools have allowed Dever to expand teacher schedules and the system of compensation outside of the collective bargaining agreement that normally controls.

Boston Pilot School: Young Achievers Science and Math Pilot School, also in Boston, has a work election agreement with its teachers pursuant to special pilot school provisions in the collective bargaining agreement for Boston. Pilot schools are granted autonomies over budget, hiring/staffing, curriculum and governance and calendar and scheduling. Teachers are expected to work 8-hour days on average. Due to the school’s pilot status, teachers at Young Achievers work an additional 95 hours per year without additional compensation and participate voluntarily in professional development opportunities that are compensated through a modest stipend.¹³ Teachers are paid a flat contractual hourly rate for time over and above the aforementioned 95 additional hours.¹⁴

Level 5 District: Guilmette Middle School is part of the Lawrence Public School District, which was placed in receivership in 2012. As with the Dever Elementary School, discussed above, the Commissioner appointed a receiver for the district, Jeff Riley, who has statutory authority to make changes to district systems in order to affect rapid turnaround, including

¹² Citation to Dever Turnaround plan, DESE website.


¹³ Citation to Young Achiever’s 2015-2016 Work Election Agreement.

¹⁴ Boston Arts Academy (BAA) in Boston, which is a \$1300 per-pupil school is also a pilot school.

school schedules and professional compensation. The receiver introduced a career ladder system that replaced the more traditional step-and-lane salary table for Lawrence teachers. As part of the new system, teachers are expected to work 1250 hours per year (approximately 7-hour school days). In addition, Guilmette teachers receive a stipend of \$2,500 per year for an additional 250 hours needed for ELT, the least expensive compensation system for additional teacher time among all ELT schools.¹⁵ Notably, the compensation model was ratified by the teachers' union as part of the most recent collective bargaining agreement.

Standard District School. The fourth of the \$800 per-pupil schools, Collins Middle School in Salem, follows a more traditional school model. Its teachers are compensated 8% of their salary for an additional 185 hours worked over the year, which can be pro-rated up or down with the hours worked. Notably, Collins has consistently used the largest percentage of its grant allocation for instructional expenses (57% in FY15 and 68% in FY16) of any of the \$800 per-pupil schools. This year the district has indicated that Collins has been provided autonomy over restructuring positions and hiring.

Table 5. Percentage of Grant Allocated to Instructional Expenses Early in Implementation and for FY16: By School and Cohort



Note: The fiscal year following the name of each school along the x-axis indicates year of earlier instructional expense (blue column). The schools are also grouped by cohort, indicating the first year of implementation of ELT.

Source: MA ELT grant records.

¹⁵ In last year's ELT report to the Legislature, the Department reported that in FY14 teacher compensation for additional time ranged from a high of \$15,768 per year to a low of \$7,442 for a teacher with 5 years of creditable experience and a Master's degree (Sustainability Report, p.12).

Table 5 shows both the relatively small amounts paid for instructional expense by the nontraditional \$800 per-pupil school models described above, as well as the fact that instructional expense tends to increase as a percentage of grant-funded expense over time for each school, assumedly as compensation rises as teachers advance on traditional salary tables.

Contractual Services

Table 5 shows that the \$800 per-pupil schools, which have on average more sustainable teacher compensation arrangements for ELT hours, spend the largest share of their grant funds for contractual services (almost 40%). A review of these expenditures shows varied use: enrichment provided by community-based partners, professional development in core subjects and project-based learning, social-emotional support for students, family engagement activities, professional coaching, and consulting for data analysis and culture-building. While \$1,300 per-pupil schools use an average of 75% of their grant allocation for instructional expense also cite many of these activities in their ELT plans, with only 4% of their grant allocation available for contractual services, these opportunities are likely more limited, unless funded through another source.

Conclusion

While the theoretical response to the above data may be to reduce the grant to \$800 per pupil, there is no indication reduction of the grant amount will cause districts to change compensation arrangements voluntarily. Of the three school models described above, two arose involuntarily, through the state accountability system, and one voluntarily in the case of the pilot school, although well before it applied for an ELT grant. Reducing the grant amount would more likely limit the pool of schools that apply for the grant to those that already have a more affordable compensation scheme for expanding time.

As we strive as a state and a nation to close the equity gaps for economically and educationally disadvantaged children, ELT is a proven mitigator. Well designed use of additional time provides both abundant and varied learning opportunities for all students and the bandwidth for teachers to build thriving professional culture and pedagogical expertise. While success, as always, lies with the conviction of district and school leadership and the unflagging commitment of the entire instructional staff, more time provides the platform for each student to meet and exceed high expectations for academic and personal success. This school year 12,000 students will have these opportunities through the MA ELT grant.

Appendix A

Expanded Learning Time Expectations for Implementation

I. ELT Design is Driven by Focused School-wide Priorities

The school's ELT design (schedule, staff, instructional approaches, assessment systems, budget) is driven by no more than three school-wide priorities, including one school-wide instructional focus. These priorities drive instructional improvement and the use of time. Progress is monitored and evaluated by both the school and district using clear, measurable goals.

II. Data is Used to Drive Continuous Improvement and Strengthen Instruction

The design and implementation of ELT is based on a data-driven assessment of student needs to establish focused school-wide priorities. The school provides the time, structure and training for all staff to participate in frequent data cycles throughout the year.

III. Additional Time for Academics is Used for Core Instruction and Differentiated Support

The school allocates additional time to rigorous core instruction in ways that reflect student needs and are aligned to the current MA Curriculum Frameworks. The school also ensures that all student schedules include academic interventions or acceleration, based on student need.

IV. Additional Time for Enrichment Is Used to Deepen Student Engagement in Learning

The school uses additional time to provide enrichment opportunities for all students which are aligned to the current MA Curriculum Frameworks and support school-wide priorities. Courses are based on student interests and choice, with opportunities for mastery.

V. Additional Time for Teacher Collaboration is Used to Strengthen Instruction and Improve Achievement

The school uses additional time to build professional learning and collaboration focused on strengthening data-informed instruction, aligned with the current MA Curriculum Frameworks and school-wide priorities.

VI. Additional Time is Used to Enhance School Culture

The school leverages time to build a culture of high academic and behavioral expectations for all students, and a culture of professionalism for all adults.

VII. School Leadership is Focused and Collaborative

The principal and Instructional Leadership team are fully committed to using additional time to accelerate student achievement and eliminate opportunity gaps. They engage all stakeholders in the process of ELT design and implementation in support of school-wide priorities.

VIII. District Leadership Supports ELT

The district actively supports all ELT schools in meeting the ELT Expectations for Implementation. It provides leadership, oversight, supervision, strategic planning and creative problem solving to ensure schools can meet rigorous achievement goals and sustain ELT