



Massachusetts Department of
**ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY
EDUCATION**

**Report to the Legislature: *Intervention and Targeted
Assistance Efforts***

Line Item 7061-9408
April 2009

**Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary
Education**

75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148
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

Ms. Maura Banta, Chair, Melrose
Ms. Harneen Chernow, Jamaica Plain
Mr. Gerald Chertavian, Cambridge
Mr. Andrew "AJ" Fajnzylber, Chair, Student Advisory Council, Brookline
Dr. Thomas E. Fortmann, Lexington
Ms. Beverly Holmes, Springfield
Dr. Jeff Howard, Reading
Ms. Ruth Kaplan, Brookline
Dr. Dana Mohler-Faria, Bridgewater
Mr. Paul Reville, Secretary of Education, Worcester
Dr. Sandra L. Stotsky, Brookline
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 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 781-338-6105.

© 2009 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





Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.
Commissioner

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

75 Pleasant Street, Malden, Massachusetts 02148-4906

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

April 2009

Dear Members of the General Court:

I am pleased to submit this *Report to the Legislature: Intervention and Targeted Assistance Efforts* pursuant to Chapter 182 of the Acts of 2008, line item 7061-9408:

“For targeted intervention to schools and districts at risk of or determined to be underperforming under sections 1J and 1K of chapter 69 of the General Laws, schools and districts which have been placed in the accountability status of identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring pursuant to departmental regulations, or which have been designated Commonwealth Priority Schools or Commonwealth Pilot Schools pursuant to said regulations;... provided further, that the department shall issue a report, no later than February 2, 2009 and annually thereafter describing and analyzing all intervention and targeted assistance efforts funded by this item;....”

The Department’s Accountability and Targeted Assistance Center maintains and manages the state’s School and District Accountability System. MCAS results are used to identify public schools and districts that are likely to require state intervention in order to ensure improvements in student performance, and to identify schools with exemplary performance and improvement. Schools and districts that fail to meet state performance and improvement standards for four or more consecutive years are identified as Commonwealth Priority Schools and are provided with targeted assistance to support district-led improvement efforts. State intervention in underperforming schools and districts is a multi-step process described in the report.

Schools showing significant improvement in Mathematics and English Language Arts are eligible for designation as Commonwealth Compass Schools. Since the program began in 2001, 95 schools have been designated as *Commonwealth Compass Schools*. They include elementary, middle, vocational, and comprehensive high schools across the state.

On an annual basis, the Department issues Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for public schools and school districts. The performance and improvement data for each school and district, together with data on MCAS participation, student attendance, and graduation rates is compiled and analyzed to determine, for each school

and district, whether students in the aggregate and student subgroups within the school have made adequate progress toward the achievement of state performance targets in English language arts and mathematics. AYP determinations are used to assign each school an “accountability status”. The category to which a school is assigned is based on its AYP determinations over multiple years and determines the course of action a school, district and/or state is expected to take to improve student performance. Accountability status categories include *Identified for Improvement*, *Corrective Action* and *Restructuring*. Schools that make AYP in a subject for all student groups for two or more consecutive years are assigned to the *No Status* category. A district or school may be placed in an accountability status on the basis of the performance and improvement profile of students in the aggregate or of one or more student subgroups over two or more years in English language arts and/or mathematics.

In 2008, 1,755 schools received AYP determinations. Of the 1,755 schools receiving determinations, 840 schools (48%) were identified for *improvement, corrective action or restructuring*. The remaining had *no status*.

In the fall of 2008, 387 districts received AYP determinations. Of the districts receiving determinations, 89 were *identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring*.

When a school is identified as a Commonwealth Priority School, the Department offers targeted assistance that is focused at the district level. Because the Department cannot realistically expect to grow agency capacity to intervene on a school-by-school basis, this represents a deliberate effort to build the district’s capacity to effectively support its low performing schools. The Department engages with district and school leaders to support development of their district plans for school intervention. The Department also provides planning support in collaboration with highly qualified consultants in several districts where there is not enough in-house capacity to provide necessary services.

When a school fails to demonstrate significant improvement in student performance within two years of acceptance of a remedial plan by the Board, the Board may declare the school to be *chronically underperforming*. To date, three schools have been identified as chronically underperforming. In each school, significant improvements are evidenced in the 2007 MCAS results, expectations of student learning have risen, teachers are focused on strategies to improve their practice, and school-community engagement has become a priority.

During the 2007-08 school year, the Department provided implementation grants to four Commonwealth Pilot schools to support the newly formed governance boards’ efforts and to potential Commonwealth Pilot Schools for planning and pre-implementation activities related to redesigned governance structures. Currently, five schools are participating in the Commonwealth Pilot School initiative. An external evaluation of the Commonwealth Pilot School initiative continues to be conducted by the Donahue Institute at UMASS Amherst.

To date, five Massachusetts districts have been declared by the Board to be underperforming: Holyoke, Winchendon, Southbridge, Gill-Montague and Randolph. In April 2008, the Board officially removed Winchendon from underperforming status.

During FY09 the Department has focused its targeted assistance efforts on building the capacities of the 10 Commissioner's Districts and the five Underperforming Districts in order that they may more effectively support their schools, particularly those designated in the fall of 2007 as Commonwealth Priority Schools (114 schools in total).

Current funding levels have enabled us to partially address these top priorities. No school-level targeted assistance has been available for the 89 other schools currently in corrective action that are not as yet formally designated as Commonwealth Priority Schools.

In FY09 the legislature enacted Chapter 311 of the Acts of 2008 (<http://www.mass.gov/legis/laws/seslaw08/sl080311.htm>) which changed the statute on school and district accountability and assistance. That new legislation dissolved the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability and the Education Management Audit Council and shifted the responsibility for review of district performance to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. It further directed the Department to create separate offices of accountability and assistance based on a deliberate clarification of roles and expectations and mandated the appointment of a senior level administrator to oversee both areas. The legislation set out clear expectations for the Department to conduct no fewer than 15 district reviews in the 2008-2009 school year as Department leaders worked to revise and clarify school and district accountability and assistance structures. Included in Attachment E of the Appendix is Accountability and Targeted Assistance Highlights Progress to Date on system redesign, internal capacity building, district reviews, regional system of support, and charter school reviews which was presented to the Advisory Council on Accountability and Assistance on April 8, 2009.

The Board's FY10 budget request of \$9.6 million would allow the Department to address more intensively the needs of the Commonwealth Priority Schools and highest priority school districts, and would also allow us to begin to develop capacity in the smaller urban districts by establishing regional school improvement assistance centers.

If you would like to discuss this report in greater detail or have questions, please feel free to contact me or Deputy Commissioner Karla Brooks-Baehr 781-338-3101 or Associate Commissioner Lynda Foisy at 781-338-3525.

Sincerely,

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

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Overview	2
I. State System for Identification of Underperforming Schools and Districts	3
Identifying Accountability Status under NCLB	
Process Changes for Identifying Underperforming Schools	
II. Targeted Assistance and Intervention in Commonwealth Priority Schools	5
Diagnostic Fact Finding Review	
District Planning for School Intervention	
Implementation Guidance and Support	
Leadership Development Training and Support	
Follow-up Panel Reviews	
III. Chronically Underperforming Schools	10
Commonwealth Pilot Schools	
IV. Intervention in Underperforming Districts	15
V. Identification and Recognition of Schools Showing Significant Improvement	19
VI. FY09 Intervention and Targeted Assistance Account Budget and FY10 Budget Recommendations	20
VII. Appendix I	21
<i>Attachment A: 2007 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Data – Massachusetts School and District Accountability Status</i>	
<i>Attachment B: Sample Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) District Report for Chelsea and Sample Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) School Report for Clark Avenue School in Chelsea</i>	
<i>Attachment C: Regulations on Underperforming Schools and School Districts</i>	
<i>Attachment D: FY 09 School and District Intervention and Targeted Assistance Account Spending by Initiative</i>	
<i>Attachment E: Accountability and Targeted Assistance Highlights of Progress to Date</i>	
VIII. Appendix II Chapter 182 of the Acts of 2008, line item 7061-9804	49

Introduction

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education respectfully submits this Report to the Legislature on: Intervention and Targeted Assistance Efforts pursuant to Chapter 182 of the Acts of 2008, line item 7061-9408:

“For targeted intervention to schools and districts at risk of or determined to be underperforming under sections 1J and 1K of chapter 69 of the General Laws, schools and districts which have been placed in the accountability status of *identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring* pursuant to departmental regulations, or which have been designated Commonwealth Priority Schools or Commonwealth Pilot Schools pursuant to said regulations; provided, that no money shall be expended in any school or district that fails to file a comprehensive district plan pursuant to the provisions of section 1I of said chapter 69 of the General Laws; provided further, that the department shall issue a report, no later than February 2, 2009 and annually thereafter describing and analyzing all intervention and targeted assistance efforts funded by this item; provided further, that such report shall include but not be limited to: the number of school and school districts eligible to receive such assistance, the number of students attending school in said districts, the nature and type of intervention activities funded through this item, by school and school district, the number of teachers in professional development funded in part through this item, the number of districts with curricula or professional development systems aligned with the Massachusetts curriculum frameworks, and the number that are undertaking that effort with grants funded by this item, the number of outside vendors with whom the department has contracted to provide intervention and turnaround services, the amount each vendor has received, and the results obtained in each instance, the number of students who have passed the MCAS assessment and obtained a competency determination through these programs, before, and during the period of intervention and turnaround, and any other data relative to the successes achieved or challenges faced by the effort to turn around schools, along with any legislative or budgetary recommendations for improving the initiative and increasing the success of all intervention efforts; provided further, that said report shall include an analysis of the number of districts with curriculum plans not aligned to the Massachusetts curriculum frameworks, along with any legislative and regulatory recommendations to address the issue; provided further, that said report shall indicate the number of schools which have accepted the Commonwealth pilot school model, the reforms which they have undertaken, and the number which have expressed interest in the pilot school option; provided further, that said report shall be provided to the secretary of administration and finance, the senate president, the speaker of the house, the chairs of the house and senate ways and means committees and the house and senate chairs of the joint committee on education;”

Overview

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's Accountability and Targeted Assistance (ATA) Center maintains and manages the state's School and District Accountability System. Results from the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) are used to identify public schools and districts that are likely to require state intervention in order to ensure improvements in student performance, and to identify schools with exemplary performance and improvement. Schools and districts that fail to meet state performance and improvement standards for four or more consecutive years are identified as Commonwealth Priority Schools and are provided with targeted assistance to support district-led improvement efforts. State intervention in underperforming schools and districts is a multi-step process described in the report below. Those schools showing significant improvement in their students' performance in Mathematics and English Language Arts are eligible for designation as Commonwealth Compass Schools.

Since the inception of the Education Reform Act 15 years ago, ATA's work with low performing schools and districts has informed our thinking about the time, support and effort it takes on the part of a school, a district and the state agency to make progress. We have begun to reexamine our state policies, practices and procedures to understand how our actions are supporting improvement and/or whether state systems are impeding those efforts. Our work is evolving based on a more collaborative approach; our interest is in taking the state system of accountability and targeted assistance to a new level of coherence and transparency in order to meet the goal of all students in all schools reaching proficiency and beyond.

I. State System for Identification of Underperforming Schools and Districts

Identifying Accountability Status under NCLB

On an annual basis, the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (the Department) issues Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for MA public schools and school districts. The performance and improvement data for each school and district, together with data on MCAS participation, student attendance, and graduation rates is compiled and analyzed to determine, for each school and district, whether students in the aggregate and student subgroups within the school have made adequate progress toward the achievement of state performance targets in English language arts and mathematics. AYP determinations are used to assign each school an “accountability status”. The category to which a school is assigned is based on its AYP determinations over multiple years and determines the course of action a school, district and/or state is expected to take to improve student performance. Accountability status categories include *Identified for Improvement*, *Corrective Action* and *Restructuring*. Schools that make AYP in a subject for all student groups for two or more consecutive years are assigned to the *No Status* category. A district or school may be placed in an accountability status on the basis of the performance and improvement profile of students in the aggregate or of one or more student subgroups over two or more years in English language arts and/or mathematics.

In 2008, 1,755 schools received AYP determinations. Of the 1,755 schools receiving determinations, 840 schools (48%) were identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring, as indicated in the table below.

SCHOOLS	Identified for Improvement	Corrective Action	Restructuring	Total
Aggregate	178	55	124	357
Subgroups	233	95	155	483
Total	411	150	279	840

Source: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/ayp/2008/>

Additional detailed information is available in [Attachment A](#).

In the fall of 2008, 387 districts received AYP determinations. Of these districts, 145 operate a single school only. Of the districts receiving determinations, 89 were *identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring*, as indicated in the table below. For districts operating multiple schools, Massachusetts issues separate district-level adequate yearly progress (AYP) determinations at the elementary, middle, and high school grade spans. Under this approach, districts are only identified for improvement when they fail to make AYP in the same subject area in all grade spans. Districts that operate only one school receive AYP determinations based on the results of all tested grades served by the school. Only districts comprising a single school may be labeled for *Restructuring*

DISTRICTS	Identified for Improvement	Corrective Action	Restructuring*
Aggregate	7	9	3
Subgroups	29	37	4

Source: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/ayp/2008/>

Sample district and school AYP reports are found in Attachment B.

Lists of schools identified for improvement, corrective action and restructuring for 2008 can be found at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/ayp/2008/>

In February 2008, the Department issued letters of notification formally designating the 53 new (not previously designated) Commonwealth Priority Schools in nine of the Commonwealth's urban districts (Boston, Brockton, Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lowell, New Bedford, Springfield and Worcester) known as the "Commissioner's Districts". This launched a four-month process of preparation, review and approval of district plans for improving student performance in these schools.

II. Targeted Assistance and Intervention in Commonwealth Priority Schools

When a school is identified as a Commonwealth Priority School, the Department offers targeted assistance that is focused at the district level. Because the Department cannot realistically expect to grow agency capacity to intervene on a school-by-school basis, this represents a deliberate effort to build the district's capacity to effectively support its low performing schools. Assistance to districts includes:

- district planning for school intervention, providing guidance and support for the development of a plan to identify and address key improvement initiatives at the district and school levels;
- consultation and review of the district's plan for school intervention by a State Review Panel comprised of experienced educators who offer feedback and clarification on the district's plan and make recommendations to the Commissioner and Board of Elementary and Secondary Education regarding the plan's viability;
- implementation guidance and support, including strategies and tools that measure the effectiveness of the planned improvement initiatives based on results, and
- development of a customized Memorandum of Understanding between the district and the state that provides financial support for the improvement initiatives set out in the district's plan.

District Planning for School Intervention

Throughout 2007-2008, Department staff continued to engage with district and school leaders to support development of their district plans for school intervention. The Department also provided planning support in collaboration with highly qualified consultants in several districts where we did not have enough in-house capacity to provide necessary services.

In 2008, Department staff collaborated with district and school leaders in the development of a suite of tools designed to support the gathering and analysis of school level information. These tools, which are used by district and school leaders, provide both factual and perceptual information that informs local decision-making regarding improvement strategies. The tools include teacher and administrator surveys and report templates designed to align with the 10 essential conditions for school improvement, which are set out in the new regulations and highlight a school's current state in relation to those conditions. Together, the tools provide district leaders with school-based data and suggest areas for focused improvement that guide development of the district plan for school intervention.

Once completed, the *District Plan for School Intervention* is reviewed by a State Review Panel. The new regulations call for the commissioner to appoint, and the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education to approve, individuals with educational expertise and experience who will interact with district and school leaders in the review of these plans. This interaction affords local leaders the opportunity to discuss their analysis of

issues and challenges at the school, propose the improvement strategies they have selected and engage in a discussion with experienced educational experts to “test” their decisions.

Districts with newly identified Commonwealth Priority Schools receive grant awards to support implementation of school improvement initiatives. These grants are funded by a combination of federal and state funds. Funds may be used for salaries, stipends, contracts, consultants, materials and travel for training to support planning and professional development identified in the school improvement plans. Funds granted for use in the 2007-2008 school year are being used to pay teacher stipends to work after school on development of improvement plans, including data analysis and action planning. Additionally, funding is provided to pay substitutes so that teacher teams convene regularly to examine cumulative evidence of plan implementation and review benchmark data including assessment results. Stipends are paid to teachers participating in professional development to interpret formative assessment results and to learn how to use these results to differentiate instruction for students in their classrooms. In 2007, funds were also dedicated to provide a differential pay incentive for two principals serving at “chronically underperforming” schools.

In the spring of 2008, nine districts developed District Plans for School Intervention using a Department developed framework. The nine districts, Boston, Brockton, Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lowell, New Bedford, Springfield and Worcester, had over 80% of the new Commonwealth Priority Schools identified in the fall of 2007 in their districts. The plans documented each district’s analysis of the needs of its Commonwealth Priority Schools and identified the priority actions it would take as a district to address the schools’ major programmatic and systemic barriers to improved student performance. Each district presented its plan to an independent review panel composed of highly experienced educational leaders in the state. The review panels made recommendations to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education concerning each district’s plan in May 2008, and they all received approval in June 2008.

Implementation Guidance and Support

Once a district’s plan for improving student performance in a Commonwealth Priority School has been accepted by the Board of Education, the school has two years to implement the plan to improve student performance. The Department enters into a Memorandum of Agreement with each of the nine districts, and through a collaborative process with district leaders, jointly identifies priority needs and focuses resources on supporting district capacity to meet them. A combination of federal and state resources is identified to help support the priority initiatives.

During that time, Department staff and consultants are assigned to provide oversight and support, making periodic visits to the district to meet with leaders and staff and observe planned initiatives underway in the district’s Commonwealth Priority Schools. Department staff providing support included experts in intervention, leadership, reading, mathematics, science, and English language learners, depending on district needs. The assistance from Department staff includes:

- Providing guidance, training, and specific data collection tools focused on instructional leadership, curriculum, instruction and teaching practices, teacher collaboration, and staffing;
- Convening and modeling structured collaborative site visits with school and district leaders to collect data on the progress and impact of improvement initiatives; and
- Conducting data driven problem solving sessions with school and district leaders to identify resources and strategies to address areas of concern.

Follow-up support and assistance activities take place throughout the 24-month period after a district's plan for school intervention is approved by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education. In 2008, implementation guidance and support was provided in 9 of the state's largest, highest poverty districts with a focus on 53 Commonwealth Priority Schools. These schools received \$10,000 in school improvement funding from state resources.

Leadership Development Training and Support

In 2005, in collaboration with the Urban Superintendents Network (USN), the Department launched a partnership with the National Institute for School Leadership (NISL), a subsidiary of the National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE) to provide high quality training and support for selected Massachusetts principals in the research-based components of effective instructional leadership for improving student achievement. This effort began with the participation of two specific cohorts of educators: the first was a group of 55 state-selected principals, superintendents and consultants working in urban districts, and the second was the entire instructional team from Holyoke Public Schools. These groups completed the 18-month training program and members of the first cohort have been certified as Massachusetts NISL trainers.

To date, the initiative has been engaged in 42 school districts, training almost 1,000 school and district leaders who are charged with educating some 270,755 students throughout the Commonwealth. In 2008, when the first cohort of educators completed their executive leadership training, the Department commissioned an external evaluation designed to determine the impact of the training on participants and students. Documentation was collected through various methods, including direct observation of the training across cohorts, interviews with NISL participant and the teachers in their schools, an online survey, and school visits. The evaluation process by The Meristem Group included:

- Documenting the content, nature, and variability of NISL training sessions across different units and different cohorts;
- Identifying unique training practices, strategies, or tools created or adapted by local NISL training teams;
- Identifying successful training practices, strategies, or tools and descriptions of the conditions under which they have been successful;
- Documenting the implementation of NISL concepts and tools by participating administrators in their schools and their districts, and the interaction between NISL principles and other school change initiatives;

- Documenting practices used by district administrators to support and facilitate implementation of NISL concepts and tools by participating administrators in their schools;
- Identifying district supporting practices that have been successful, and defining the conditions under which these practices have been successful; and
- Assessing the impact of NISL training on (1) knowledge and behavior of participating administrators, (2) school culture and teaching practices, and (3) student academic performance and school engagement.

The examination of the impact of NISL instructional leadership on its participants' practice is provided in the Executive Summary of the final report, available at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/reports/legislative.html>. Positive impact was evidenced in an increase in the amount of time leaders report spending visiting classrooms to observe instruction, and in the development of leaders' actions as instructional leaders. Participants identified three key areas of the training where their practice was changing based on the training: leadership team development, evaluating the effectiveness of instructional practice, and using student data to improve instruction. A majority of leaders (84%) indicated improvement on their school leadership team, and 78% reported that they regularly shared information gained from NISL training with their staff. Participants, who were more active in implementing NISL principles of instructional leadership in their schools, during the training period, reported a greater positive impact on the operation and culture of their school.

It has been difficult to determine the impact of the NISL leadership training on changes in instructional practice resulting in increased student achievement on state standardized test (MCAS) and districts' standardized assessment instruments. Further collection of student data is required and will be a part of our ongoing evaluation of this initiative. In future examinations, student data will be analyzed based on NISL training cohort, attendance of participants, student subgroups, and qualitative assessment of participant efforts to implement NISL in the school.

More information about the National Institute for School Leadership training units and curriculum is available at <http://www.ncee.org/nisl/index.jsp?setProtocol=true>.

Follow-up Panel Reviews

Two years after a district with a school declared to be a Commonwealth Priority School begins implementing its Board approved plan for improving student performance at the school, a follow-up panel review is conducted to assess the school's progress. After considering the follow-up panel's findings, the Department determines 1) whether the school appears to have effectively implemented plans leading to improved student performance, and 2) whether the conditions are in place to sustain improvement. The commissioner uses these reports, along with other student performance data, to determine whether the school will exit its status of *underperforming* - now designated as Commonwealth Priority Schools - or be recommended to the Board for a determination of *chronically underperforming*.

Depending on the findings in the two-year follow-up review report, a *Commonwealth Priority School* that has shown significant progress in improving student performance

may exit Commonwealth Priority School status. A school that has implemented its plan with reasonable fidelity but shown only minimal improvement may be retained in Commonwealth Priority School status to ensure continued state oversight and support. A school that has been unable to successfully implement the improvement initiatives in the plan and where students did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) may be recommended to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education for a determination of *chronic underperformance*. To date, seven schools have exited underperforming status: Arlington Elementary School in Lawrence, Liberty and Washington Elementary Schools in Springfield, Roosevelt Middle School and Mt. Pleasant Elementary School in New Bedford, the Maurice Donahue Elementary School in Holyoke, the E.J. Harrington Elementary School in Lynn, and the Laurel Lake Elementary School in Fall River.

Reports submitted to the commissioner from each stage of the School Performance Evaluation Process, including School Panel Review Reports, Fact finding Reports, and Two-Year Follow-up Review Reports are available on the Department of Education web site by cohort year at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/review/>.

As a result of regulatory changes approved by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education in October 2006, the Department has adjusted the focus of its Follow-up Reviews, shifting from a school-by-school review of progress made over time to an assessment of the district's efforts to support and foster student improvement in its Commonwealth Priority Schools. In the current school year, nine districts will undergo reviews of their efforts to implement their district plans for school intervention.

III. Chronically Underperforming Schools

When a school fails to demonstrate significant improvement in student performance within two years of acceptance of a remedial plan by the Board, the Board may declare the school to be *chronically underperforming*. To date, three schools have been identified as chronically underperforming. In each school, significant improvements are evidenced in the 2007 MCAS results, expectations of student learning have risen, teachers are focused on strategies to improve their practice, and school-community engagement has become a priority.

The schools are listed in the table below.

School	District	Date of Determination	# of Students	# of Teachers Receiving PD	Cost
Matthew Kuss Middle School	Fall River	October 2004	530	63	\$150,000 + principal hiring bonus of \$10,300
Henry Lord Middle School	Fall River	September 2005	628	50	\$150,000 + principal hiring bonus of \$16,700
William Peck Middle School	Holyoke	October 2005	Closed in 2008	—	—

Source: Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

The Department has contracted with America's Choice to provide turn-around partner services to these three schools.

Matthew Kuss Middle School – Fall River

The Kuss Middle School was initially identified as *underperforming* in 2000 and was determined to be *chronically underperforming* by the Board in 2004. The Department recruited an experienced principal who was hired by the district and began her leadership work at the Lord Middle School in the 2005-2006 school year. At the same time, the Department initiated the services of America's Choice as the school's turnaround partner and implementation of the school reform model began.

Over the last two years, teachers and leaders in the school have focused on effective implementation of the America's Choice curriculum and the workshop model. The Kuss School has participated in the state's Expanded Learning Time initiative, increasing the school day by approximately two hours for four days every week. The leadership team at the school has paid particular attention to developing and maintaining effective communication, both within the school and in outreach to parents and community. As part of the school redesign process, the leadership team has also focused on improving

school climate and student conduct, and a plan is now in place to establish teachers as student mentors, supported by intervention strategies for individual students. In 2007, the Kuss Middle School made AYP in both ELA and mathematics for all students in the aggregate and for all subgroups, but was unable to sustain this improvement in the next year. In 2008, the Kuss Middle School did not make AYP in either ELA or mathematics for students in the aggregate and subgroups. The school is in *improvement year 1* for subgroups in ELA and is in *restructuring year 2* for students in the aggregate in mathematics. Improvement ratings indicate that the school has declined in ELA and improved in mathematics but did not meet its target. Performance ratings place the school in the *moderate* range in ELA and in the *very low* range in mathematics. School faculty and leaders are struggling with meeting the learning challenges of students with disabilities; in 2008, they are focusing on review and analysis of their inclusion program. The school has also been affected by major fiscal issues in the district that have impacted retention of faculty because of reductions and shifting staffing patterns.

Henry Lord Middle School – Fall River

The Henry Lord Middle School was identified as *underperforming* in 2002 and determined to be *chronically underperforming* by the Board in 2005. The district placed an interim principal in the school for the 2005-06 school year. The Department recruited an experienced principal who was hired by the district and began her leadership work at the Lord Middle School in the 2006-07 school year. At the same time, the Department initiated the services of America's Choice as the school's turnaround partner and implementation of the school reform model began.

Over the last year, under the new principal's leadership the Lord Middle School has undergone significant change. The establishment and training of school-based data teams has informed revision of the School Improvement Plan and implementation of the new improvement initiatives. An aggressive professional development plan has been created and training is being delivered to teachers during the school day, after school and on Saturdays. This training has been focused on changing instructional practice in literacy and mathematics, and has been grounded in the America's Choice workshop model.

In 2006-07, teachers at the Lord School participated in over 70 hours of professional development in differentiated teaching and learning, critical thinking and strategies for vocabulary development for middle grade students. Policies and procedures have been put in place to ensure efficient and orderly operation of the school. School administrators, teachers and consultants conduct "Learning Walks" on a regular basis to identify effective teaching practices and inform ongoing technical assistance. During the 2006-07 school year, teacher attendance at the Lord School rose from 91% to 94%, the highest attendance rate of any school in the district.

In preparation for the 2007-08 school year, the principal developed and submitted a customized plan to support and expand the school's improvement agenda. This plan refocuses the role of America's Choice and extends direct coaching/mentoring work with teachers to include the services of other consultants and programs.

In 2008, the Lord School made AYP in mathematics for students in the aggregate and subgroups, but did not make AYP in ELA for either group. The school remains in

restructuring status in both subjects, needing a second consecutive year of positive AYP findings in order to exit status. Improvement ratings indicate that the school is *on target* in mathematics and there is no change in ELA. Performance ratings place the school in the *moderate* range in ELA and in the *very low* range in mathematics.

Improvement in student achievement in mathematics appears to be the result of strong and focused instructional leadership, a collaborative, school-wide approach to using data to make decisions for teaching and learning, and frequent, consistent support for teachers to make improvements in their teaching practices.

In the case of Fall River, where the district faced extraordinary difficulty in attracting highly qualified, experienced principals for two *chronically underperforming* schools, the Department provided a significant financial incentive to attract, hire and retain these school leaders. An annual grant to supplement the district's negotiated salary rate for each principal was made available to support the hiring and retention of the current principals at each of the two schools.

Fall River FY09 Update

The district of Fall River has a long history of poor student achievement and insufficient progress. In the fall of 2008, the district faced a serious budget shortfall and a period of contentious relations between the superintendent, the school committee and municipal leaders which led to the superintendent's resignation. In January 2009, Mayor Robert Correia and Commissioner Chester agreed that the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education should send a review team to the district to evaluate the effectiveness of district leadership and the district's resource management capacity. The review team's final report has been completed and is available at: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/district/2009/00950000.doc>

District leaders are preparing a plan to address the areas of weakness identified in the report for the commissioner's review and approval: school committee governance; strategic implementation of improvements to teaching and learning, human resource management; and financial management. The Department will provide assistance and oversight as district leaders implement their improvement plan initiatives.

William Peck Middle School – Holyoke

The William Peck Middle School was initially identified as *underperforming* in 2002 and determined to be *chronically underperforming* by the Board in 2005. At that time, the principal retired and the district elevated an assistant principal to the leadership position in the school. The Department contracted with America's Choice as the district's turnaround partner and the implementation of the school reform model began at the Peck School.

Over the last two years, the principal, school leadership team members and teachers have been trained to analyze student performance data and student work samples against rubric criteria and benchmark papers. District-wide efforts have produced performance standards in ELA and mathematics that the school uses to guide this work. The Readers/Writers Workshop model has guided the school's focus on literacy and teachers use an extended literacy block to implement a four-part class period that includes

independent reading, read aloud/think aloud, work period (writing lessons, small group reading lessons, independent work), and a closing. Teachers are focusing on attaining consistency across all levels in the literacy instructional model. A continuing challenge for the school is the need to attract highly qualified mathematics teachers and teachers skilled in working with a wide range of beginning English Language Learners.

In 2008, the Peck School did not make AYP in mathematics or ELA for students in the aggregate and subgroups. The school remains in *restructuring* status in both subjects. Improvement ratings indicate that the school has declined in both mathematics and ELA. Performance ratings place the school in the *very low* range in ELA and in the *critically low* range in mathematics.

After the 2007-2008 school year, the Peck School was closed. Redistricting has resulted in the creation of a new K-8 school that now includes middle grade students from Peck. The new school is being developed as a full service community school, serving a neighborhood-based student population with an emphasis on serving a broad range of student and family needs.

Commonwealth Pilot Schools

2007-2008 Implementation (Year 1)

During the 2007-08 school year, the Department provided implementation grants to the four Commonwealth Pilot schools to support the newly formed governance boards' efforts and to potential Commonwealth Pilot Schools for planning and pre-implementation activities related to redesigned governance structures. Implementation support grants were awarded in FY08 to Duggan MS (Springfield), Putnam HS (Springfield), English HS (Boston), Academy MS (Fitchburg) and a planning grant to Homer Street School (Springfield).

Towards the end of the 2007-2008 school year, the Department asked each school, district and local educational association to submit an update on the progress made during this school year. The Spring 2008 Progress Reports included a reflection on each of the district and school conditions that have been established and initial progress that has been observed. Additionally, as schools were preparing to begin year 2 as Commonwealth Pilot Schools, the report asked them to specify any changes or adjustments to the original plans.

An external evaluation of the Commonwealth Pilot School initiative continues to be conducted by the Donahue Institute at UMASS Amherst.

The Center for Collaborative Education (CCE) continues to provide technical assistance and coaching at each of the Commonwealth Pilot Schools through a contract with the Department. Written agreements detailing the specific services to be provided at each school were approved by the school's principal, the district superintendent, CCE and the Department.

Expansion of Initiative

The Department notified the Superintendents of all current Commonwealth Priority Schools (schools that, in accordance with No Child Left Behind Act, are identified for *corrective action* or *restructuring* as a result of the English language arts or mathematics performance of students in the aggregate) about the opportunity to convert one or more of the schools to Commonwealth Pilot status in December 2007. Springfield Public Schools expressed an interest in converting a school to a Commonwealth Pilot school for September 2008 (Homer Street School). CCE coaches customized assistance and provided support for that school's planning efforts.

2008-2009 Implementation (Year 2)

Five schools are currently participating in the Commonwealth Pilot School initiative. Each school will receive FY09 grant funds to support the efforts outlined in original design plans and subsequent progress reports as well as priority activities determined by the schools' governing boards. Grant funds can be used for activities in a broad range of categories including the development of professional learning communities, strengthening of instructional practices, refining assessment systems (interim and formative), providing non-academic student support services and academic interventions and supports, and the continued development of school organization and culture.

The Department received approval from the US Department of Education to use some federal funds for the redesign efforts of Commonwealth Pilot schools. This increases the Department's flexibility and capacity as well as mitigates the effect of recent state budget cuts. In addition to these grants, the Department is continuing to contract with CCE to provide intensive coaching and technical assistance in each school and district in the initiative.

IV. Intervention in Underperforming Districts

Until July 2008, district performance review under NCLB was the responsibility of the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (EQA). The Office was created by the Massachusetts Legislature in July of 2000 to provide independent and objective programmatic and financial audits of the 350-plus school districts that serve the cities and towns of Massachusetts. In cases where EQA found district performance to be below acceptable standards, the Education Management Audit Council (EMAC), EQA's governing Board, referred a district for Department and State Board of Education action regarding a designation as an *underperforming* district. Gill-Montague and Randolph were the last two districts referred by EMAC for Department and Board action.

In July 2008, the Legislature acted on a bill that called for the dissolution of the EMAC and of EQA. The responsibility for the review of district performance was shifted to the Department and included the creation of separate offices of accountability and assistance within the Department in order to gain clarity of expectations and roles. A new deputy commissioner was hired to oversee the central functions of both offices, ensuring strong and effective connections between the offices, but maintaining separate procedures and processes. Deputy Commissioner Karla Brooks-Baehr currently leads the restructuring of the state's accountability and assistance model. *Attachment E* provides an update of recent Department progress with regard to district and school accountability.

Underperforming Districts

To date, five Massachusetts districts have been declared by the Board to be underperforming; they are listed in the chart below. In the case of Holyoke, Winchendon and Southbridge, the Department has engaged third-party "turn-around partners" to assist with each of these districts to support the planning and implementation of Board-approved improvement initiatives. In April 2008, the Board officially removed Winchendon from underperforming status. In Gill-Montague and Randolph, the Department conducted district leadership evaluations in 2007. Results of these evaluations were brought forward to the commissioner and Board at the March 2008 Board meeting for discussion. These reports informed each district's development of a turnaround plan, setting out the district's improvement agendas.

District	Date of determination	# of students	# of Teachers receiving PD	FY 08 Cost
Holyoke	November 2003	6,121	625	\$1,146,750
Winchendon	November 2003, removed April 2008	1,647	138	\$139,616
Southbridge	September 2004	2,148	174	\$154,064
Gill-Montague	June 2007	1,127	100	\$6,810
Randolph	November 2007	3,138	250	\$10,600

Source: Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Holyoke

The Department engaged the services of the America's Choice program to support and expand the Board-approved turnaround plan for the Holyoke Public Schools. America's Choice officials worked closely with Department staff and Holyoke leaders to design a comprehensive implementation plan and to guide and support the district's improvement work. The district's capacity to collect, manage and analyze data has improved significantly. A focus on instructional leadership at the district and school levels has been supported through the NISL training. A fulltime America's Choice Assistant to the Superintendent has been supported by the Department's grant to Holyoke. A new and defined vision for the district's expectations of staff, students, parents and the community and their respective roles in the improvement effort has evolved. Holyoke teachers have participated in literacy and mathematics training. Leadership training and coaching has been provided to teams in every school.

In December 2007, the Department contracted with The Meristem Group, LLC to conduct an evaluation of the turnaround initiative in Holyoke. That comprehensive evaluation found that, after three years of operation, the Holyoke Turnaround Initiative has succeeded in creating consistent and widespread changes in some areas of teaching and learning in the Holyoke schools. These changes represent an early stage in the turnaround process in Holyoke and have potentially contributed to modest student academic achievement gains. The Initiative has also made significant changes in the operational structure of the district and the individual schools. These changes have the potential for providing the framework needed to substantially advance and sustain the turnaround effort in coming years.

In 2008, the district did not make AYP for students in the aggregate in mathematics, but did make AYP for students in the aggregate in ELA. Holyoke remains in *corrective action* accountability status for both subjects. The Department continues to support the improvement work in this district.

Winchendon

The Department appointed an interim superintendent for the Winchendon Public Schools in January 2004 to provide leadership for the district as the school committee conducted a search for a permanent leader. In the fall of 2004, a new superintendent was hired. With the new superintendent's input, the Department contracted with the Education Development Center (EDC) to provide services, training and guidance to the district as implementation of the improvement initiatives outlined in the Board-approved turnaround plan got underway. The district has focused on the development of strong systems for establishing and supervising changes in instructional practices at all levels and in all schools. Teachers throughout the system have engaged in training to differentiate instruction for student learners and significant work has been completed in curriculum alignment in both ELA and mathematics. District leaders have also focused time and effort on developing productive relations with town officials. The Department has provided Winchendon school and district leaders with the opportunity to participate in the National Institute for School Leadership (NISL) training during the 2006-2007 school year. The program's focus on the development of leadership for improved instruction supports the district's improvement plan.

The Board voted to remove Winchendon from *underperforming* status at their April 2008 meeting. The district made AYP for both subjects in 2008 and has no AYP status in either subject.

Southbridge

The Department appointed an interim superintendent for the Southbridge Public Schools in March 2005 to provide leadership for the district as the school committee conducted a search for a permanent leader. In August of 2005, a new superintendent was hired. The new leader developed the district's turnaround plan, which was approved by the Board in December 2005. The Department appointed a team of two retired superintendents to guide and oversee the plan's implementation. A strong focus on curriculum development and alignment was the primary initiative. The superintendent has provided leadership by building the district's capacity with a major technology enhancement effort and an emphasis on using student performance data to guide improvement.

In 2008, the district did not make AYP for students in the aggregate in ELA, but did make AYP for students in the aggregate in mathematics. Southbridge has no AYP status in mathematics and remains in Corrective Action in ELA for subgroups.

Gill-Montague

In June 2007, the Board declared the Gill-Montague Regional School District (GMRSD) to be underperforming. As a result of that determination, the Department engaged a three-member team of independent evaluators to conduct an onsite District Leadership Review. In October 2007, using an established protocol, the review team assessed the strengths of the superintendent, the school committee, key central office staff and building-level leaders in order to determine whether components of district leadership must be adjusted or supported to ensure the likelihood of significant improvement. Additionally, the review team engaged teachers, parents and community leaders in interviews and focus group discussions to gain a more complete perspective on leadership capacity for the district and its schools. Gill-Montague presented its improvement plan for Board review and approval at the March 2008 Board meeting; the board approved the district's plan at the June meeting.

The Department has provided the GMRSD with ongoing support in a number of areas: agreeing to support a waiver for the serving superintendent (retired) to stay in his position for school year 2008-09 to ensure stability of leadership, providing grant funds to support mathematics content training for teachers in the district, support for curriculum-mapping work and for technology enhancement.

Gill-Montague made AYP for both subjects in 2008 and has no AYP status in either subject. The district continues, however, to struggle with serious fiscal challenges.

Randolph

In November 2007, the Board determined the Randolph School District to be underperforming. As a result of that determination, the Department engaged a three-member team of independent evaluators to conduct an onsite District Leadership Review in December 2007. Using an established protocol, the review team assessed the strengths

of the superintendent, the school committee, key central office staff and building-level leaders in order to determine whether components of district leadership must be adjusted or supported to ensure the likelihood of significant improvement. Furthermore, the review team engaged teachers, parents and community leaders in interviews and focus group discussions to gain a more complete perspective on leadership capacity for the district and its schools. The Board reviewed and approved the Randolph district leadership review team's report and recommendations at the Board's March 2008 regular meeting. In May, the Board received the Randolph Turnaround Plan; it was approved in June. Shortly thereafter, the Randolph community supported an over-ride vote that resulted in a substantial infusion of money earmarked to support the district's school budget. The Department assigned a support team to work with municipal and school leaders in their efforts to address the goals set out in the plan.

Randolph is in Corrective Action for subgroups in ELA and in Need of Improvement Year 2 for subgroups in mathematics.

V. Identification and Recognition of Schools Showing Significant Improvement

Compass Schools

The Department also uses the School and District Accountability System to identify schools showing significant improvement in their students' performance in English Language Arts and Mathematics, and designates them as *Commonwealth Compass Schools*. In February of 2007, based on the MA School and District Accountability System's fall 2006 results, 35 schools were selected as Commonwealth Compass Schools. In addition to special recognition at a public event at the Great Hall of the State House, each of the *2007 Compass Schools* received a \$2,500 grant. This year, we will identify a new cohort of Compass Schools and will notify and recognize them in early 2009.

Since the program began in 2001, 95 schools have been designated as *Commonwealth Compass Schools*. They include elementary, middle, vocational, and comprehensive high schools across the state.

Schools no longer carrying an AYP status under NCLB

In FY08, for the first time the Department awarded "Sustaining Success Grants" to schools demonstrating significant progress, i.e., those that have made AYP for two consecutive years. A total of \$75,000 was made available to five schools (approximately \$15,000 per school). These funds were intended to support the continuation of the instructional practices and initiatives that enabled the school to show significant improvement leading to removal of AYP status. This year's funding is insufficient to be able to make awards to schools that no longer carry AYP status.

VI. FY09 Intervention and Targeted Assistance Account Budget and FY10 Budget Recommendations

During FY09 the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education has focused its targeted assistance efforts on building the capacities of the 10 Commissioner's Districts and the five Underperforming Districts in order that they may more effectively support their schools, particularly those designated in the fall of 2007 as Commonwealth Priority Schools (114 schools in total).

Current funding levels have enabled us to partially address these top priorities. No school-level targeted assistance has been available for the 89 other schools currently in corrective action that are not as yet formally designated as Commonwealth Priority Schools.

The FY09 budget also included funding for the activities previously conducted by the EQA. In August, Chapter 311 of the Acts of 2008 An Act Relative to School District Accountability was approved by the Governor. The Department has been very engaged with implementing this new law. *Attachment E* provides an update of Department activity in the areas of system redesign, internal capacity building, district reviews, regional system of support and charter schools. In addition to scheduled reviews, one specific update of note is field testing of an MCAS "growth model". The model will make possible a more potent and efficient way of identifying districts and schools that require the most intervention and targeted assistance. Tied to the state student information system, the model identifies "typical" annual growth patterns for students based on various past patterns of achievement; it then projects whether or not a student is "on track" toward proficiency. The model will allow us to track absolute performance in combination with growth by student, grade, subgroup, school and/or district, thereby identifying schools with exemplary results (high achievement + high growth) as well as those where students are most at risk (low achievement + low annual growth). The MCAS growth model was presented to the Board in March. Seven districts are participating in field tests in anticipation of a 2009-2010 rollout.

The Board's FY10 budget request of \$9.6 million would allow the Department to address more intensively the needs of the Commonwealth Priority Schools and highest priority school districts, and would also allow us to begin to develop capacity in the smaller urban districts by establishing regional school improvement assistance centers.

A summary of the Department's plan for expenditure of FY09 Intervention and Targeted Assistance account funds are included as Attachment D.

VII. Appendix I

Attachment A: 2007 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Data – Massachusetts School and District Accountability Status

Attachment B: Sample Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) District Report for Chelsea and Sample Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) School Report for Clark Avenue School in Chelsea

Attachment C: Regulations on Underperforming Schools and School Districts

Attachment D: FY 09 School and District Intervention Account Spending by Initiative

Attachment A: 2008 AYP Data - Accountability Status (School and District)

2008 Massachusetts District & School Accountability Status Data

Total School Districts = 387

DISTRICT Accountability Status	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	
	#	#	#	#	#	%
Restructuring - Aggregate (Single-School Districts Only)	1	1	3	3	3	0.8
Corrective Action – Aggregate	2	2	11	9	9	2.3
Identified for Improvement - Aggregate	10	16	9	12	7	1.8
Subtotal	13	19	23	24	19	4.9
Restructuring - Subgroups (Single-School Districts Only)	0	0	0	4	4	1.0
Corrective Action – Subgroups	0	0	20	28	37	9.6
Identified for Improvement - Subgroups	130	152	116	26	29	7.5
Total	143	171	159	82	89	23.0

2008	
New ID	Exited
#	#
0	0
0	0
4	1
4	1
0	0
0	2
12	4
16	7

Total Schools = 1755

SCHOOL Accountability Status	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	
	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	%
Restructuring - Aggregate			24	30	60	77	124	7.1
Corrective Action - Aggregate		38	28	37	49	25	55	3.1
Identified for Improvement - Aggregate	208	168	128	131	208	200	178	10.1
Subtotal	208	206	180	198	317	302	357	20.4
Restructuring - Subgroups						114	155	8.8
Corrective Action - Subgroups					139	92	95	5.4
Identified for Improvement - Subgroups			193	222	174	164	233	13.3
Total	208	206	373	420	630	672	840	48.0

2008					
New ID	Exited	AYP			Title I
#	#	Yes	No	No 2008 Findings	
	0	3	121	0	108
	1	0	53	2	51
80	10	12	165	1	140
80	11	15	339	3	299
	0	6	149	0	97
	2	9	86	0	56
133	16	21	212	0	138
213	29	51	786	3	590

Notes:

A single school district is a district comprising a single school (e.g., Commonwealth Charter or regional vocational/technical school, et cetera). Percentages are out of the total number of school districts (n=387) or schools (n=1755) included.

The 'New ID' figure in Column L indicates the number of schools or districts newly identified for an Accountability Status in 2008.

The 'Exited' figure in Column M indicates the number of schools or districts that exited their 2007 Accountability Status by making AYP in the identified subject area for two consecutive years.

Attachment B

Chelsea - 2008 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Data

District: Chelsea (00570000)

Title I District: Yes

2008 AYP Data - Summary

Summary Data | [Detailed Data](#)

	NCLB Accountability Status	Performance Rating	Improvement Rating
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS	Corrective Action - Subgroups	Moderate	No Change
MATHEMATICS	Corrective Action - Subgroups	Low	Improved Below Target

A district will be newly identified for improvement if it fails to make AYP in the same subject area and all grade-spans, for students in the aggregate or any subgroup, for two consecutive years. A district will have no accountability status if it makes AYP in the same subject area for at least one grade-span for two consecutive years.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Grade Spans		2007	2008	2008 Subgroups Not Making AYP
Grades 3-5	Aggregate	No	No	White -Special Education -Low Income -Hispanic/Latino -F/LEP -
	All Subgroups	No	No	
Grades 6-8	Aggregate	Yes	No	Afr American/Black -Special Education -Low Income -Hispanic/Latino -F/LEP -
	All Subgroups	No	No	
Grades 9-12	Aggregate	No	Yes	Special Education -F/LEP -
	All Subgroups	No	No	

MATHEMATICS

Grade Spans		2007	2008	2008 Subgroups Not Making AYP
Grades 3-5	Aggregate	Yes	No	White -Special Education -Low Income -Hispanic/Latino -F/LEP -
	All Subgroups	No	No	
Grades 6-8	Aggregate	No	No	Afr American/Black -Special Education -F/LEP -
	All Subgroups	No	No	
Grades 9-12	Aggregate	No	Yes	Special Education -F/LEP -
	All Subgroups	No	No	

Adequate Yearly Progress History

											NCLB Accountability Status
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	
ELA	Aggregate	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Corrective Action - Subgroups
	All Subgroups	-	-	-	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	
MATH	Aggregate	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Corrective Action - Subgroups
	All Subgroups	-	-	-	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	

Chelsea - 2008 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Data

District: Chelsea (00570000)

Title I District: Yes

2008 AYP Data - Detail

[Summary Data](#) | Detailed Data

Chelsea:

2008 AYP Data - English Language Arts By Grade Span

To make adequate yearly progress in 2008, a student group must meet (A) a student participation requirement, either (B) the State's 2008 performance target for that subject or (C) the group's own 2008 improvement target, and (D) an additional attendance or graduation requirement.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS															
Student Group	(A) Participation				(B) Performance			(C) Improvement				(D) Attendance/Grad Rate			AYP 2008
	Enrolled	Assessed	%	Met Target (95%)	N	2008 CPI	Met Target (85.4)	2007 CPI (Baseline)	Gain Target	On Target Range	Met Target	%	Change	Met Target	
Grades 3-5															
Aggregate	1203	1198	100	Yes	1171	67.8	No	70.7	4.2	73.4-76.4	No	95.9	0.2	Yes	No
Lim. English Prof.	402	400	100	Yes	373	57.6	No	60.6	5.6	63.7-68.7	No	96.5	0.1	Yes	No
Special Education	183	182	99	Yes	182	49.7	No	55.3	6.4	59.2-64.2	No	94.9	0.4	Yes	No
Low Income	1122	1117	100	Yes	1090	67.2	No	69.3	4.4	72.2-75.2	No	95.8	0.2	Yes	No
Afr. Amer./Black	76	76	100	Yes	71	63.0	No	62.1	5.4	63.0-72.0	Yes	97.0	0.9	Yes	Yes
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	24	24	-	-	24	89.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	976	972	100	Yes	950	66.6	No	70.7	4.2	73.4-76.4	No	95.9	0.1	Yes	No
Native American	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	118	117	99	Yes	117	76.1	No	76.1	3.4	77.0-	No	94.5	0.1	Yes	No

										82.0					
Grades 6-8															
Aggregate	1109	1102	99	Yes	1055	71.6	No	70.8	4.2	73.5-76.5	No	95.3	0.6	Yes	No
Lim. English Prof.	286	285	100	Yes	238	46.6	No	52.3	6.8	56.6-61.6	No	96.3	0.6	Yes	No
Special Education	214	208	97	Yes	207	44.2	No	46.7	7.6	51.8-56.8	No	93.5	0.9	Yes	No
Low Income	1015	1008	99	Yes	965	70.6	No	69.2	4.4	72.1-75.1	No	95.2	0.6	Yes	No
Afr. Amer./Black	90	90	100	Yes	84	59.2	No	66.0	4.9	66.4-75.4	No	97.3	1.0	Yes	No
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	31	31	-	-	29	87.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	864	858	99	Yes	821	71.2	No	69.7	4.3	72.5-75.5	No	95.3	0.8	Yes	No
Native American	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	117	116	99	Yes	114	78.9	No	77.4	3.2	78.1-83.1	Yes	93.2	-0.6	Yes	Yes
Grades 9-12															
Aggregate	331	318	96	Yes	312	77.8	No	73.4	3.8	74.7-79.7	Yes	53.0	7.2	Yes	Yes
Lim. English Prof.	78	76	97	Yes	70	59.3	No	49.1	7.3	51.9-60.9	Yes	36.5	1.9	No	No
Special Education	53	46	87	No	46	64.7	No	60.1	5.7	61.3-70.3	Yes	28.0	-1.6	No	No
Low Income	302	291	96	Yes	285	77.7	No	69.7	4.3	71.5-76.5	Yes	50.6	6.4	Yes	Yes
Afr. Amer./Black	26	26	-	-	25	63.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	13	12	-	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	261	250	96	Yes	246	78.5	No	72.1	4.0	73.6-78.6	Yes	47.5	3.3	Yes	Yes
Native American	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	31	30	-	-	29	82.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Chelsea:
2008 AYP Data - Mathematics By Grade Span**

To make adequate yearly progress in 2008, a student group must meet (A) a student participation requirement, either (B) the State's 2008 performance target for that subject or (C) the group's own 2008 improvement target, and (D) an additional attendance or graduation requirement.

MATHEMATICS															
Student Group	(A) Participation				(B) Performance			(C) Improvement				(D) Attendance/Grad Rate			AYP 2008
	Enrolled	Assessed	%	Met Target (95%)	N	2008 CPI	Met Target (76.5)	2007 CPI (Baseline)	Gain Target	On Target Range	Met Target	%	Change	Met Target	
Grades 3-5															
Aggregate	1211	1206	100	Yes	1167	73.2	No	72.6	3.9	75.0-78.0	No	95.9	0.2	Yes	No
Lim. English Prof.	413	409	99	Yes	370	64.9	No	64.3	5.1	66.9-71.9	No	96.5	0.1	Yes	No
Special Education	181	179	99	Yes	179	54.1	No	60.8	5.6	63.9-68.9	No	94.9	0.4	Yes	No
Low Income	1130	1125	100	Yes	1086	72.7	No	71.1	4.1	73.7-76.7	No	95.8	0.2	Yes	No
Afr. Amer./Black	78	78	100	Yes	71	62.3	No	60.6	5.6	61.7-70.7	Yes	97.0	0.9	Yes	Yes
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	24	24	-	-	24	95.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	981	976	99	Yes	945	73.1	No	73.0	3.9	75.4-78.4	No	95.9	0.1	Yes	No
Native American	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	119	119	100	Yes	118	75.8	No	76.3	3.4	77.2-82.2	No	94.5	0.1	Yes	No
Grades 6-8															
Aggregate	1112	1104	99	Yes	1052	55.8	No	51.0	7.0	56.5-59.5	No	95.3	0.6	Yes	No

Lim. English Prof.	290	288	99	Yes	236	35.5	No	37.8	8.9	44.2-49.2	No	96.3	0.6	Yes	No
Special Education	213	207	97	Yes	206	36.3	No	30.9	9.9	38.3-43.3	No	93.5	0.9	Yes	No
Low Income	1018	1010	99	Yes	962	54.9	No	48.8	7.3	54.6-57.6	Yes	95.2	0.6	Yes	Yes
Afr. Amer./Black	91	91	100	Yes	84	42.6	No	46.9	7.6	50.0-59.0	No	97.3	1.0	Yes	No
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	31	31	-	-	29	79.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	867	860	99	Yes	819	55.7	No	49.8	7.2	55.5-58.5	Yes	95.3	0.8	Yes	Yes
Native American	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	116	115	99	Yes	113	60.0	No	55.7	6.3	59.5-64.5	Yes	93.2	-0.6	Yes	Yes
Grades 9-12															
Aggregate	328	316	96	Yes	309	68.0	No	65.1	5.0	67.6-72.6	Yes	53.0	7.2	Yes	Yes
Lim. English Prof.	77	76	99	Yes	69	52.5	No	55.7	6.3	57.5-66.5	No	36.5	1.9	No	No
Special Education	54	49	91	No	49	45.9	No	46.8	7.6	49.9-58.9	No	28.0	-1.6	No	No
Low Income	299	290	97	Yes	283	68.0	No	61.9	5.4	64.8-69.8	Yes	50.6	6.4	Yes	Yes
Afr. Amer./Black	25	25	-	-	24	50.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	13	13	-	-	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	259	249	96	Yes	245	67.9	No	61.3	5.5	64.3-69.3	Yes	47.5	3.3	Yes	Yes
Native American	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	31	29	-	-	27	72.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Chelsea:
2008 AYP Data - All Grades**

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS															
Student Group	(A) Participation				(B) Performance			(C) Improvement				(D) Attendance			AYP 2008
	Enrolled	Assessed	%	Met Target (95%)	N	2008 CPI	Met Target (85.4)	2007 CPI (Baseline)	Gain Target	On Target Range	Met Target	%	Change	Met Target	
Aggregate	2643	2618	99	Yes	2538	70.6	No	71.1	4.1	74.2-76.2	No	94.6	0.3	Yes	No
Lim. English Prof.	766	761	99	Yes	681	53.9	No	56.2	6.3	60.5-64.5	No	95.7	0.1	Yes	No
Special Education	450	436	97	Yes	435	48.7	No	51.6	6.9	56.5-60.5	No	93.1	0.5	Yes	No
Low Income	2439	2416	99	Yes	2340	69.9	No	69.3	4.4	72.7-74.7	No	94.7	0.5	Yes	No
Afr. Amer./Black	192	192	100	Yes	180	61.3	No	66.1	4.8	68.4-73.4	No	96.1	0.5	Yes	No
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	68	67	-	-	65	87.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	2101	2080	99	Yes	2017	69.9	No	70.4	4.2	73.6-75.6	No	94.5	0.3	Yes	No
Native American	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	266	263	99	Yes	260	78.1	No	76.5	3.4	77.4-82.4	Yes	93.2	-0.1	Yes	Yes

MATHEMATICS															
Student Group	(A) Participation				(B) Performance			(C) Improvement				(D) Attendance			AYP 2008
	Enrolled	Assessed	%	Met Target (95%)	N	2008 CPI	Met Target (76.5)	2007 CPI (Baseline)	Gain Target	On Target Range	Met Target	%	Change	Met Target	
Aggregate	2651	2626	99	Yes	2528	65.3	No	62.6	5.3	66.9-	No	94.6	0.3	Yes	No

										68.9					
Lim. English Prof.	780	773	99	Yes	675	53.4	No	53.6	6.6	58.2-62.2	No	95.7	0.1	Yes	No
Special Education	448	435	97	Yes	434	44.7	No	45.5	7.8	51.3-55.3	No	93.1	0.5	Yes	No
Low Income	2447	2425	99	Yes	2331	64.8	No	60.7	5.6	65.3-67.3	No	94.7	0.5	Yes	No
Afr. Amer./Black	194	194	100	Yes	179	51.4	No	56.9	6.2	60.6-65.6	No	96.1	0.5	Yes	No
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	68	68	-	-	66	88.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	2107	2085	99	Yes	2009	65.4	No	61.9	5.4	66.3-68.3	No	94.5	0.3	Yes	No
Native American	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	266	263	99	Yes	258	68.5	No	65.8	4.9	68.2-73.2	Yes	93.2	-0.1	Yes	Yes

Clark Avenue School - 2008 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Data

District: Chelsea (00570000)
 School: Clark Avenue School (00570050)
 School Title I Status: Title I School (SW)
 NCLB School Choice Required: Yes
 Supplemental Educational Services Required: Yes

2008 AYP Data - Summary

Summary Data | [Detailed Data](#)

	NCLB Accountability Status	Performance Rating	Improvement Rating
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS	Improvement Year 2 - Subgroups	Moderate	On Target
MATHEMATICS	Restructuring Year 2 - Subgroups	Low	On Target

To make adequate yearly progress in 2008, a student group must meet (A) a student participation requirement, either (B) the State's 2008 performance target for that subject or (C) the group's own 2008 improvement target, and (D) an additional attendance or graduation requirement.

Student Group	(A) Participation		(B) Performance		(C) Improvement		(D) Attendance		AYP 2008
	Met Target	Actual	Met Target (85.4)	Actual	Met Target	Change from 2007	Met Target	Actual	
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS									
Aggregate	Yes	100	No	73.1	Yes	2.2	Yes	95.9	Yes
Lim. English Prof.	Yes	100	No	53.3	No	-2.2	Yes	95.7	No
Special Education	Yes	100	No	40.3	No	-3.5	Yes	95.2	No

Low Income	Yes	100	No	72.3	Yes	2.8	Yes	95.9	Yes
Afr. Amer./Black	-	-	-	66.7	-	-	-	-	-
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	Yes	100	No	72.1	No	1.3	Yes	96.0	No
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	Yes	100	No	84.0	Yes	6.4	Yes	93.9	Yes
MATHEMATICS	Met Target	Actual	Met Target (76.5)	Actual	Met Target	Change from 2007	Met Target	Actual	AYP 2008
Aggregate	Yes	100	No	64.3	Yes	6.8	Yes	95.9	Yes
Lim. English Prof.	Yes	99	No	45.2	No	-1.4	Yes	95.7	No
Special Education	Yes	100	No	34.7	No	2.0	Yes	95.2	No
Low Income	Yes	100	No	63.8	Yes	8.2	Yes	95.9	Yes
Afr. Amer./Black	-	-	-	56.1	-	-	-	-	-
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	Yes	100	No	63.8	Yes	5.8	Yes	96.0	Yes
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	Yes	100	No	70.5	Yes	11.2	Yes	93.9	Yes

Adequate Yearly Progress History										NCLB Accountability Status	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007		2008
ELA	Aggregate	-	-	-	-	-	No	No	Yes	Yes	Improvement Year 2 - Subgroups
	All Subgroups	-	-	-	-	-	No	No	Yes	No	
MATH	Aggregate	-	-	-	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Restructuring Year 2 - Subgroups
	All Subgroups	-	-	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	

Clark Avenue School - 2008 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Data

District: Chelsea (00570000)
 School: Clark Avenue School (00570050)
 School Title I Status: Title I School (SW)
 NCLB School Choice Required: Yes
 Supplemental Educational Services Required: Yes

2008 AYP Data - Detail

[Summary Data](#) | Detailed Data

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS															
Student Group	(A) Participation				(B) Performance			(C) Improvement				(D) Attendance			AYP 2008
	Enrolled	Assessed	%	Met Target (95%)	N	2008 CPI	Met Target (85.4)	2007 CPI (Baseline)	Gain Target	On Target Range	Met Target	%	Change	Met Target	
Aggregate	571	571	100	Yes	530	73.1	No	70.9	4.2	72.6-77.6	Yes	95.9	-0.1	Yes	Yes
Lim. English Prof.	156	156	100	Yes	130	53.3	No	55.5	6.4	59.4-64.4	No	95.7	-0.8	Yes	No
Special Education	95	95	100	Yes	93	40.3	No	43.8	8.0	47.3-56.3	No	95.2	0.1	Yes	No
Low Income	524	524	100	Yes	485	72.3	No	69.5	4.4	71.4-76.4	Yes	95.9	0.1	Yes	Yes
Afr. Amer./Black	37	37	-	-	33	66.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	13	13	-	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	451	451	100	Yes	418	72.1	No	70.8	4.2	72.5-77.5	No	96.0	-0.1	Yes	No
Native American	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	64	64	100	Yes	61	84.0	No	77.6	3.2	77.6-85.3	Yes	93.9	-0.7	Yes	Yes

MATHEMATICS															
Student Group	(A) Participation				(B) Performance			(C) Improvement				(D) Attendance			AYP 2008
	Enrolled	Assessed	%	Met Target (95%)	N	2008 CPI	Met Target (76.5)	2007 CPI (Baseline)	Gain Target	On Target Range	Met Target	%	Change	Met Target	
Aggregate	576	575	100	Yes	529	64.3	No	57.5	6.1	61.1-66.1	Yes	95.9	-0.1	Yes	Yes
Lim. English Prof.	161	160	99	Yes	129	45.2	No	46.6	7.6	51.7-56.7	No	95.7	-0.8	Yes	No
Special Education	95	95	100	Yes	93	34.7	No	32.7	9.6	37.8-46.8	No	95.2	0.1	Yes	No
Low Income	529	528	100	Yes	484	63.8	No	55.6	6.3	59.4-64.4	Yes	95.9	0.1	Yes	Yes
Afr. Amer./Black	38	38	-	-	33	56.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	13	13	-	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	455	454	100	Yes	417	63.8	No	58.0	6.0	61.5-66.5	Yes	96.0	-0.1	Yes	Yes
Native American	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	64	64	100	Yes	61	70.5	No	59.3	5.8	60.6-69.6	Yes	93.9	-0.7	Yes	Yes

Adequate Yearly Progress History											NCLB Accountability Status
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	
ELA	Aggregate	-	-	-	-	-	No	No	Yes	Yes	Improvement Year 2 - Subgroups
	All Subgroups	-	-	-	-	-	No	No	Yes	No	
MATH	Aggregate	-	-	-	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Restructuring Year 2 - Subgroups
	All Subgroups	-	-	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	

Attachment C

Education Laws and Regulations

603 CMR 2.00: Underperforming Schools and School Districts

Section:

[2.01:](#) Authority, Scope, and Purpose

[2.02:](#) Definitions

[2.03:](#) School Accountability

[2.04:](#) Underperforming School Districts

[2.05:](#) Low-Performing Mathematics Programs

[View All Sections](#)

Adopted by the Board of Education: June 16, 1997

Most Recently Amended by the Board of Education: October 24, 2006

2.01: Authority, Scope and Purpose

- (1) 603 CMR 2.00 is promulgated pursuant to the authority of the Board of Education under M.G.L. c.69, §§ 1B and 1J and c. 71, § 38G.

603 CMR 2.00 governs the Board's review of the adequacy of the educational opportunities and services provided by the Commonwealth's public schools, and identifies the circumstances under which the Board may declare a school or school district chronically underperforming and intervene in accordance with M.G.L. c. 69, §§ 1J and 1K. 603 CMR 2.00 also

- (2) governs the Board's review of the mathematics programs provided by the Commonwealth's public school's and identifies circumstances under which the Board may declare a school's mathematics program low-performing and require mathematics teachers in that program to take a diagnostic mathematics content assessment.

2.02: Definitions

Accountability Status shall mean the category to which a school is assigned, based on its AYP determinations over multiple years, to define the required course of school, district and/or state action that must be taken to improve student performance.

Accountability status categories include Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action and Restructuring. Schools that make AYP in a subject for all student groups for two or more consecutive years are assigned to the No Status category. A district or school may be placed in an accountability status on the basis of the performance and improvement profile of students in the aggregate or of one or more student subgroups over two or more years in English language arts and/or mathematics.

Adequate Yearly Process or AYP shall mean a determination by the Department of the adequacy of district, grade level, school, and student subgroup performance and improvement relative to performance and improvement targets in English language arts and mathematics established by the Board in accordance with the No Child Left Behind Act.

Board shall mean the Board of Education, appointed in accordance with M.G.L. c. 15, § 1E.

Chronically Underperforming School shall mean a school deemed by the Commissioner to be an underperforming school, also known as a Commonwealth Priority School, that is found by the Board, in accordance with M.G.L. c. 69, § 1J, to have failed to

demonstrate significant improvement consistent with its approved remedial plan within 24 months after Board approval of its plan.

Commissioner shall mean the Commissioner of Education, appointed in accordance with M.G.L. c. 15, § 1F, or his or her designee.

Commonwealth Priority School shall mean a school that the Commissioner has deemed to be underperforming within the meaning of M.G.L. c. 69, § 1J.

Core academic subjects shall mean the subjects specified in M.G.L. c. 69, § 1D (mathematics, science and technology, history and social science, English, foreign languages and the arts) and subjects covered in courses that are part of an approved vocational-technical education program under M.G.L. c. 74.

Corrective Action shall mean the Accountability Status of a school that has failed to meet AYP in English language arts, mathematics, or both subjects in the aggregate or for student subgroups for four consecutive years or for two or more non-consecutive years while in Identified for Improvement accountability status.

Department shall mean the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education acting through the Commissioner or his designee.

District or school district shall mean a municipal school department or regional school district, acting through its school committee or superintendent of schools; a county agricultural school, acting through its board of trustees or superintendent/director; a charter school, acting through its board of trustees or school leader; or any other public school established by statute or charter, acting through its governing board or director.

District Review shall mean a review conducted by the office of Educational Quality and Accountability to determine whether a district is making adequate provision for the delivery of a high quality education to all students served by the district, and whether the district is making effective and efficient use of available resources to improve the educational outcomes attained by students attending the district's schools. District reviews shall be based on performance standards adopted by the EMAC. The Office of Educational Quality and Accountability shall publish and provide district officials with written guidelines for District reviews.

District Review Teams shall mean a group of individuals appointed by the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability to conduct desk based and/or on site school and district performance review activities.

Educational Management Audit Council or "EMAC" shall mean the entity, comprised of individuals appointed by the Governor pursuant to M.G.L. c. 15, § 55A that directs and oversees the conduct of school and district audits performed by the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability.

Fact-Finding Review shall mean a review conducted by one or more individuals appointed by the Commissioner in accordance with M.G. L. c. 69, §1J or 1K to assess the reasons for a school's or district's underperformance and prospects for its improvement.

Identified for Improvement shall mean the Accountability Status of a school that has failed to meet AYP in English language arts or math or both subjects in the aggregate or for student subgroups for two consecutive years.

Low-performing Mathematics Program: A mathematics program in a Massachusetts public middle or high school that has been identified as low-performing according to the criteria found in 603 CMR 2.05.

Mathematics Content Assessment: A diagnostic assessment of mathematics content knowledge designated by the Board and paid for by the Department.

Mathematics Teacher: Any educator who teaches any mathematics course in a Massachusetts public school.

NCLB shall mean the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. 6301, et. seq.

Office of Educational Quality and Accountability or "EQA" shall mean the agency established pursuant to M.G. L. c. 15, § 55A.

Restructuring shall mean the Accountability Status of a school that has failed to make AYP in English language arts, mathematics, or both subjects in the aggregate or for student subgroups for five or more consecutive years or for one or more additional years after being identified for Corrective Action.

School shall mean a single public school, consisting of one or more school buildings, which operates under the direct administration of a principal, director, or school leader appointed by the school district or charter school board responsible for its governance.

State Review Panel shall mean a group of highly qualified individuals appointed to serve, on request, as advisors to the Commissioner and Board on matters related to school and district performance review and improvement planning.

2.03: School Accountability

The Department shall implement an accountability system approved by the Board to track the performance and improvement demonstrated by Massachusetts public schools on State assessments in designated core academic subjects and other measures of performance approved by the Board on recommendation of the Commissioner. The school accountability system implemented by the Department shall be designed to meet federal as well as state statutory requirements.

The school accountability system shall measure performance referenced to Board-approved state targets for student

- (a) performance on MCAS tests and alternative assessments in English language arts and mathematics, high school graduation rate, and student attendance.

- (1) (b) In addition to state targets for MCAS performance which in a given year are the same for all schools, the Department shall establish subject-specific MCAS improvement targets on an annual basis for each school, and for each student subgroup within a school.

- (c) The Department shall compile and analyze the performance and improvement data for each school and district, together with data on MCAS participation, student attendance, and high school graduation rates on an annual basis to determine, for each school, whether students in the aggregate and student subgroups within the school have made adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward the achievement of state performance targets.

- (d) The Department shall communicate AYP and accountability status determinations to school and district officials and the public on an annual basis as soon as practicable after annual MCAS results become available, and shall inform school and district officials of any state actions that may occur as a consequence of those determinations.

The Commissioner shall recruit highly qualified individuals to serve as members of a State Review Panel.

The Commissioner shall select Review Panel members on the basis of their demonstrated expertise in one or more of the following fields:

1. district or school leadership
2. standards-based elementary or secondary curriculum, instruction, and assessment
3. instructional data management and analysis
4. district, school, or program evaluation
- (2) (a) 5. educational program management
6. teacher leadership
7. organizational management
8. district or school budget and finance
9. any other fields that the Commissioner deems to be relevant to the review and evaluation of school or district performance or school improvement planning.
- (b) The Commissioner shall deploy Review Panel members, individually or as a group, to conduct or participate in the

review of school improvement plans and the evaluation of district improvement activities. Review Panel members may be asked to provide advice and assistance to the Commissioner and Board regarding the appropriateness and sufficiency of actions being taken by district and school leaders and by the Department to improve student performance in Commonwealth Priority Schools and Chronically Underperforming Schools.

- (c) Candidates for appointment to the State Review Panel shall be approved by the Board.
- (d) State Review Panel members may be compensated by the Department for their service.

Designation as a Commonwealth Priority School

- (3) When a school is identified for Corrective Action or Restructuring in English language arts and/or mathematics for students in the aggregate as a result of failing, for four or more years, to make AYP in the same subject(s), the Commissioner shall designate the school a Commonwealth Priority School

Notice of Designation and Opportunity for Reconsideration

- (a) When a school is found to meet the criteria for designation as a Commonwealth Priority School, the Department will provide written notice to the governing body of the school, the district superintendent, if any, the school's principal, and the collective bargaining agent for the school's faculty, if any, informing them that the school is so designated.

- (4) (b) The governing body of a school designated as a Commonwealth Priority School may seek reconsideration of that designation if it believes that the designation was based upon erroneous or misleading information or that the school should not be so designated due to special circumstances. A request for reconsideration of a Commonwealth Priority School designation shall be accompanied by documentary support of the claim of error, offer of explanation, or statement of special circumstances, and must be received by the Commissioner no later than thirty (30) calendar days after the date the school received notification of its designation.
- (c) The Department will not initiate state intervention in a school designated as a Commonwealth Priority School while a timely request for reconsideration is pending.
- (d) The Commissioner's determination on reconsideration of a Commonwealth Priority School designation shall be final.

Fact Finding to Assess Intervention Required

Within thirty (30) days after the Commissioner issues a Commonwealth Priority School designation, the school committee and superintendent of a district in which a school so designated is located, or the board of trustees and head of school of a charter school so designated, shall submit a written self-assessment to the Department setting forth:

- (a) 1. a succinct assessment of the extent to which the essential structures, policies, administrative practices and operating conditions for improving student performance in the school are in place, and
- 2. the school's needs for improvement assistance and support.
- (b) District officials shall confer with teacher representatives in preparing this assessment and statement of needs.
- (c) The Department may rely in whole or in part on information contained in the district self-assessment report to determine initially the school's need for service and support.
- (5) (d) Within thirty (30) days following Department receipt of a Commonwealth Priority School's self-assessment and statement of needs, the Department will initiate an independent fact finding review to assess the current capacity and willingness of district, school, and community leaders to plan for, lead, and productively engage the school's faculty, administrators, students, parents and community institutions in appropriate school improvement efforts, with or without assistance from an external partner.

The Commissioner may appoint one or more members of the State Review Panel to consider the results of the fact finding review, the district's self-assessment and statement of needs, and other relevant information provided by the Department or solicited by panel members. The panel member(s) may recommend appropriate action to the

- (e) Commissioner and Board based on their professional judgments regarding:
 - 1. the present adequacy of leadership for change to improve results;
 - 2. the present adequacy of district infrastructure to support school improvement;

3. the readiness and apparent capacity of school and district personnel to plan effectively and lead the implementation of appropriate actions to improve student achievement at the school;
4. the readiness and apparent capacity of district, school and faculty leaders to engage productively with and benefit from the assistance provided by an external partner;
5. the likelihood of positive returns on state investments of assistance and support to improve the school's performance within current management structure and staffing; and
6. the necessity that the school in question remain in operation to serve district students.

The Commissioner, upon consideration of the recommendations of the State Review Panel members assigned to the case, shall determine the services and supports for which a Commonwealth Priority School will have priority. The school may be given priority for receipt of state-funded or arranged assistance and supports including, but not limited to:

1. financial support from the Department to support the successful implementation of district planned and directed improvement initiatives;
- (f) 2. direct assistance from Department staff and consultants to support data analysis, program design, evaluation of curriculum and instructional practice, or school management;
3. school improvement planning, personnel recruitment, selection or evaluation, and budget planning assistance;
4. participation in state-sponsored leadership training and teacher professional development opportunities;
5. guidance, assistance and/or services from an external organizational partner engaged by the Department to support district systemic changes and/or school-based improvement initiatives

Improvement Planning and Reporting Requirements

The governing body of a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School shall adopt clear, rigorous performance expectations for raising the level of student achievement at the school. Such expectations shall

- (a) include, but not be limited to, meeting school-wide Adequate Yearly Progress standards within two years after the adoption of a school improvement plan. The governing body shall adopt a written policy setting forth the manner in which the performance expectations it has established will be used in its personnel evaluation system.

The governing body and administrators responsible for management of a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School shall ensure that essential infrastructure and conditions are in place to support the delivery of high quality, standards-based curriculum, instruction, assessment and student support services at the school.

- (b)

The governing body of a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School shall revise existing policies, structures, agreements, processes, and practices as needed to remove existing barriers to achievement of the conditions for effective teaching, learning and instructional management.

- (c)

- (6) In accordance with M.G.L. c. 69, § 1J, no more than six months after the school is declared to be a Commonwealth Priority School or a Chronically Underperforming School, the superintendent of the district in which the school is located, or in the case of a charter school, its head of school, shall submit to the Board the district's plan to improve the performance of students at the school. The improvement plan shall specify:

- (d) 1. the immediate corrective actions that the district has taken and proposes to take to ensure that essential infrastructure and conditions for improved teaching, learning, and instructional management at the school are in place, and
2. the steps that will be followed by school administrators and faculty to develop and implement a coherent, intentional design for the delivery of effective teaching, learning, instructional management and student services at the school.

- (e) The district's immediate term plan of corrective action to improve student performance in a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School shall describe the changes in the district's or school's existing policies, structures, agreements, processes, and practices necessary to ensure significant achievement gains for all students

enrolled in such schools. All such plans must include the following elements, or a compelling rationale for alternative approaches designed to achieve comparable or superior results:

1. The school's principal has authority to select and assign staff to positions in the school without regard to seniority;
2. The school's principal has control over financial resources necessary to successfully implement the school improvement plan;
3. The school is implementing curricula that are aligned to state frameworks in core academic subjects;
4. The school implements systematically a program of interim assessments (4-6 times per year) in English language arts and mathematics that are aligned to school curriculum and state frameworks;
5. The school has a system to provide detailed tracking and analysis of assessment results and uses those results to inform curriculum, instruction and individual interventions;
6. The school schedule for student learning provides adequate time on a daily and weekly basis for the delivery of instruction and provision of individualized support as needed in English language arts and math, which for students not yet proficient is presumed to be at least 90 minutes per day in each subject;
7. The school provides daily after-school tutoring and homework help for students who need supplemental instruction and focused work on skill development;
8. The school has at least two full-time subject-area coaches, one each for English language arts/reading and for mathematics, who are responsible to provide faculty at the school with consistent classroom observation and feedback on the quality and effectiveness of curriculum delivery, instructional practice, and data use;
9. School administrators periodically evaluate faculty, including direct evaluation of applicable content knowledge and annual evaluation of overall performance tied in part to solid growth in student learning and commitment to the school's culture, educational model, and improvement strategy;
10. The weekly and annual work schedule for teachers provides adequate time for regular, frequent, department and/or grade-level faculty meetings to discuss individual student progress, curriculum issues, instructional practice, and school-wide improvement efforts. As a general rule no less than one hour per week shall be dedicated to leadership-directed, collaborative work, and no fewer than 5 days per year, or hours equivalent thereto, when teachers are not responsible for supervising or teaching students, shall be dedicated to professional development and planning activities directed by school leaders.

(f) District officials, in developing a plan to improve the performance of a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School, shall consider the merits of contracting for third party management services or requesting Board approval of a Horace Mann charter to restructure governance of the school. The district's written submission to the Board, containing district leaders' improvement plan proposal, shall include a discussion of these options.

(g) The Commissioner will publish guidance to assist district administrators, school leaders, faculty, and staff of a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School with the organizational redesign aspect of the school improvement planning process referenced at 603 C.M.R. 2.03(6)(d) 2. The Department's guidance on school system design will identify elements of effective practice and conditions of organizational operation that have been demonstrated to be effective contributors to improved student performance in low performing schools.

(h) The Commissioner's published guidance on instructional and administrative policies, practices and conditions found to have positive effects on student performance shall serve as a basis for the Department's assessment of the adequacy of the policies, practices, and conditions in a school failing to meet performance expectations, and shall be the foundation for the school improvement planning and support provided by the Department.

(i) The Department will form a stakeholder working group to assist in the development and participate in periodic review and amendment of Department guidelines for the conduct of fact-finding reviews to determine the capacity and service needs of districts with schools designated as Commonwealth Priority Schools. The stakeholder working group shall include, but not be limited to, representatives from the professional associations of Massachusetts school committees, superintendents, principals, program administrators, teachers and parents. The Department will publish these guidelines in draft form for public review and comment prior to adoption and final publication.

(j) When the governing body of a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School submits, for Board approval, its plan for improving student performance, the Commissioner may appoint one or more members from the State Review Panel to review the proposed plan and recommend appropriate action to the Commissioner and Board.

(k) The Commissioner shall recommend to the Board, and the Board shall exercise its discretion to decide whether to accept, reject or direct that specific amendments be made to the plan submitted by a district to improve student performance at a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School. The Board's exercise of its plan approval authority shall be guided by the recommendations, if any, of any State Review Panel members designated by the Commissioner to review and advise on approval of proposed plans. In cases of Chronically Underperforming schools, the Board shall consider amending school improvement plans to require management of the school by a qualified third party, under a performance-based contract or Horace Mann charter.

(l) In January and July of each year, the governing body of a Commonwealth Priority School and a Chronically Underperforming School shall provide the Commissioner with a written report of the school's progress toward its improvement objectives. These progress reports shall be prepared and submitted by the school's leader and superintendent in conjunction with the school's external partner, if any.

(m) The Commissioner, with approval of the Board and to the extent permitted by federal and state statutes, may withhold funds when, after reasonable notice and opportunity to comply, the district fails to comply with directives of the Board to take specified actions designed to improve student performance in a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School.

(n) Failure by local school or municipal officials to comply with directives of the Board issued pursuant to its authority under M.G.L. c. 69, s 1J to address performance deficiencies in a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School may result in Board action to declare the district to be chronically underperforming and place the district in receivership, as provided for by M.G.L. c. 69, s 1K and 603 CMR 2.04(5).

Training and Support for School Leaders

(7) Subject to funding, the Department will make training and support available to the principals and members of the school leadership teams of all schools designated as Commonwealth Priority Schools or Chronically Underperforming Schools. The nature and extent of training provided in a particular case will depend on the leadership education and training history, past professional development experiences, and demonstrated knowledge and skills of the principal and leadership team. Subject to funding, the Department will make available coaches or mentors to principals and leaders of schools designated as Commonwealth Priority Schools or Chronically Underperforming Schools to advise, assist, and support them in fulfilling their leadership responsibilities.

(b) The principal or leader appointed to lead a Commonwealth Priority School or Chronically Underperforming School shall participate in the school leadership training and support program approved for him or her by the Commissioner.

(c) The Department may fund recruitment and performance-based pay incentives to attract highly qualified individuals to serve as principals or leaders of Commonwealth Priority Schools and Chronically Underperforming Schools.

Termination of Designation as a Commonwealth Priority School

(8) (a) If a Commonwealth Priority School makes AYP in both English language arts and mathematics for students in the aggregate for two consecutive years following its designation as a Commonwealth Priority School, the school's governing body may request termination of the school's designation. The Commissioner may grant the request unless the school is in Restructuring.

(b) If a Commonwealth Priority School has significantly improved student performance and has met many but not all of its AYP targets for students in the aggregate for four or more years, the school's governing body may request termination of the school's designation. The Commissioner may grant the request unless the school is in Restructuring.

(9) If a Commonwealth Priority School fails to demonstrate significant improvement in student performance within 24 months after acceptance of a remedial plan by the Board, the Board may declare the school to be chronically underperforming. School officials of the district in which the school is located and members of the public shall have an opportunity to be heard by the Board prior to final action by the Board declaring a school chronically underperforming.

- Upon declaration by the Board that a school is chronically underperforming, the Board shall intervene in accordance with M.G.L. c. 69, § 1J, and shall issue a written order specifying actions that the district shall take to improve the academic performance of students at the school. The principal or leader appointed to lead a chronically school shall have the extraordinary powers specified in M.G.L. c. 69, § 1J. The superintendent and school committee of the district, or the school leader and board of trustees of a charter school, in which a chronically underperforming school is located shall ensure that all corrective actions ordered by the Board are implemented without delay.
- underperforming

2.04: Underperforming School Districts

Every district shall develop and implement an annual self-evaluation and district improvement planning process, led by the district superintendent and school committee with active participation by teachers, parents, business and community leaders.

- The district's evaluation and planning process shall result, at least once in every three years, in the development of a
- (a) written long-range plan to improve the educational programs and services and ensure the adequacy of educational facilities and equipment for students attending the district's schools.
 - (1) (b) Annually, the district shall develop and implement a written plan stating specific goals for improved student performance and detailing the actions to be taken by the district to meet those goals.
- A district's long-range and annual improvement plans shall be premised on an analysis of data on performance by the
- (c) district's students and an assessment of actions the district and its schools must take to improve that performance toward meeting State targets.
 - (d) Annual district improvement plans shall, in form and content, conform to requirements set forth in M.G.L. c. 69, § 1I and guidelines published by the Department.

- A district's plan(s) to support the improvement of any school within the district that has been designated a Commonwealth
- (2) Priority School or a Chronically Underperforming School shall be incorporated into, and given high priority, in the district's annual improvement plan.

The Office of Educational Quality and Accountability shall, on an annual basis, analyze data evidencing the performance of all school districts, and based on that analysis shall select districts to undergo district review.

- (a) District reviews shall be conducted according to standards, policies and procedures adopted by the EMAC.
- The district review shall consist of an analysis of data, reports and documents and a focused interview of the district's leadership team, and shall address five areas of inquiry: assessment and evaluation, curriculum and instruction, student academic support services, leadership and governance, and business and financial management. Beginning November 1, 2004, for any district whose level of student performance and improvement is below the threshold established by the Board of Education in consultation with EMAC, the district review shall also include an in-depth review of the
- (3) deficiencies the EQA has identified.
- In addition to the in-depth reviews that EQA shall conduct under 603 CMR 2.04 (3) (b), the EMAC may direct the EQA
- (c) to conduct an in-depth review in any district based on identified deficiencies relating to any of the five areas of inquiry in 603 CMR 2.04 (3)(b).
 - (d) The EQA shall provide a written report of the findings and conclusions of each district review team to the district, the EMAC and the Commissioner of Education, and shall make such reports available to the public.
 - (e) The EQA shall provide the EMAC and the Commissioner and Board with an annual report of the results of the reviews it performs.

- The EMAC shall advise the Commissioner of any case in which a district review conducted by the EQA uncovered serious or widespread deficiencies in the quality of curriculum or instruction or in the adequacy of programs, services, operational management or facilities that, in the EMAC's judgment, are likely to have a substantial negative effect on the educational achievement of students attending the district's schools. The Commissioner shall provide Board members with copies of the written district review report for each district in which such deficiencies are identified.
- (4)

- (a) The Board, after receipt and review of such a report and any additional information it may request, shall provide an

opportunity for district officials to appear before the Board or a subcommittee thereof to explain the reasons for the district's performance deficiencies and offer a plan for their remediation, and after consideration of the findings of the district review team and any contrary or explanatory information provided to the Board by district officials, shall determine whether the district's performance warrants a declaration of underperformance.

If the Board determines a district to be underperforming, the Commissioner shall appoint an independent fact-finding team. Using the reports from EQA as a basis, the fact-finding team will assess the reasons for the underperformance. The fact-finding process shall include an evaluation of the capacity and willingness of the district's leadership to implement effectively an improvement plan in partnership with the Department. At the Commissioner's direction, the team shall do additional fact-finding as needed to assess the reasons for the underperformance and the prospects for improvement. When the Commissioner is satisfied with the adequacy of the fact-finding, he may take action as follows.

If the Commissioner concludes, based on the fact-finding, that the district leadership does have the requisite capacity and willingness to implement an improvement plan, the Commissioner shall direct the district to prepare a

- (b) 1. plan to remedy its performance deficiencies and to propose a timeframe within which identified deficiencies shall be corrected. The Board, upon the recommendation of the Commissioner, may accept, reject or require modification of the district's plan.

The Commissioner shall, to the extent practicable, enter into a memorandum of agreement with the district and a turnaround partner approved by the Department who will work with district leaders to support strategic planning,

2. training and management assistance for necessary reforms. As long as the district is classified as underperforming, the district may not dismiss the turnaround partner without the agreement of the Commissioner. The district and its turnaround partner, if any, shall make regular progress reports to the Commissioner, at least twice each year.

If the Commissioner concludes, based on the fact-finding, that the district leadership does not have the requisite

3. capacity and willingness to implement an improvement plan, he may either propose specific personnel changes to the district or recommend to the Board that it declare the district to be chronically underperforming.

A determination by the Board, on recommendation of the Commissioner, that one or more of the conditions or occurrences set forth at 603 CMR 2.04(5)(a) through (h) exists within a particular school district shall constitute evidence that inadequate or unsound educational or fiscal practices by a school district are negatively affecting the academic performance of students within the district's schools. Such evidence shall be sufficient grounds for the Board to declare a district to be chronically underperforming and shall trigger the appointment by the Board of a receiver for the district. The receiver shall report to and take direction from the Commissioner, and shall have all of the powers normally vested in the superintendent and school committee, as provided by M.G.L. c. 69, § 1K.

- (a) Failure by the district's superintendent and school committee to agree to, or failure by the district to faithfully and diligently implement, within the established timeframe, a plan approved by the Commissioner and Board pursuant to 603 CMR 2.04(4)(b) 1. or 2.

- (b) Determination by the Commissioner, pursuant to 603 CMR 2.04 (4) (b) 3, that the district leadership does not have the requisite capacity and willingness to implement an improvement plan, and that the district has failed to make personnel changes recommended by the Commissioner, if any, to ensure adequate leadership.

(5)

- (c) Failure by a district to submit an acceptable plan, or to faithfully and diligently implement, within the established timeframe, the plan approved by the Commissioner and Board, for the improvement of one or more schools declared, pursuant to M.G.L. c. 69, § 1J, and 603 CMR 2.03, to be a Commonwealth Priority School(s) or Chronically Underperforming School(s).

- (d) Failure by a district to remedy, within the time period specified by the Department or permitted by statute or agency rule, a serious violation of state or federal law regarding the provision or operation of required public education programs or services.

- (e) Failure by a district to correct, within the time period specified by the Department, any school facility deficiency that seriously impedes the delivery of education services or poses a serious health or safety risk to district students.

- (f) Failure by a school district or its governing city or town(s), after notice and opportunity to take corrective action(s), to comply substantially with the appropriation and spending requirements set forth at M.G. L. c. 70, 603 CMR 10.00, and any special legislative enactment related to the financing of public education.

- (g) Failure by a school district, after notice and opportunity to take corrective action(s), to properly manage, lawfully expend, or truthfully report the district's use of funds appropriated or awarded for the support of public education.
 - (h) Failure by a school district to meet student performance and improvement objectives specified in the district improvement plan, after the period of time specified in the plan.
- (6) School district and municipal officials and members of the public shall have an opportunity to be heard by the Board prior to final action by the Board to declare the district to be chronically underperforming.
 - (7) The Board shall proceed in accordance with M.G.L. c. 69, § 1K when requested to modify or terminate a school district receivership order.

2.05: Low-Performing Mathematics Programs

- Any middle or high school in which 30 percent or more of the students fail the MCAS mathematics test, excluding those students who are enrolled in special education, who are classified as having limited English proficiency, or who have not been
- (1) enrolled in the school for at least two school years, and which failed to make AYP in mathematics for students in the aggregate or any student subgroup during the most recent accountability cycle, shall be considered to have a Low-Performing Mathematics Program.

- Mathematics teachers at schools with low-performing mathematics programs shall take the next administration of the Mathematics Content Assessment offered after the mathematics program is classified as low-performing. In addition, any mathematics teacher in a middle or high school that has been designated a Commonwealth Priority School or a Chronically Underperforming School, and any mathematics teacher who is not certified in mathematics and is teaching in a middle or high
- (2) school with 30% or greater failure rate on the MCAS mathematics test, excluding those students who are enrolled in special education, who are classified as having limited English proficiency, or who have not been enrolled in the school for at least two school years, shall be considered a mathematics teacher in a Low-Performing Mathematics Program and shall take the Mathematics Content Assessment when it is next offered. A mathematics teacher shall be required to take the Mathematics Content Assessment only once.

- Individual results on the Mathematics Content Assessment shall be forwarded to the applicable mathematics teachers and their school principals for use in developing or revising professional development plans, as provided in the Recertification Regulations, 603 CMR 44.04 (4). These individual results are to be used for diagnostic purposes only, and individual
- (3) mathematics teachers' results shall not be considered public records. The Department shall analyze and publish aggregate, statewide, district-level and school-level results, except to the extent such publication would have the effect of revealing the performance of any individual teacher.

- In addition to the procedures contained in 603 CMR 2.03(1)-(3), the Commissioner shall determine whether any school with a
- (4) low-performing mathematics program should be designated a Commonwealth Priority School. In making this determination, the Commissioner shall consider the participation rates and performance of the school's mathematics teachers on the Mathematics Content Assessment, among other factors.

- The Commissioner may waive the Mathematics Content Assessment requirement for individual mathematics teachers based
- (5) on a finding that such teachers have demonstrated mastery of mathematics or that special circumstances exist that make said assessment requirement inappropriate or immaterial.

Regulatory Authority:

M.G.L. c. 69, §§ 1J and 1K, c. 71, § 38G.

Attachment D

FY09 7061-9408 Targeted Assistance Spending Report Summary by Initiative					
	Payroll/Admin	Consultants	Conference Expenses	Grants	
<u>Staff - 28 FTE's</u>					
Subtotal	2,242,650				2
<u>Underperforming Districts</u>					
Subtotal		1,024,765	23,900	663,080	1
<u>Commissioner's Districts</u>					
Subtotal		361,810	22,000	358,553	
<u>Services to Commonwealth Priority Schools</u>					
Subtotal		217,124		3,189,205	3
<u>Other Targeted Assistance</u>					
Includes: Urban HS Dropout Reduction Initiative, Coaching, Regional Service Centers, Urban Leadership Transitions Planning Support					
Subtotal		260,608	32,500	143,249	
<u>Professional Development for Teachers</u>					
Subtotal		394,675			
<u>School Review Panels/Fact Finding Reviews</u>					
Subtotal		73,910	19,000		
<u>Instructional Leadership Training</u>					
Subtotal		1,123,090	700		1
<u>Regionalization</u>					
Subtotal		125,000		100,000	
Budget Allocation Total	2,242,650	3,580,981	98,100	4,454,087	10

7061-9408 FY09 account
 * Balance from FY08 account
 Total funds

8,175,039
2,200,779
<hr/>
10,375,818

* Monies rolled forward to support summer activities as authorized by the legislative language expended by August 31, 2008

Attachment E

Accountability and Targeted Assistance Highlights of Progress to Date *Presented to Advisory Council on Accountability and Assistance April 8, 2009*

- Internal Capacity Building
 - *The Center for Accountability* has hired six full-time staff including one of the three management positions envisioned in the reorganization; several more positions remain to be filled. An analysis of the likely impacts of anticipated FY 10 budget reductions and staffing caps is underway.
 - Other ESE offices have been assigned responsibility for some accountability work and are reassigning and/or expanding their staffs to complete them, e.g., the *Office of Strategic Planning, Research and Evaluation* is developing the district data profile and is executing a contract to develop a searchable database for the teacher contracts being collected statewide for the first time.
 - The *Center for Accountability* has also recruited nearly two dozen professionals with specialized experience and knowledge who will be available to perform work on contract in the future. These include former examiners from the Office of Education Quality and Accountability (EQA) to assist in review and redesign of the district review process.
- System Redesign
 - Deputy Commissioner Baehr has used iterations of the *Framework for District Accountability* graphic presented to the Board at its October and February meetings in discussions with interested parties to focus analysis, deepen understanding of the issues, strengthen alignment, improve the design, and identify next steps. Groups engaged include the Advisory Council, the Stakeholder Working Group, the Urban Superintendents' Network, ESE senior staff, legislative staff, external experts and practitioners, and others.
 - Field testing of an MCAS “growth model” is underway. The model will make possible a more potent and efficient way of identifying districts and schools that require the most intervention and targeted assistance. Tied to the state student information system, the model identifies “typical” annual growth patterns for students based on various past patterns of achievement; it then projects whether or not a student is “on track” toward proficiency. The model will allow us to track absolute performance in combination with growth by student, grade, subgroup, school and/or district, thereby identifying schools with exemplary results (high achievement + high growth) as well as those where students are most at risk (low achievement + low annual growth). The MCAS growth model was presented to the Board in March. Seven districts are participating in field tests in anticipation of a 2009-2010 rollout.

- A draft revision of the “ten essential conditions” delineated in current Board regulations has been developed and is being “vetted” with the field.
- ESE is completing discussions with staff from the Executive Office of Education, to develop ways that *Readiness Schools* can be used as one form of school turnaround and/or conversion at Levels 4 and/or 5 of the *Accountability and Assistance Framework*.
- ESE has integrated federally-mandated special education accountability designations with the new *Accountability and Assistance Framework* levels (i.e., Level 1 through 5).
- ESE has developed a draft of District and School Intervention at Levels 4 and 5 of the *Accountability and Assistance Framework* and has begun “vetting” it with stakeholders.
- In collaboration with the Executive Office of Education, ESE staff applied for and received a \$ 150,000 National Governors Association Best Practices Grant, *The Turnaround Challenge: State Strategies to Improve Chronically Low-Performing Schools*, to assist in the design of Levels 4 and 5 of the *Framework*. Funds will be available next month to secure consulting services to assist in the design and implementation of key components of the redesign of the accountability and assistance framework.
- ESE staff applied for and received a \$6 million federal grant to support development of *Massachusetts Students Connect*, a statewide longitudinal data system designed to improve the timeliness and exchange of data, facilitate an interagency *Readiness Passport System*. The grant will also enable ESE to explore the feasibility of regional data sharing among states.
- The statute requires that the Department administer “an annual survey to any schools and districts receiving technical assistance”. To fulfill part of that obligation, ESE staff engaged the Donahue Institute at the University of Massachusetts to conduct an administrator satisfaction survey of every superintendent, principal charter school leader, and collaborative executive director statewide; the survey focuses on perceptions of how well ESE is performing the full range of its accountability and assistance functions. Results of this survey will be available in spring and will give us baseline data to guide future strategic planning and work with these stakeholders in the field.
- Work is underway to develop the *Comprehensive Annual District and School Five-Year Trend Profile* consisting of various academic and resource indicators; the *Trend Profile* will be accessible to the public and provide a “snapshot” of how schools and districts are performing on multiple measures compared to others in the state. A lead staff person has been hired and began work in March on the project. A pilot prototype will be available for AAAC review in June.

- To ensure coordination between accountability and assistance, the Center for Accountability has integrated the essential features of the classroom observation tool used by EQA with the classroom observation tool developed by the Center for Targeted Assistance in 2007; ESE has contracted with *SchoolWorks* to develop a training module; to ensure rater reliability in the future, all members of district review teams will complete the training prior to participating in any district review.
- District Reviews
 - The Commissioner dispatched a team of seven former EQA examiners to conduct a comprehensive review of the Fall River Public Schools; the team's report was released on March 6th. The Commissioner will be recommending "stringent" planning and monitoring including a six-month follow-up report to the Commissioner by an ESE-appointed monitor. The ESE monitor has been appointed and an initial meeting scheduled for this month.
 - The *Center for Accountability* has executed contracts with *Class Measures* and *Schoolworks* to conduct eight (8) urban district reviews in April and May with a focus on the effectiveness of district work to intervene successfully on behalf of the students in its *Commonwealth Priority Schools*.
 - ESE interviewed vendors to undertake reviews of up to three (3) districts whose efforts to explore regional approaches to governance, operations and/or service delivery might benefit from a comprehensive district review focused on identifying obstacles and opportunities related to their goals. Consultation with potential vendors and others led to a decision in early April to pursue a different path to support expanded regional approaches to service delivery: the district review process will incorporate an indicator assessing the district's effectiveness in using regional approaches; at the same time, the Center for Targeted Assistance will expand its capacity to provide technical assistance directly or by referral when weaknesses are noted in that indicator.
 - Work is underway to identify up to four (4) districts where student achievement as measured by MCAS reveals more success with students with special needs than is typical for comparable districts; similarly, up to four (4) districts are being identified where responses to recommendations from Coordinated Program Reviews have been swift and effective. In both cases focused district reviews are expected be completed this spring. They will be targeted at identifying systems and practices in place that are most likely to be contributing to those results. At the same time, these reviews will give ESE critical information needed to achieve its legal mandate to more effectively integrate the Coordinated Review process with the district review process. ESE has identified a vendor capable of assisting ESE in developing an effective protocol and appropriate expertise to conduct these focused district reviews this spring and in the future.

- Regional System of Support
 - In collaboration with an educational collaborative serving nine (9) small urban communities, the *Center for Targeted Assistance* has launched a pilot *School Improvement Assistance Center* to enhance the capacity of district personnel to identify and respond to the assistance needs of their low performing schools; funds to launch two more regional pilot assistance initiatives have been secured.
 - ESE has developed a draft concept paper that outlines a way to include the functions of Title I-funded *School Improvement Assistance Centers* and the concept of *Foundational Professional Development* with the proposed *Commonwealth Readiness Centers* outlined in the Readiness Report.
- Charter School Reviews

Through the Charter School Office, accountability funds were used to contract with two (2) vendors who conducted eleven (11) charter school renewal inspections; work is underway to complete four (4) additional inspections by the end of FY09.

VIII. Appendix II

Chapter 182 of the Acts of 2008

7061-9408 “For targeted intervention to schools and districts at risk of or determined to be underperforming under sections 1J and 1K of chapter 69 of the General Laws, schools and districts which have been placed in the accountability status of identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring pursuant to departmental regulations, or which have been designated Commonwealth Priority Schools or Commonwealth Pilot Schools pursuant to said regulations; provided, that no money shall be expended in any school or district that fails to file a comprehensive district plan pursuant to the provisions of section 1I of said chapter 69 of the General Laws; provided further, that the department shall only approve reform plans with proven, replicable results in improving student performance; provided further, that in carrying out the provisions of this item, the department may contract with school support specialists, turnaround partners, and such other external assistance as is needed in the expert opinion of the commissioner, to successfully turn around failing school and district performance; provided further, that no funds shall be expended on targeted intervention unless the department shall have approved, as part of the comprehensive district improvement plan, a professional development plan which addresses the needs of the district as determined by the department; provided further, that eligible professional development activities for purposes of this item shall include, but not be limited to: professional development among teachers of the same grade levels and teachers of the same subject matter across grade levels, professional development focused on improving the teacher’s content knowledge in the field or subject area in which the teacher is practicing, professional development which provides teachers with research based strategies for increasing student success, professional development teaching the principles of data driven instruction, and funding which helps provide common planning time for teachers within a school and within the school district; provided further, that preference in the awarding of such funds shall be given to professional development in math and English content skills; provided further, that funds from any targeted intervention grant may be used to partially offset the cost of said professional development and common planning time; provided further, that funds may be expended for the purchase of instructional materials pursuant to section 57 of chapter 15 of the General Laws; provided further, that no funds shall be expended on instructional materials except where the purchase of such materials is part of a comprehensive plan to align the school or district curriculum with the Massachusetts curriculum frameworks; provided further, that preference in distributing funds shall be made for proposals which coordinate reform efforts within all schools of a district in order to prevent conflicts between multiple reforms and interventions among the schools; provided further, that not more than \$1,200,000 of this amount shall be expended on the Commonwealth pilot school initiative established by the board in November 2006; provided further, that not more than \$200,000 of this amount shall be expended on regionalism study grants to explore methods of improving the delivery of education services in areas of declining student enrollment, including but not limited to, studies of fully regionalizing partial regional school districts, funding demographic studies to project future district enrollments, and exploring creative means of collaborating across

regions, including sharing curriculum specialists, professional development providers, transportation services, and other educational and instructional interventions between regions; provided further, that the department shall issue a report, no later than February 2, 2009 and annually thereafter describing and analyzing all intervention and targeted assistance efforts funded by this item; provided further, that such report shall include but not be limited to: the number of school and school districts eligible to receive such assistance, the number of students attending school in said districts, the nature and type of intervention activities funded through this item, by school and school district, the number of teachers in professional development funded in part through this item, the number of districts with curricula or professional development systems aligned with the Massachusetts curriculum frameworks, and the number that are undertaking that effort with grants funded by this item, the number of outside vendors with whom the department has contracted to provide intervention and turnaround services, the amount each vendor has received, and the results obtained in each instance, the number of students who have passed the MCAS assessment and obtained a competency determination through these programs, before, and during the period of intervention and turnaround, and any other data relative to the successes achieved or challenges faced by the effort to turn around schools, along with any legislative or budgetary recommendations for improving the initiative and increasing the success of all intervention efforts; provided further, that said report shall include an analysis of the number of districts with curriculum plans not aligned to the Massachusetts curriculum frameworks, along with any legislative and regulatory recommendations to address the issue; provided further, that said report shall indicate the number of schools which have accepted the Commonwealth pilot school model, the reforms which they have undertaken, and the number which have expressed interest in the pilot school option; provided further, that said report shall be provided to the secretary of administration and finance, the senate president, the speaker of the house, the chairs of the house and senate ways and means committees and the house and senate chairs of the joint committee on education; provided further, that no funds shall be expended on recurring school or school district expenditures unless the department and school district have developed a long term plan to fund such expenditures from the district's operational budget; provided further, that for the purpose of this item, appropriated funds may be expended through August 31, 2009 to allow for intervention and school and district improvement planning in the summer months; provided further, that not less than \$200,000 be expended for a pilot parent engagement program including, but not limited to, a Randolph Parents' Academy and Parents' Support Network operated by the Randolph Public Schools; provided further, that not more than \$100,000 shall be expended to reimburse planning and implementation expenses incurred by municipalities in their efforts to establish new regional school districts; and provided further, that any funds distributed from this item to a city, town or regional school district shall be deposited with the treasurer of such city, town, or regional school district and held in a separate account and shall be expended by the school committee of such city, town, or regional school district without further appropriation, notwithstanding any general or special law to the contrary \$9,175,041"