A large part of the problem lies in the fact that many educators do not understand what it means to engage in educational practices that promote equity. Equity means more than simply ensuring that children have access to education. Equity also entails a focus on outcomes and results.

A. Wade Boykin, Pedro Noguera (2011)
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1. Academics goals and targets: conditions for successful implementation of MA Curriculum Frameworks
Academics Moving Forward

✓ The Office of Academics is becoming a more nimble, data-driven & project-based organization with the capacity to turnaround, transform, improve and sustain schools.

✓ The Office of Academics is accountable and focused on eliminating the academic achievement gap, successfully implementing the MA Curriculum Frameworks & PARCC and supporting the increase of full inclusion opportunities for students with disabilities.

BPS theory of action to improve instruction & achievement outcomes

Improved student learning requires improved instruction.

Schools are the units of change for instructional improvement, and principals/headmasters and their school-based teams are the leaders of that change.

BPS SY 2012
Problems WE are trying to resolve

**INTERRUPT, SUSTAIN & INCREASE**

Interrupt the pipeline of Level 4 schools AND sustain and increase numbers of Level 1 schools

**RESOLVE THE "NARROW DOOR EFFECT"**

Identify priorities that can be implemented in the time we have AND with the resources at hand
Sustainable Transformation: Theory of Action

- If the BPS strategically uses **data, systems, structures, staff, time**, and **ensures implementation with fidelity of the MA Curriculum Frameworks** to accelerate student learning

- *and* executes strategic initiatives that are clearly articulated and communicated with a focus on quality implementation that is consistently supported and monitored

- ...then outcomes for students will be dramatically transformed.

Adapted from Guidance for Level 4 Districts: Focused Planning for Accelerating Student Learning (May 2013) & Emerging and Sustaining Practices for School Turnaround (April 2013)
BPS uses three types of qualitative school reviews based on school needs:

- School Quality Reviews (SQR) 14 schools
- Instructional Walkthroughs
- School Audits as needed
Building organizational systems and structures

Does the district and each school have an organizational structure that support the instructional plan and the improvement of achievement outcomes?

**QSP**
- Data
- Identify Problem
- Define Action Plan

**ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**
- School Site Council
- ILT
- Common Planning Time
- Data Structures
- Professional Development Plan & delivery structure
- Student Council

**SYSTEMS & PROCESSES**
- Knowledge transfer
- Analytical Capacity
- Documentation of meetings & decisions and expected outcomes
- Review, revise and restart
Strategy designed to effectively and consistently turnaround schools and interrupt pipeline of Level 4 schools

Tiered Supports & Interventions

**Transforming**

**Target:** Level 4 & 5 schools, and Level 3 schools where outcomes are stagnant (2 years) and their performance is beneath the 10th percentile of comparable schools in MA.

**Goal:** Support and intervene if necessary as in-district receiver with the capacity to transform the school

**Improving**

**Target:** Schools where there is evidence of progress but improvements have not been enough to move school to a higher level and performance. Schools are between the 10th - 25th percentile of comparable schools in MA

**Goal:** Support schools in strengthening and/or identifying new organizational and instructional practices and interventions to accelerate progress

**Sustaining**

**Target:** High-performing schools, Level 1 and Level 2 schools that are between the 26th - 99th percentile of comparable schools in MA

**Goal:** Sustain organizational and instructional practices and interventions that help move the school to a higher level; remain vigilant that unanticipated internal or external actions do not derail school’s performance

**Note:** Level of intervention will be informed by the internal measures as well as DESE Level designations
## School Tiers by Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transforming (40 Schools)</th>
<th>Improving (37 Schools)</th>
<th>Sustaining (32 Schools)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: 0 Schools</td>
<td>A: 7 Schools</td>
<td>A: 6 Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: 6 Schools</td>
<td>B: 3 Schools</td>
<td>B: 3 Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: 7 Schools</td>
<td>C: 4 Schools</td>
<td>C: 3 Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: 4 Schools</td>
<td>D: 8 Schools</td>
<td>D: 2 Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: 6 Schools</td>
<td>E: 3 Schools</td>
<td>E: 7 Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: 5 Schools</td>
<td>F: 3 Schools</td>
<td>F: 4 Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: 11 Schools</td>
<td>G: 9 Schools</td>
<td>G: 7 Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also 13 schools that do not have accountability data, including Early Education programs, alternative schools, and newer schools (less than 4 years of data).
To narrow the ELA proficiency gap by half by 2017 would require the district to gain 4 CPI points each year for the next three years.

Source: MA DESE
To narrow the Math proficiency gap by half by 2017 would require the district to gain 4.5 CPI points each year for the next three years.

Source: MA DESE
# Academics Goals

**Quantitative Goals** (how we measure our progress)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Goal 1</th>
<th>2015 Target</th>
<th>2016 Target</th>
<th>2017 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math CPI 74.4</td>
<td>Math CPI 78.9</td>
<td>Math CPI 83.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Goal 2</th>
<th>2015 Target</th>
<th>2016 Target</th>
<th>2017 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA CPI 79.7</td>
<td>ELA CPI 83.7</td>
<td>ELA CPI 87.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Goal 3</th>
<th>2015 Target</th>
<th>2016 Target</th>
<th>2017 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math / ELA SGP &gt;51</td>
<td>Math / ELA SGP &gt;51</td>
<td>Math / ELA SGP &gt;51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Goal 4</th>
<th>2015 Target</th>
<th>2016 Target</th>
<th>2017 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60% of master schedules in elementary &amp; secondary schools will be analyzed to ensure alignment with student need: core courses, graduation requirements, ELL &amp; SPED</td>
<td>60% of students will have <strong>access to core courses</strong> aligned with Mass Core, including Honors and AP.</td>
<td>100% in 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% in 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Academics Qualitative Goals

## Qualitative Goal 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 Target</th>
<th>2016 Target</th>
<th>2017 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% of schools will have high functioning ILT, Common Planning time, Data Structures, School Site Councils</td>
<td>75% of schools will have high quality systems for sharing knowledge including professional delivery plan and delivery structure.</td>
<td>75% of secondary schools will have student voice and representation in school governance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of schools in 2016</td>
<td>100% of schools in 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Qualitative Goal 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 Target</th>
<th>2016 Target</th>
<th>2017 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Schools will have completed and begin implementation of SQR recommendations</td>
<td>25 schools will have completed and begin implementation of SQR recommendations.</td>
<td>35 schools will have completed and begin implementation of SQR recommendations for a total of 77 Schools at the end of 2017 including 3 in 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Central Transformation and Compliance

Priorities

The priority of Central Transformation and Compliance is ensuring that all our schools are supported and resourced from all departments within central office and meet accountability requirements established by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Through the work of the Central Transformation and Compliance unit a strategy will be developed to Interrupt the pipeline of Level 4 schools AND sustain and increase numbers of Level 1 schools.

Strategic Initiatives

1. Convene Cross-Functional Team to Create Systems of Tiered Support for Transforming, Improving and Sustaining Schools

2. Support Existing and Newly Designated Level 4 Schools

3. Collaborate with Stakeholders in Supporting Transforming Schools (DESE and Community)
2. Academics alignment: Instructional Research and Development—Networks—Academic Turnaround & Transformation
Instructional Research and Development

Priorities

The priority of Instructional Research and Development is ensuring that all our schools are using instructional resources and materials aligned to the MA Curriculum standards. As such, IR&D will develop professional development modules and resources for schools to deepen usage of instructional materials that will increase positive outcomes for all students, as measured by district assessments and PARCC.

This is a direct relation with the Academics Priority of:

successfully implementing MA Curriculum Frameworks
### Instructional Research & Development

#### Quantitative & Qualitative Goals (how we measure our progress)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 Target</th>
<th>2016 Target</th>
<th>2017 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative Goal 1</strong></td>
<td>Math CPI 74.4</td>
<td>Math CPI 78.9</td>
<td>Math CPI 83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative Goal 2</strong></td>
<td>ELA CPI 79.7</td>
<td>ELA CPI 83.7</td>
<td>ELA CPI 87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative Goal 3</strong></td>
<td>Math / ELA SGP 51+</td>
<td>Math / ELA SGP 51+</td>
<td>Math / ELA SGP 51+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 Target</th>
<th>2016 Target</th>
<th>2017 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualitative Goal 1</strong></td>
<td>Identify materials and resources for ELA K2-5</td>
<td>Align all materials and resources to the BPS vision for ELA instruction</td>
<td>All schools are using materials and resources aligned with BPS vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualitative Goal 2</strong></td>
<td>Introduction and implementation of Core Actions as instructional observation tool to identify practice aligned with common core shifts in ELA and Math, K2 – 12th grade</td>
<td>At least 60% of schools will be using Core Actions and Instructional Practice Guides in ELA and Math and Core Actions in all contents; K2-12th grade</td>
<td>All schools are using Core Actions and Instructional Practice Guides for observation and planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Strategic Initiatives

1. Expeditionary Learning (Grades 3-5 ELA) and Fundations (Grades K2-2)
   In 36 schools, Fundations is introduced in K2 and growing to 1st and 2nd grade, building upon the success of early literacy. Simultaneously, 30 schools are introducing Expeditionary Learning (EL) Literacy Curriculum, clearly aligned with standards and instructional practices, consistent with Core Actions and Instructional Practice Guides being used across the district.

2. Math (Grades 6-12 Professional Development – Discipline Specific)
   Through a partnership with Harvard, the Math department will be leading professional development, specific to discipline (such as geometry) to teachers in all high schools, as well as 6th – 8th grade teachers.

3. Grades K-3 Thematic, Project-Based Unit Development
   The Early Childhood Department is developing a 1st grade thematic curriculum, building off of three years of work. This past summer involved evaluation of curriculum with a team of BPS teachers and researchers from HGSE. This development is highly project based, connected to strategic initiative #1 (Expeditionary Learning Literacy Modules) and will inform project based learning in 6th – 8th as well.
Where were we last year? Where are we now?

Last year, we identified the following areas of focus:

1. Knowing the Shifts
2. Using Aligned Materials
3. Supporting Aligned Instructional Practices
4. Focusing on Professional Development
5. Using Aligned Assessments
Know the Shifts

Ensure all staff know and understand the MA Curriculum Frameworks for mathematics, ELA and literacy across content areas and the shifts they require

2013 – 2014

- Professional development sessions for teachers, school leaders, central office in awareness of shifts
- Online PD modules for understanding the shifts by Student Achievement Partners
- Course launched last summer in an institute and continued during the year - 1,600 participants grades PK-12

2014 – 2015

- PD Modules available for teachers and administrators
- Continued work with Student Achievement Partners, connected to the shifts
- Explicit identification of literacy (disciplinary literacy) across all content areas in documents from department (and related PD)
Use Aligned Materials

While using existing materials with revised lessons, ensure instructional resources meet the goals and expectations of the MA Curriculum Frameworks

2013 - 2014

- Leveraged current materials and replaced lessons (ELA), re-sequenced content (Math) to reflect shifts and supplemented with First in Math
- Close reading lessons across content
- Shift toward a focus on evidence of student learning outcomes at defined intervals
- Grade level materials need to be used: complex, compelling texts with a balance of non-fiction; appropriate grade content
- Partnering with Dana Center, Council of Great City Schools, Aspen Institutes – all national leaders on aligned materials development

2014-2015

- Curriculum Documents updated to align with CCSS / MCF 2011
  - Student Learning Outcomes
  - Curriculum Guides
  - Pacing Calendars
  - Cross-Content Calendar
- Close Reading lessons still available across content
- IR&D has a Director of Interdisciplinary Writing who has been researching and evaluating resources and materials for instructional, aligned to standards and curriculum in district

Goal for this year: a district-wide survey on curriculum materials used as core or supplemental
Support Aligned Instructional Practice

Ensure educator effectiveness tools used to guide instructional practice reflect and prioritize the expectations of the MA Curriculum Frameworks

2013 - 2014

- Observation tools in each content area
- Sample student and professional practice goals
- Provide feedback grounded in instructional shifts using observational tool
- Focus school-wide and grade/departmental common planning time on instructional practices aligned to the CCSS
- Close reading lessons materials and PD
- Sample schedules (Elementary)
- Worked with Dr. David Pook to develop professional development to various audiences (administrators, department heads, working groups, schools), create close reading lessons across content areas (still available for all BPS educators), and guide assessments design and revision strategies

2014-2015

- Deep focus on building baseline for instructional practice through Core Actions documents, modeled after Student Achievement Partners tools
- Use of Core Actions in both observations and feedback as well as common planning time
- In all classrooms, we expect to see instructional practice based on standards, and shifts, as indicated by the Instructional Practice Guides (ELA and Math)
- In all schools, we expect to see observation and feedback through the use of Instructional Practice Guides

Goal for this year: monthly professional development sessions with school leaders (network PD) with a clear focus on materials and structures that can be brought back to the school level
Focus Professional Development

Ensure time spent on professional learning deepens educators' knowledge of and facility with the MA Curriculum Frameworks

2013 - 2014
- Teacher Professional Development (e.g., shifts, text complexity, close reading, math practices, fractions institute)
- School Leader Professional Development (summer institute: shifts, instructional resources, observational tools)
- Literacy and math facilitator Professional Development on shifts
- Teacher work groups on text complexity, close reading, materials alignment, assessment/task development

2014 - 2015
- School Leader Professional Development at monthly sessions with a focus on Core Actions (and, related, shifts, standards, instructional resources, observational tools)
- Teacher Professional Development aligned with “Focus on Core” 30 schools (started in June)
- Teacher Professional Development in middle and high school on math specific disciplines (starting October)
- Teacher Professional Development on cross-discipline writing (starting in fall/winter)

Goal for this year: teacher work groups with a strategic focus on writing, both discrete and interdisciplinary
Use Aligned Assessments

*Use district-wide assessments which reflect the expectation of the CCSS*

### 2013 - 2014
- Writing rubrics aligned to three text types
- Predictive assessment items aligned to CCSS
- Performance tasks for PARCC
- Student Learning Outcomes
- Curriculum-embedded performance tasks
- Data, Literacy, and Math Facilitators

### 2014 - 2015
- Aligning Student Learning Outcomes to the Core Actions for clear alignment with shifts
- Development of yearly scope for each content to identify timing for instruction of all concepts

**Goal for this year:** data collections on Core Aligned Literacy Modules (Expeditionary Learning) on both fidelity of implementation and student outcomes to inform lesson planning, teacher practice, professional development, and future implementation of thematic project-based instructional materials
# Academic Turnaround & Transformation

**Quantitative & Qualitative Goals** *(how we measure our progress)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 Target</th>
<th>2016 Target</th>
<th>2017 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative Goal 1</strong></td>
<td>Impact the increase of CPI and SGP in 21 schools, meeting or exceeding each school’s individual benchmark.</td>
<td>Impact the increase of CPI and SGP in 21 schools, meeting or exceeding each school’s individual benchmark.</td>
<td>Impact the increase of CPI and SGP in 21 schools, meeting or exceeding each school’s individual benchmark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualitative Goal 1</strong></td>
<td>Use MA Curriculum Frameworks Implementation Guides to assess the increase in MA Curriculum Frameworks implementation in 21 schools.</td>
<td>Identify the instructional strategies most connected to high quality MA Curriculum Frameworks implementation in 42 schools to inform and improve the implementation tool.</td>
<td>Distribute guidance for all BPS schools on how to use MA Curriculum Frameworks Implementation Guides to assess the increase in Common Core implementation across 128 schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualitative Goal 2</strong></td>
<td>Increase evidence of systems, structures and protocols used to improve instruction in Instructional Leadership Teams and Teacher Professional Collaboration work.</td>
<td>Replicate and distribute the systems, structures and protocols that were connected to the largest student gains to 21 schools.</td>
<td>Distribute guidance for all BPS schools on how to replicate and distribute the systems, structures and protocols that were connected to the largest student gains.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Consistent Implementation of the Core Actions across schools identified as Transforming to improve student achievement, increasing Student Growth and school CPI.

2. Increasing the Professional Capital of the staff in Transforming Schools to develop and strengthen systems, structures and protocols that allow for data driven teacher collaboration that continuously examines instruction and ensures high student performance.

3. Strategic use of resources to provide out of school time learning and enrichment to eliminate the achievement and opportunity gap in our schools.
## Academic Turnaround & Transformation

**Schools Receiving Support from the Academic Response Teams:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transforming (38 Schools)</th>
<th>Schools receiving ART support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: 0 Schools</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: 6 Schools</td>
<td>Ellis, Higginson-Lewis, Winthrop Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: 7 Schools</td>
<td>Frederick, Holmes, Perkins, Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: 4 Schools</td>
<td>Curley, Mission Hill, Tobin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: 6 Schools</td>
<td>Channing Elementary, Chittick Elementary, Grew Elementary Mattahunt Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: 5 Schools</td>
<td>Elihu Greenwood Leadership Academy, Kenny Elementary, Mildred Ave K-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: 9 Schools</td>
<td>Dearborn, Dorchester Academy, Snowden, Madison Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Network ELA Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>2015 Target</th>
<th>2016 Target</th>
<th>2017 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network A</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 80</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 84</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network B</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 71</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 75</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network C</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 72</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 76</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network D</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 72</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 76</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network E</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 79</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 83</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network F</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 77</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 81</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network G</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 91.8</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 92.9</td>
<td>ELA CPI: 94.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All network Student Growth Percentile (SGP) goals are 51 or higher each year.
## Network Math Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>2015 Target</th>
<th>2016 Target</th>
<th>2017 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network A</td>
<td>Math CPI: 78.5</td>
<td>Math CPI: 83</td>
<td>Math CPI: 87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network B</td>
<td>Math CPI: 69.5</td>
<td>Math CPI: 74</td>
<td>Math CPI: 78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network C</td>
<td>Math CPI: 69.5</td>
<td>Math CPI: 74</td>
<td>Math CPI: 78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network D</td>
<td>Math CPI: 66.5</td>
<td>Math CPI: 71</td>
<td>Math CPI: 75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network E</td>
<td>Math CPI: 70.5</td>
<td>Math CPI: 75</td>
<td>Math CPI: 79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network F</td>
<td>Math CPI: 71.5</td>
<td>Math CPI: 76</td>
<td>Math CPI: 80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network G</td>
<td>Math CPI: 83.9</td>
<td>Math CPI: 86.9</td>
<td>Math CPI: 89.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All network Student Growth Percentile (SGP) goals are 51 or higher each year.
# Network A

## Quantitative & Qualitative Goals (how we measure our progress)

### Quantitative Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>2015 Target</th>
<th>2016 Target</th>
<th>2017 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1</td>
<td>ELA Mean CPI: 80</td>
<td>ELA Mean CPI: 84</td>
<td>ELA Mean CPI: 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2</td>
<td>Math Mean CPI 78.5</td>
<td>Math Mean CPI: 83</td>
<td>Math Mean CPI: 87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3</td>
<td>ELA Median SGP: 51+</td>
<td>ELA Median SGP: 51+</td>
<td>ELA Median SGP: 51+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4</td>
<td>Math Median SGP: 51+</td>
<td>Math Median SGP 51+</td>
<td>Math Median SGP: 51+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Qualitative Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>2015 Target</th>
<th>2016 Target</th>
<th>2017 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1</td>
<td>Adopt F &amp; P reading assessment K2-2 in all schools</td>
<td>Reading levels are accelerated by grade level (K2-2)</td>
<td>All K2-2 students read at benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2</td>
<td>Unpack the Core Actions &amp; SLO’s (Gr. K2-8) in all schools</td>
<td>Core Actions &amp; standards guide planning and instruction</td>
<td>Core Actions embedded in instruction &amp; assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3</td>
<td>Deepen understanding of Disciplinary Literacy across the Network</td>
<td>All school integrate Literacy into all subject areas.</td>
<td>Disciplinary Literacy in embedded in instruction &amp; assessments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Network A

Strategic Initiatives (informed by data on subgroups)

1. **Collaboration of Network Leaders** – the 5 schools implementing the Core Aligned Literacy Modules (CALM) (Gr. 3-5) and Fundations (K2- Gr.2). The Adams, Guild, Warren Prescott, Otis and Harvard Kent will develop common interim assessments and will conduct Looking at Student Work sessions across the schools. These 5 schools will become the learning sites for the other schools in the network as we conduct inquiry on the unpacking of the Core Actions in Literacy in grades 3 to 8. High performing schools share best practices in the network.

2. **Focus on Early Grades** - adoption of the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment in all schools in Network A in grades K2 – Grade 2. Three key goals with this initiative: establish reading levels data cycles in the lower grades; track primary reading levels in the network; and accelerate reading comprehension through the systematic instruction of increasingly complex text during guided reading instruction.

3. **Hands on PD** - the network this year will focus on unpacking the Core Actions and Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)- what should they look like in practice and how they must planning. Network PD sessions will be working sessions where teacher leaders and principals will plan lessons and units in order to guide this work at their schools. Learning walks in the CALM schools will support the observation and execution of this work.
Creating the guiding coalition

- Principals & Headmasters Advisory Board
- Student Advisory Board
- External Advisory Board
- Professional Advisory Board (BTU-BPS)
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Transforming Schools

Network B
Boston - Blackstone
Boston - Ellis Mendell
Boston - Higginson/Lewis K-8
Boston - James P Timilty Middle
Boston - John Winthrop
Boston - King K-8

Network C
Boston - Edward Everett
Boston - James Condon Elementary
Boston - John P Holland
Boston - Michael J Perkins
Boston - O W Holmes
Boston - Oliver Hazard Perry
Boston - Paul A Dever

Network D
Boston - James W Hennigan
Boston - Maurice J Tobin
Boston - William McKinley

Network E
Boston - Henry Grew
Boston - James J Chittick
Boston - Mattahunt
Boston - Washington Irving Middle
Boston - William Ellery Channing
Boston - Wm B Rogers Middle

Network F
Boston - Elihu Greenwood Leadership Academy
Boston - Harbor School
Boston - Mather
Boston - Mildred Avenue K-8
Boston - Thomas J Kenny

Network G
Boston - Charlestown High
Boston - Community Academy of Science and Health
Boston - Dearborn
Boston - Dorchester Academy
Boston - East Boston High
Boston - Excel High School
Boston - Jeremiah E Burke High
Boston - Snowden International School at Copley
Boston - Green Academy
Boston – TechBoston Academy
Boston – West Roxbury Academy
Boston - The English High
Boston - Madison Park High
Improving Schools

Network A
Boston - Clarence R Edwards Middle
Boston - Curtis Guild
Boston - Donald McKay
Boston - Harvard-Kent
Boston - Hugh Roe O'Donnell
Boston - Samuel Adams
Boston – Mario Umami Academy

Network B
Boston - David A Ellis
Boston - Samuel W Mason
Boston - William Monroe Trotter

Network C
Boston - John W McCormack
Boston - Joseph P Tynan
Boston – Lila G. Frederick Middle
Boston – UP Academy Dorchester

Network D
Boston - Boston Teachers Union School
Boston - Curley K-8 School
Boston - Edison K-8
Boston - Gardner Pilot Academy
Boston - Horace Mann School for the Deaf
Boston - Jackson Mann
Boston - John F Kennedy
Boston - Mission Hill School

Network E
Boston - Charles Sumner
Boston - Dennis C Haley
Boston – Mozart

Network F
Boston - Charles H Taylor
Boston - Sarah Greenwood
Boston - Young Achievers

Network G
Boston - Another Course To College
Boston - Boston Arts Academy
Boston - Boston Community Leadership Academy
Boston - Brighton High
Boston - Lyon Upper 9-12
Boston - Quincy Upper School
Boston - Urban Science Academy
Boston – Boston Day and Evening Academy
Boston – Margarita Muniz Academy
## Sustaining Schools

### Network A
- Boston - Eliot Elementary
- Boston - James Otis
- Boston - Josiah Quincy
- Boston - Manassah E Bradley
- Boston - Patrick J Kennedy
- Boston - Warren-Prescott

### Network B
- Boston - Joseph J Hurley
- Boston - Nathan Hale
- Boston - Orchard Gardens

### Network C
- Boston - Roger Clap
- Boston - William E Russell
- Boston – UP Academy Boston

### Network D
- Boston - Joseph P Manning
- Boston - Lyon K-8

### Network E
- Boston - Franklin D Roosevelt
- Boston - George H Conley
- Boston - John D Philbrick
- Boston - Joyce Kilmer
- Boston – Lyndon
- Boston - Phineas Bates
- Boston - William H Ohrenberger

### Network F
- Boston - Dr. William Henderson
- Boston - Joseph Lee
- Boston - Rafael Hernandez
- Boston - Richard J Murphy

### Network G
- Boston - Boston International High School
- Boston - Boston Latin
- Boston - Boston Latin Academy
- Boston - Fenway High School
- Boston - New Mission High School
- Boston - O'Bryant School Math/Science
- Boston – Edward M. Kennedy Academy for Health and Careers
The SQR system consists of the following components:

1. School Self-Study to include the development of the school portfolio,
2. School Quality Review (SQR) visit conducted by an external team,
3. School Response and Action Plan, and
4. Review by the Superintendent.

Schools Selection Criteria:

- School with capacity to organize for intensive review
- School with capacity for self-reflection and self-correction
- School with capacity to implement recommendations
- Network Superintendent with the capacity to support the implementation of recommendations

SQR Cycles:

**Cycle 1** - October 1, 2014 - February 27, 2015
**Cycle 2** - November 1, 2014 - March 31, 2015
**Cycle 3** - December 15, 2014 - May 15, 2015
School Participating in SQR 2015

Cycle 1
East Boston High 9-12
McKinley South End Academy K-12
Thomas A. Edison K-8
Lila G. Frederick Middle School 6-8

Cycle 2
James F. Condon Elementary K-5
William Blackstone Elementary K-5
John Winthrop Elementary K-5
William E. Channing Elementary K-5
Rogers Middle School 6-8
Middle School Academy 6-8

Cycle 3
Henry Grew Elementary K-5
Samuel W. Mason Elementary School K-5
Quincy Upper School 6-12
William Monroe Trotter K-5, Growing into K-8
Schools Participating in Data Inquiry Cycles
(Office of Data & Accountability)

- Boston International Newcomers Academy*
- Brighton High School
- Burke High School
- Community Academy of Science & Health
- Edwards Middle
- Everett Elementary
- Excel High*
- Haley Elementary*
- Harvard Kent Elementary*
- Hernandez K-8*
- Irving Middle
- Joseph Lee*
- O'Donnell Elementary
- Ohrenberger
- Rogers*
- Sarah Greenwood K-8
- Snowden International
- Taylor Elementary
- TechBoston Academy*
- Timilty Middle School*
- Urban Science Academy
- West Roxbury Academy

* Second year in BPS Inquiry Network
Schools working with ANET

- Curley K-8
- David A. Ellis
- Elihu Greenwood
- Henry Grew
- Higginson-Lewis K-8
- Jackson Mann
- James J Chittick
- Joseph P. Tynan Elementary
- King K-8
- Mather
- Mildred Avenue Middle School
- Patrick J Kennedy
- William Ellery Channing
- Winship Elementary
- Young Achievers
- Blackstone Elementary
- Dearborn 6-12 STEM Early College Academy
- Dever Elementary
- Elliot K-8
- Ellis Mendell
- Gardner Pilot Academy
- Guild Elementary
- Henderson K-12 Inclusion School
- James Condon Elementary
- Joseph J. Hurley K-8
- Manning Elementary
- Mario Umana Academy
- Mattahunt
- Maurice J. Tobin K-8 School
- McCormack Middle
- McKay K-8
- O W Holmes
- Orchard Gardens Pilot School
- Roger Clap
- Samuel W. Mason School
- Thomas Edison K8 School
- UP Academy
- UP Academy Charter School of Dorchester
- UP Academy Holland
- William E. Russell
- Winthrop Elementary
Network A: Spring 2014 MCAS All Grades Result by Subject by School

Network B: Spring 2014 MCAS All Grades Result by Subject by School

Network C: Spring 2014 MCAS All Grades Result by Subject by School

### Network D: Spring 2014 MCAS All Grades Result by Subject by School

#### English Language Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean CPI</th>
<th>Median SGP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William McGee</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James W. Worrall</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace Mann</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton Hill School</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemenway</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar K. &amp; L.</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winthrop Elementary</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolidge &amp; School</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Pilot Academy</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean CPI</th>
<th>Median SGP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William McGee</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James W. Worrall</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace Mann</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton Hill School</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemenway</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar K. &amp; L.</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winthrop Elementary</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolidge &amp; School</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Pilot Academy</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>85.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Science and Technology/Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean CPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William McGee</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James W. Worrall</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace Mann</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton Hill School</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemenway</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar K. &amp; L.</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winthrop Elementary</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolidge &amp; School</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Pilot Academy</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph P. Manning</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph P. Manning</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHS &amp; Pilot</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph P. Manning</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Network E: Spring 2014 MCAS All Grades Result by Subject by School

Network F: Spring 2014 MCAS All Grades Result by Subject by School

Transforming Schools
Improving Schools
Sustaining Schools
Insufficient data

English Language Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Transforming</th>
<th>Improving</th>
<th>Sustaining</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Kennedy</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred Avenue K-8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Greenswood</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matta</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Academy</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellison/Porter ES</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Transforming</th>
<th>Improving</th>
<th>Sustaining</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mildred Avenue K-8</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor School</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Kennedy</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Greenswood</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Science and Technology/Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean CPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young Academy</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred Avenue...</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Kennedy</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Greenswood</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor School</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Taylor</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Murphy</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Lee</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Network G High School Level:
Spring 2014 MCAS All Grades Result by Subject by School

Transforming Schools  Improving Schools  Sustaining Schools  Insufficient data

English Language Arts

Mean CPI  Median SGP

Mathematics

Mean CPI  Median SGP

Science and Technology/Engineering

Mean CPI

Data source: http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/mcas.aspx  Downloaded: 09/22/2014
# Network G Middle-High School Level:
Spring 2014 MCAS All Grades Result by Subject by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Transforming Schools</th>
<th>Improving Schools</th>
<th>Sustaining Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Language Arts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean CPI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Median SGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearborn</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Boston Academy</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quincy Upper School</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Green Acad</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Bryant School</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Latin Academy</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Latin</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean CPI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Median SGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Boston Academy</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearborn</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Green Acad</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quincy Upper School</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Latin Academy</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Bryant School</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Latin</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science and Technology/Engineering</strong></td>
<td>Mean CPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearborn</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Boston Academy</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quincy Upper School</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Green Acad</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Bryant School</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Latin Academy</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Latin</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: [http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/mcas.aspx](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/mcas.aspx)  
Downloaded: 09/22/2014
School percentiles
A school percentile between 1 and 99 is reported for schools with at least four years of data. This number is an indication of the school’s overall performance relative to other schools that serve the same or similar grades. All schools are classified into one of five school type categories: (1) Elementary, usually schools serving grades K-5 or K-6; (2) Elementary/Middle, usually schools serving grades K-8; (3) Middle, usually schools serving grades 6-8 or 7-8; (4) Middle/High, usually schools serving grades 7-12 or K-12; and (5) High, usually schools serving grades 9-12. State law requires Massachusetts to classify into Level 3 those schools that are among the lowest performing 20 percent relative to other schools of the same school type. These schools are considered to be the lowest-achieving, least-improving schools in the state. For a school to be eligible for classification into Level 3 or assigned a percentile, it must have sufficient data to be compared to other schools based on achievement and improvement.

Cumulative Progress and Performance Index (PPI)
The cumulative PPI combines information about narrowing proficiency gaps, growth, and graduation and dropout rates over the most recent four-year period into a single number between 0 and 100. All districts, schools, and groups with sufficient data are assigned an annual PPI based on two years of data and a cumulative PPI between 0 and 100 based on three annual PPIs. The annual PPI is a measure of the improvement that a group makes toward its own targets over a two-year period on up to seven indicators: narrowing proficiency gaps (in English language arts (ELA), mathematics, and science); growth (ELA and mathematics); the annual dropout rate; and the cohort graduation rate. The cumulative PPI is the average of a group’s annual PPIs over four years, weighting the most recent years the most (1-2-3-4). A cumulative PPI is calculated for a group if it has at least three annual PPIs. If a group is missing an annual PPI for one year, that year is left out of the weighting (e.g., 1-X-3-4). While a group’s annual PPI can exceed 100 points, the cumulative PPI is always reported on a 100-point scale. For a school to be considered to be making progress toward narrowing proficiency gaps, the cumulative PPI for both the “all students” group and high needs students must be 75 or higher.

Proficiency Gap Narrowing and Composite Performance Index (CPI)
All groups (districts, schools, and subgroups) are expected to halve the distance between their level of performance in 2011 and proficiency by the year 2017. Massachusetts uses the 100-point Composite Performance Index (CPI) to measure progress towards this goal of narrowing proficiency gaps. The CPI assigns 100, 75, 50, 25, or 0 points to each student participating in MCAS and MCAS-Alternate Assessment tests based on how close they came to scoring Proficient or Advanced. (For example, all students scoring Proficient or Advanced are assigned 100 CPI points; students with very low MCAS scores are assigned 0 CPI points.) The CPI is calculated by dividing the total number of points by the number of students in the group. The result is a number between 0 and 100. A CPI of 100 means that all students in a group are proficient.
Glossary

Student Growth Percentile (SGP)
A student growth percentile measures student progress by comparing one student’s progress to the progress of other students with similar MCAS performance histories. We refer to students with similar score histories as “academic peers.” Percentiles are commonly understood values that express the percentage of cases that fall below a certain score. For example:

• A student with a growth percentile of 90 in 5th grade mathematics grew as much or more than 90 percent of her academic peers (students with similar score histories) from the 4th grade math MCAS to the 5th grade math MCAS. Only 10% of her academic peers grew more in math than she did.

Because growth is measuring change in performance rather than absolute performance, it doesn’t matter how a student performed on the MCAS last year. In any given testing year, each student has an equal opportunity to grow at the 99th percentile. In other words, even though a student may not achieve a score of 278 out of 280 this year, it is possible for a student to have grown at the 99th percentile from last year to this year. Although a student may perform well below the proficiency mark, that student could potentially have a high growth percentile. Such an occurrence could indicate that a program, a new approach, or something else is working for this student.

Student Growth Percentiles in Aggregate
To summarize student growth rates by subgroup, grade, school, or district level, individual student growth percentiles can be aggregated. The most appropriate measure for reporting growth for a group is the median student growth percentile (the middle score if one ranks the individual student growth percentiles from highest to lowest). The average or mean is not an appropriate measure when comparing percentiles. A typical school or district in the Commonwealth would have a median student growth percentile of 50.

No matter how student growth percentiles are aggregated, whether at the subgroup, school, or district level, the statistic and its interpretation remain the same. For example, if the students with disabilities in your district have a median student growth percentile of 53, that particular group of students, on average, achieved higher than their academic peers—a group of students who may or may not be students with disabilities. The median student growth percentile does not indicate that your students with disabilities improved more than 53 percent of other students with disabilities. It does not indicate that your students with disabilities improved more than 53 percent of students without disabilities. The comparison group is always the students’ academic peers: students with similar MCAS test score histories.