

AT-RISK LEVEL 3 SCHOOLS

Dan Anderson, Strategy Team
Shira DeCovnick, Office of Turnaround & Transformation

Low Performing Schools

- Schools that have been designated by the state as level 4
- Schools that have been ranked by the state as level 3 and which are in the bottom 10% of schools statewide (based on 2015-2016 accountability data)

Accountability Levels: “Level 3”

	<u>Description</u>	<u>ESE Engagement</u>
<i>Commendation Schools</i>	High achieving, high growth, gap narrowing schools (subset of Level 1)	
Level 1	Meeting proficiency gap narrowing goals (for aggregate & high needs students)	Very low
Level 2	Not meeting proficiency gap narrowing goals (for aggregate &/or high needs students)	Low
Level 3	Lowest performing 20% of schools (including lowest performing subgroups)	High
Level 4	Lowest performing schools (subset of Level 3)	Very high
Level 5	Chronically underperforming schools (subset of Level 3 & 4)	Extremely high

Level 3 schools...

1. Are in the lowest performing 20% of schools across the state within same grade span, and/or
2. Have subgroups among the lowest performing 20% of subgroups across the state, and/or
3. Have persistently low graduation rates for one or more groups (below 70%), and/or
4. Score high enough to be Level 2 schools but have very low test participation (less than 90%)

BPS Level 3 schools in bottom 1-5% statewide

Blackstone (3)*	Perkins (5)
Chittick (2)	Timilty (5)
Ellis (3)	McKinley (5)
Holmes (3)	Urban Science (5)
King K-8 (5)	West Roxbury Academy (4)
Mendell (3)	

*Blackstone is a former Level 4 school

BPS Level 3 schools in bottom 6-10% statewide

Condon (9)

Edwards (8)

Frederick (9)

Hennigan (9)

Higginson-Lewis (7)

Irving (6)

Mason (9)

Mission Hill (7)

Sumner (10)

Tobin (6)

Winship (8)

East Boston (6)

Charlestown (9)

CASH (6)

Lyon Upper (7)

Demographics of BPS Level 3 Schools in 1-5%

	Black	Asian	Hispanic/ Latino	White	ELL	Students with Disabilities	Economically Disadvantaged
BPS	35%	9%	42%	14%	30%	20%	70%
All 1-5% L3 Schools	44.3%	1.4%	43.8%	6.9%	27%	27.4%	68.2%
Difference from BPS Average (Percentage Point)	+9.3	-7.6	+1.8	-7.1	-3	+7.4	-1.8

Schools with a Monitoring Site Visit (MSV) in 16-17

Level 4 Schools	Level 3 Schools (from bottom 5% statewide)
Brighton High School Channing Elementary Dorchester Academy Dearborn STEM Academy English High School Excel High School Grew Elementary Madison Park High School Winthrop Elementary	Blackstone Elementary Chittick Elementary Ellis Elementary Holmes Elementary King (K-8) Mendell Elementary Perkins Elementary Timilty Middle School Urban Science Academy West Roxbury Academy

Key Takeaways from 19 Monitoring Site Visit (MSV) Reports

- Most significant needs are in core instruction and intervention
- BPS struggling schools tend to struggle with the same challenges
- BPS Level 4 schools show improvement on overall performance over time
- Selected Level 3 schools mirror the performance of first year Level 4 schools

Turnaround Practice Ratings

	Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration	Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction	Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students	School Climate and Culture
Brighton	Developing	Developing	Developing	Developing
Excel HS	Developing	Developing	Developing	Developing
Dorchester Acadmy.	Developing	Developing	Developing	Providing
Timilty	Developing	Providing	Developing	Developing
Dearborn STEM	Providing	Providing	Developing	Developing
Holmes	Providing	Providing	Developing	Developing
King	Providing	Providing	Developing	Providing
Madison Park	Providing	Providing	Developing	Providing
West Roxbury	Providing	Providing	Developing	Providing
Blackstone	Developing	Providing	Providing	Providing
Chittick	Providing	Developing	Providing	Sustaining
Ellis	Providing	Providing	Providing	Providing
Perkins	Providing	Providing	Providing	Providing
Urban Science	Providing	Providing	Providing	Providing
Winthrop	Providing	Providing	Providing	Providing
Mendell	Sustaining	Providing	Providing	Providing
Channing	Sustaining	Providing	Providing	Sustaining
The English	Coherent Implementation	Providing	Coherent Implementation	Sustaining
Grew	Coherent Implementation	Sustaining	Coherent Implementation	Coherent Implementation

Limited Evidence

Developing

Providing

Sustaining

Coherent Implementation

Overall Strengths and Growth Areas

Leadership, Shared Responsibility, Prof. Collaboration	Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction	Student Specific Support & Instruction to all Students	School Culture and Climate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Use of time for collaboration ● Use of autonomies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Classroom Observation data use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Academic Interventions for English Language Learners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Family and Community Engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Vision / Theory of Action Buy-in ● Monitoring Implementation of School Progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Instructional Schedule ● Using Student Assess. data for schoolwide decision-making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Multi-tiered System of Supports ● Teacher training to identify needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Adult-Student Relationships ● Schoolwide Behavior Plan

Classroom Observation Results: Elementary

Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Classroom Organization Domain		Emotional Support Domain		Instructional Support Domain		Student Engagement
Grades:	PK-3	4-8	PK-3	4-8	PK-3	4-8	4-8
Blackstone	5.9	6.9	5.4	4.5	4.3	4.5	5.7
Channing	6.1	6.7	5.9	5.8	4.4	5.1	5.7
Chittick	6	6.5	5.5	4.5	3.3	4.4	5.3
Ellis	5.8	6.4	5.3	4.1	3.8	4	5.2
Grew	6.2	6.9	6.1	5.8	4.9	5.7	6.3
Holmes	5.6	5.8	5.2	3.8	3.4	4	4
Mendell	5.5	6.1	5.5	4.5	2.8	3.8	5.5
Perkins	6.3	6.4	6	3.8	4.5	4.4	5
Winthrop	5.8	6.4	5.3	4.4	3.4	3.9	5.4
King	5.9	5.9	5.4	4	3.2	3.6	4.7
Average	5.9	6.4	5.6	4.5	3.8	4.3	5.3

Classroom Observation Results: Middle/Highs

Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Classroom Organization Domain	Emotional Support Domain	Instructional Support Domain	Student Engagement
Brighton	6.3	4.7	4.6	5.2
Dearborn	6.5	4.2	3.2	5
Dorchester Acdmy.	6.2	4.8	4	4.9
Excel	6.2	4.8	4	4.9
Madison Park	6.3	5	3.7	5.2
The English	6.1	5.3	4.3	5.1
Timilty	6.1	5.2	4.7	5.3
Urban Science	6.2	4.9	4.2	4.9
West Roxbury	5.7	4.8	3.6	4.3
Average	6.2	4.9	4.0	5.0

Observations Strengths and Growth Areas

Classroom Organization	Emotional Support	Instructional Support	Student Engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Negative Climate (<u>very few</u> instances) ● Productivity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teacher sensitivity in elementary grades 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Content Understanding in elementary grades 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Engagement in elementary grades
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Behavior Management in some high schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Regard for student perspectives in elementary grades ● Positive Climate in high schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Analysis and Inquiry ● Instructional Dialogue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Engagement in high schools

SY16-17 Supports to Low Performing Schools

District Strategy	Level 4 Schools	Low Performing Level 3 Schools (in bottom 10% across MA)
Technical Assistance Teams	10	2
Academic Response Team (ART) Residency	6	6
Data Inquiry Team Residency	5	8
Schools with activities funded by Strategic Support grant	-	20
Two-day Monitoring Site Visit	9	10
Acceleration Academies	5	12

Support for Low Performing Schools this Year

- Continue past supports and other central office interventions as needed
- Includes a broad array of the District Leadership Team members and central office staff at all levels
- Scope of work includes:
 - Establishing consistent diagnostic process for assessing need in low performing schools
 - Coordinating central office supports for low performing schools to directly address diagnosed need
 - Establishing toolkit of viable/effective school models
 - Intervene in low performing schools now before any designation

APPENDIX: DATA FOR SCHOOLS IN 1-5%

Blackstone Elementary

Composite Performance Index (CPI)

Subject	SY12-13	SY13-14	SY14-15	SY15-16	2016 PARCC & MCAS: Percent L4-5 & Prof/Adv	
ELA	62.3	56.9	56.2	56.9	16%	
Math	66.5	64.3	62.6	62.2	21%	
Science	37	40.4	39.8	42.8	3%	

Student Growth Percentile (SGP)

ELA	52	40	32	36
Math	54	54	48	41

Statewide School Percentile Rank

Elementary schools	9	7	3	3
--------------------	---	---	---	---

**Enrollment SY16-17:
585**

Chittick Elementary

Composite Performance Index (CPI)

Subject	SY12-13	SY13-14	SY14-15	SY15-16	2016 PARCC & MCAS: Percent L4-5 & Prof/Adv	
ELA	69.2	65.5	68.8	76.1	36%	
Math	64.7	71	67.5	65.6	25%	
Science	54.1	56.4	50	40.5	3%	

Student Growth Percentile (SGP)

ELA	61	39	61	36
Math	42	42	42	26

Statewide School Percentile Rank

Elementary schools	5	4	4	2
--------------------	---	---	---	---

Enrollment SY16-17:
296

Ellis Elementary

Composite Performance Index (CPI)

Subject	SY12-13	SY13-14	SY14-15	SY15-16	2016 PARCC & MCAS: Percent L4-5 & Prof/Adv
ELA	56.8	62.4	63.5	57.5	26%
Math	61	66.7	58.3	55.8	23%
Science	43.3	45.9	50	44.4	17%

Student Growth Percentile (SGP)

ELA	45	51	50	22
Math	60	63	44	33

Statewide School Percentile Rank

Elementary schools	7	10	7	3
--------------------	---	----	---	---

Enrollment SY16-17:
438

Holmes Elementary

Composite Performance Index (CPI)

Subject	SY12-13	SY13-14	SY14-15	SY15-16	2016 PARCC & MCAS: Percent L4-5 & Prof/Adv
ELA	67.3	63.1	68.2	64.2	27%
Math	65.2	62.9	69.6	65.8	22%
Science	49.3	40.1	57	33.7	0%

Student Growth Percentile (SGP)

ELA	65	40	60	27
Math	53	33	60	25

Statewide School Percentile Rank

Elementary schools	12	6	12	3
--------------------	----	---	----	---

**Enrollment SY16-17:
368**

King K-8

Composite Performance Index (CPI)

Subject	SY12-13	SY13-14	SY14-15	SY15-16	2016 PARCC & MCAS: Percent L4-5 & Prof/Adv	
ELA	71.8	69.9	62.1	59.6	14%	
Math	58.7	68.4	52.4	52.7	11%	
Science	46.5	44.9	40.4	44.6	2%	

Student Growth Percentile (SGP)

ELA	45	40	32	36
Math	42	52	25	37

Statewide School Percentile Rank

Elem/Middle schools	4	4	4	5
---------------------	---	---	---	---

**Enrollment SY16-17:
490**

McKinley K-12

Composite Performance Index (CPI)

Subject	SY12-13	SY13-14	SY14-15	SY15-16	2016 PARCC & MCAS: Percent L4-5 & Prof/Adv
ELA	56.7	48.2	57.0	53.9	53%*
Math	43	36.4	44.1	44.7	25%*
Science	50.4	30.3	42.9	42.5	7%*

Student Growth Percentile (SGP)

ELA	44	33	47	23
Math	25	25	42	60

*Includes only grade 10

Statewide School Percentile Rank

K-12 schools	6	4	4	5
--------------	---	---	---	---

**Enrollment SY16-17:
337**

Mendell Elementary

Composite Performance Index (CPI)

Subject	SY12-13	SY13-14	SY14-15	SY15-16	2016 PARCC & MCAS: Percent L4-5 & Prof/Adv	
ELA	60.3	67.2	68.4	74.4	43%	
Math	68.3	69.5	67.4	72.2	41%	
Science	48.8	35.9	45.7	58.9	21%	

Student Growth Percentile (SGP)

ELA	23.5	47.5	37	34
Math	43	46	32	24

Statewide School Percentile Rank

Elementary schools	3	3	3	3
--------------------	---	---	---	---

**Enrollment SY16-17:
244**

Perkins Elementary

Composite Performance Index (CPI)

Subject	SY12-13	SY13-14	SY14-15	SY15-16	2016 PARCC & MCAS: Percent L4-5 & Prof/Adv	
ELA	67.9	66.8	81.6	66	27%	
Math	70	71.3	77.7	71.9	32%	
Science	47.5	58.7	50	69.1	35%	

Student Growth Percentile (SGP)

ELA	37	21	46	21
Math	33.5	14	26	16

Statewide School Percentile Rank

Elementary schools	5	3	4	5
--------------------	---	---	---	---

**Enrollment SY16-17:
238**

Timilty Middle School

Composite Performance Index (CPI)

Subject	SY12-13	SY13-14	SY14-15	SY15-16	2016 PARCC & MCAS: Percent L4-5 & Prof/Adv
ELA	68.8	68.9	73.5	61.6	20%
Math	59.2	55.7	55.8	47.3	15%
Science	44	50.4	49.8	39.3	6%

Student Growth Percentile (SGP)

ELA	42	40	53	31
Math	41.5	41	46	34

Statewide School Percentile Rank

Middle schools	5	3	6	5
----------------	---	---	---	---

**Enrollment SY16-17:
371**

Urban Science Academy

Composite Performance Index (CPI)

Subject	SY12-13	SY13-14	SY14-15	SY15-16	2016 PARCC & MCAS: Percent L4-5 & Prof/Adv
ELA	93.9	95.6	92.7	91.6	77%
Math	78.8	85.2	73.3	74.7	47%
Science	65.3	64.8	59.7	63.1	29%

Student Growth Percentile (SGP)

ELA	41.5	55	36.5	30.5
Math	35	55	38	41

Statewide School Percentile Rank

High schools	16	14	8	5
--------------	----	----	---	---

Enrollment SY16-17:
432

West Roxbury Academy

Composite Performance Index (CPI)

Subject	SY12-13	SY13-14	SY14-15	SY15-16	2016 PARCC & MCAS: Percent L4-5 & Prof/Adv
ELA	85.7	86.7	90.4	91.3	70%
Math	66.4	70.4	66.7	82.2	50%
Science	66.4	65.4	62.8	68.5	24%

Student Growth Percentile (SGP)

ELA	42	33	39	36.5
Math	34	36	40	50

Statewide School Percentile Rank

High schools	NA	NA	3	4
--------------	----	----	---	---

Enrollment SY16-17:
496

APPENDIX B

2015-16 Percent of Economically Disadvantaged Students by Configuration & Level

Configuration	Level 1 (n=22)	Level 2 (n=27)	Level 3 (n=47)	Level 4 (n=10)	Level 5 (n=2)	Average
Elementary (n=41)	46%	45%	59%	62%	66%	53%
Elementary-Middle (n=30)	45%	41%	55%	--	--	48%
High School (n=20)	41%	52%	48%	57%	--	49%
Middle School (n=5)	--	--	59%	--	--	59%
Middle-High & K-12 (n=12)	43%	39%	54%	56%	--	46%
Average	44%	43%	56%	59%	66%	51%

2015-16 Intake Percentage by Configuration & Level

Proportion of students who entered their schools after the first day of the school year

Configuration	Level 1 (n=22)	Level 2 (n=27)	Level 3 (n=47)	Level 4 (n=10)	Level 5 (n=2)	Average
Elementary (n=41)	12%	17%	18%	27%	21%	17%
Elementary-Middle (n=30)	13%	12%	19%	-	-	15%
High School (n=20)	17%	10%	21%	31%	-	22%
Middle School (n=5)	-	-	22%	-	-	22%
Middle-High & K-12 (n=12)	4%	7%	23%	15%	-	13%
Average	13%	12%	20%	28%	21%	17%

BPS's experience with federal intervention models

Accountability action	Transformation	Turnaround	Restart	Closure	TBD
Exited L4 status	1	5	0	0	
Exited Level 4 in 3 years	1	4	0	0	
Exited Level 4 in 4 years	0	1	0	0	
Designated L4-under review	0	2	0	0	
Designated Level 5	1	1	0	0	
Former L4: Increased percentile SY 15-16	0	0	0	0	
Current L4: Increased percentile in SY 15-16	0	4	1	0	0

Monitoring Site Visit Methodology

In ESE's research on the first cohort of Level 4 schools, four Turnaround Practices were used consistently by schools making achievement gains*. **The MSV assesses the strength of a school's practices in these four Turnaround Practices:**

1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration
2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction
3. Student Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students
4. School Climate and Culture

The assessments are made based on **a two day visit to the school by the American Institutes of Research**, where researchers collect the following forms of evidence:

- Interviews and focus groups with faculty, students, administrators, and district leaders
- Classroom observations
- 100-question survey of instructional staff
- Documents and artifacts provided by the school

*<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ease/accountability/turnaround/practices-report-2014.pdf>

2011-2014 MSVs: Methodology and Components

The MSV process was designed around **Essential Conditions for School Effectiveness** (Essential Conditions). The Essential Conditions were developed in 2009 and voted into regulation by the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education in 2010 to represent a research- and practice-based consensus of practices for effective schools.

During these years, the MSV utilized multiple sources of evidence (documents, interviews, classroom visits) to understand the progress the school made toward implementing plans for school turnaround.

Strengths identified programs, practices and operations that were working well and supporting effective school turnaround implementation.

Growth Areas identified practices and operations that needed attention to better serve students and/or school turnaround implementation.

2015-Present MSVs: Definition of Ratings

- **Limited Evidence:** Indicators for this turnaround practice area show limited or no evidence of implementation of the organizational practices, structures, and/or processes.
- **Developing:** Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that all or most of the organizational practices, structures, and/or processes related to this area exist on paper or are being tried but are not yet fully developed or implemented.
- **Providing:** Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that related systems are functional, and their structures and processes are implemented consistently throughout the school; however, either communication or systemic decision making is limited.
- **Sustaining:** Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that the organizational practices, structures, and processes are functioning effectively, and timely feedback systems are embedded to identify potential problems and challenges.
- **Coherent Implementation:** The organizational practices across all indicators within turnaround practice are at the sustaining level and are working together to support one another in a way that is meaningful for staff and students.

2015-Present MSVs: Classroom Observation Domains

Emotional Support	Classroom Organization	Instructional Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positive Climate Teacher Sensitivity Regard for Student Perspectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Behavior Management Productivity Negative Climate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructional Learning Formats Content Understanding Analysis and Inquiry Quality of Feedback Instructional Dialogue
Student Engagement		

Sample Ratings Calculation from Observations

Student Engagement School Average*: 4.4

	Low Range		Middle Range			High Range	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of Observations		3	3	10	6	6	1

*The school average is an average of the observation scores. In Table 13, the school average is computed as:

$$([2 \times 3] + [3 \times 3] + [4 \times 10] + [5 \times 6] + [6 \times 6] + [7 \times 1]) \div 29 \text{ observations} = 4.4$$