Focused Planning for Accelerating Student Learning

Fall River Public Schools

October 15, 2012

Meg Mayo-Brown, Superintendent of Schools

Section 1: Summary of Key Issues and Strategic Objectives

In this section summarize the key issues arising from the District Review and any other available quantitative and qualitative evidence. Identify the Strategic Objectives that the Plan will focus on and why they are important (maximum 900 words). Conclude with a Theory of Action.

From 2009 – 2011 the Fall River Public Schools was under a recovery plan co-developed with the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. This plan stemmed from a district review that found significant deficiencies in the system as whole. More specifically, the review revealed the areas of School Committee Governance, Human Resources, Financial Management, and Teaching and Learning were significantly flawed, negatively impacting the quality of education provided to students.

Through much planning and restructuring, the District showed significant improvement. The final monitoring report from October 2011 states, "Overall, there has been significant progress made in putting processes and systems in place that will lead to high quality teaching and learning in the Fall River Public Schools." The report continues on to define the next level of District improvement work.

> *The challenge that now faces the District is to constantly monitor the work across the school system, from the central office to the classroom level. The goal is to ensure that in each and every classroom the newly aligned curriculum is alive and being delivered in a consistent manner, using appropriate teaching strategies.*

The four Strategic Objectives in this plan are meant to accomplish this goal: *Each child in every classroom receives high quality instruction, each and every day.*

Strategic Objective 1 aims to ensure that communication between central office and schools, as well as among and within schools is fluid and purposeful. This strategy recognizes the need to have staff members collectively work towards the academic success of all students. We accomplish this through two avenues. First, each school is assigned an Office of Instruction Liaison to support and oversee the specific work of the school. Second, the Office of Instruction facilitates district-wide networks of instructional coaching/department heads in ELA, Math, and Student Adjustment Counselors. These key personnel then in turn facilitate their respective school-based vertical teams.

The district's mission is to prepare all students for success in college and careers. This can only be achieved through the teaching and learning of a rigorous curriculum, aligned with 21st century skills (e.g., critical thinking, problem solving, and real-world applications). The purpose of Strategic Objective 2 is to define such rigorous learning expectations, and provide teachers with the tools and knowledge they will need to ensure that *all* students achieve those college and career readiness expectations. These efforts are currently focused on implementing the instructional shifts of the Common Core that emphasize improved focus, coherence, and rigor across content areas.

Strategic Objective 3 recognizes that students' social and emotional readiness to learn impacts their ability to learn. That is, students' abilities to recognize and manage their emotions, demonstrate caring and concern for others, establish positive relationships, make responsible decisions, constructively handle challenging social situations, and persevere through challenging tasks either enhance or diminish their engagement in learning. The District believes that these social skills are not predetermined nor a fixed character trait. Rather, Strategic Objective 3 sets out to proactively enhance these skills in students through arming staff with knowledge and tools and aims to engage families and the larger community in supporting the social and emotional development of students.

The intended impact of Strategic Objectives 1-3 will not reach their full potential without systematically improving the quality of all educators, the focus of Strategic Objective 4. Educator improvement opportunities occur in a variety of professional development formats, from large scale training sessions, collaborative planning and problem-solving with colleagues, to self-reflection on unsuccessful and successful practices. In addition, a key driver in this improvement is feedback to all staff. Just as students need specific feedback on their performance, so too do all staff. This feedback can occur both formally or informally. The feedback must be purposeful and drive improvement either through actionable pedagogical strategies or directed professional development that targets the needs of groups as well as individual staff members. Effective implementation of the AIP will lead to a dramatic increase in student performance over the course of SY13. These targets are designated below:

Project the 2013 annual PPI and 2013 cumulative PPI		**PPI Points Awarded**			
		2010	**2011**	**2012**	**Projected 2013**
English language arts	Narrowing proficiency gaps (Composite Performance Index)	25		25	75
	Growth (Student Growth Percentiles)	50	50	50	100
	Extra credit for decreasing % Warning/Failing (10% or more)				25
	Extra credit for increasing % Advanced (10% or more)		25		25
Mathematics	Narrowing proficiency gaps (Composite Performance Index)	50	50	25	75
	Growth (Student Growth Percentiles)	75	50	50	100
	Extra credit for decreasing % Warning/Failing (10% or more)	25			25
	Extra credit for increasing % Advanced (10% or more)	25			25
Science	Narrowing proficiency gaps (Composite Performance Index)	50	25		75
	Extra credit for decreasing % Warning/Failing (10% or more)	25			25
	Extra credit for increasing % Advanced (10% or more)			25	25
High School	Cohort Graduation Rate	75	75	25	50
	Annual Dropout Rate	50	50	50	100
Points awarded for narrowing proficiency gaps, growth, and high school indicators		375	350	225	575
Points awarded for extra credit		75	25	25	150
Total points awarded		450	375	250	725
Number of proficiency gap narrowing, growth, and high school indicators		7	7	6	7
Actual 2010, 2011, 2012, & *Projected* 2013 Annual PPIs = (Total points / number of indicators)		**64**	**54**	**42**	**104**

While this plan contains four strategic objectives, they are anything but discrete. We understand that our goal of preparing all students for college and careers is dependent upon how well these objectives work in unison. That is, high quality rigorous instruction (Strategic Objective 2) will not occur without improving educator quality (Strategic Objective 4) and will need to include supporting the social emotional needs of students and families (Strategic Objective 3). Furthermore, we view the communication networks within schools and from district to schools (Strategic Objective 1) to be the

conduit or "central artery" through which this work occurs. Once all parts are working as a seamless system, then the district will be able to accelerate student learning.

District Theory of Action

If all improvement efforts are strategically aligned to improve delivery of effective, high quality, and rigorous instruction,
and
If we as a staff collectively engage in the implementation of those efforts,
and
If we utilize our communication networks to monitor, support, and provide feedback on educator performance,
then
Each student will receive a high quality education that prepares them to be successful in college and future careers.

Section 2: Plan Summary

Strategic Objective 1: District systems developed and or strengthened during Recovery support effective school-based implementation of School Improvement Plans through enhanced leadership capacity and administrator quality.		
Strategic Initiatives	**Early Evidence of Change, Short-term Outcomes, and Final Outcomes**	**Interdependencies**
1. Provide differentiated support to schools through continuation of school review visits from Office of Instruction. Currently, the achievement levels and needs of each of the district's 16 schools are vast. The purpose of the School Review Visits is to provide differentiated support to schools based on their need level. This support is accomplished through assigning a member of the Office of Instruction to schools as a School Review Visit (SRV) Partner, matching the need of the school with the expertise of the OOI Staff. In addition, schools in greater need are visited more frequently. The SRV Partner works closely with the Principal and the Instructional Leadership Team on school improvement efforts. This work begins with a "Data Think Tank" session conducted collaboratively with Office of Instruction and a school's leadership team to conduct a root cause analysis of the previous year's performance data. That process leads to identifying high leverage short term goals, which then become the focus of the School Review Visits (see Appendix A for Short Term Goal Template). The goals are set for a 2-3 month increments so as to allow for mid-course corrections and are assessed through early evidence of change and defined short term outcomes, as parallel to the Accelerated Improvement Plan (AIP) structure.	**Early Evidence of Change** • School improvement efforts are focused and targeted with regard to short term goals as measured by memos, common planning agendas, professional practice /student learning goals and embedded professional development sessions and recorded in the School Review Visit Monitoring Tool (Part A). Data is compiled bi-weekly for Tier 3 schools (Henry Lord, Tansey, Letourneau, Morton, & Watson), monthly for Tier 2 schools (Durfee, Spencer Borden, Fonseca, Talbot, Doran, RPS, & Stone) and quarterly for Tier 1 schools (Kuss, Viveiros, Greene, & Silvia). SRV Partners will provide feedback on all data collected with the School Review Visit Monitoring Tool to schools according to the tiered schedule described above, providing multiple entry points for mid-course corrections. • Principals are routinely leading school walkthroughs and provided oral and written feedback that is focused on the identified short term goals at least 80% of the time. Data is compiled within School Review Visit Monitoring Tool (Part A). **Short-term Outcomes** • All schools will have an increase of 10% to15% of students demonstrating proficiency or above using the district benchmarks as identified in the Short Term Goal Template for the given 2-3 month time period. **Final Outcomes** • Schools that showed a decline (Tansey, Letourneau, & Morton) or no change (Henry Lord, Spencer Borden, Fonseca & Watson) as measured by the annual Progress and Performance Index (PPI) less than 50 will improve to an annual PPI of 50 or above for SY 13. • Schools that improved but below target (Silvia, Talbot, & Doran) as measured by an annual PPI between 50 and 74 will accelerate their improvement to achieve an annual PPI of 75 or above in SY 13.	The School Review Visit (SRV) process is the lever through which the district provides support, monitors progress, and holds all schools accountable for school improvement efforts. Therefore, the SRV process is dispersed throughout all objectives and corresponding initiatives and activities.

	• Schools that improved on Target (Greene, Durfee, Viveiros & Kuss) as measured by an annual PPI of 75 or above will maintain a PPI of 75 or above.	
2. Provide consistent learning environment across all classrooms through communication vehicles among and across district-level and school-level staff through a variety of networks and vertical teams including school based teacher teams. This initiative speaks to the need to ensure that all students receive high quality instruction across schools and grade levels. This goal will not be reached without establishing dense communications networks within schools, across schools, and across grade levels. In addition to grade level and content common planning which is common practice for all schools, each school is expected to form a minimum of three vertical content teams—Mathematics, Language and Literacy, and Social Emotional Learning (SEL). At least one member from each of these teams is expected to serve on the school's Instructional Leadership Team. These teams are facilitated by the instructional coaches for Literacy and Math, and a Student Adjustment Counselor (SAC). These facilitators, in turn, participate in district networks of the three areas, Math, Literacy, and Social Emotional Learning (see Strategic Objective 3 for more detail on SEL). Networks meet bi-weekly and are facilitated by a member of the office of instruction. Both the district networks and instructional coaching networks are charged with the consistent implementation of the designated instructional priorities for SY 13. The academic priorities are focused on implementation of the Common Core State Standards: Literacy Across Content Areas • Increase the use of non-fiction texts to 50-50 at elementary and 80-20 at secondary, • Reading and writing tasks must be grounded in evidence from text, and • Students are regularly interacting with complex texts and its academic vocabulary. Mathematics • Increased emphasis on *Deep Understanding*	**Early Evidence of Change** • At least 80% of SRV walkthrough data indicates that teachers are implementing the instructional priorities as identified for Literacy and Math (see description in box on left). This data will be collected on each walkthrough and feedback will be given to school on a regular basis. This data will be recorded in the School Review Visit Monitoring Tool (Part B) and then presented as feedback to schools on a regular basis. **Short-term Outcomes** • District benchmarks for ELA that assess non-fiction comprehension (e.g., Reading Street for elementary, Non-Fiction District Benchmark grades 2-10) will show an improvement of 10-15% in the percentage of students showing mastery of those passages over the course of a year. This improvement should occur for 100% of grade levels district-wide, 90% of schools, and then for 80% of teachers within a school. • Existing Math District Benchmarks largely are in a multiple choice format, mimicking the structure of MCAS. For SY 13, each math district benchmark will include one or more performance assessments that assess "Deep Understanding" in the form of open response or short answers. Progress will be determined by a 10-15% increase in performance on these items over the course of the academic year. **Final Outcomes** • ELA MCAS data indicates a 10% increase in performance on non-fiction passages from SY 12 to SY 13 across 100% of grade levels and 100% of schools. • Math MCAS data indicates a 10% increase in performance on Short Answers and Open Response Items from SY 12 to SY 13 across 100% of grade levels and 100% of schools.	SRV Partners (see Strategic Objective 1, Initiative 1) are members of the Office of Instruction, which in turn lead district networks of instructional coaches/department heads and Student Adjustment Counselors.

which enables students to see mathematics as a discipline of (a) connected concepts that are communicated using (b) a variety of representations, and (c) can be applied to authentic situations and problems to solve.		
Strategic Objective 2: Ensure success for all students through high quality, rigorous teaching and learning leading to high academic achievement.		
Strategic Initiatives	**Early Evidence of Change, Short-term Outcomes, and Final Outcomes**	**Interdependencies**
1. Improve quality and consistency of curriculum through the alignment to 2011 MA Curriculum Frameworks and the establishment of cycle of continuous curriculum review and refinement. The Common Core State Standards, and its subsequent MA adoption, provides a lens through which to examine the level of rigor in terms of college and career expectations of the district's existing curricula. Issues of text complexity, evidenced and text based discussions, and the ownership of literacy across all content areas signals a significant shift in curriculum. In Mathematics, the emphasis on focus, coherence, and deep understanding support our earlier math curriculum initiatives. However, the movement of topics vertically across grade levels demands a shift and need for re-alignment. Curriculum alignment work began last year through two avenues: ad hoc district vertical teams (science, algebra and ELA 6-12) and instructional coaching networks (elementary math, elementary ELA). This work is in its final stages of completion for Math and ELA but is in initial stages for Science and Social Studies.	**Early Evidence** • 90% of classroom observations indicate that classroom lessons are aligned with existing curriculum maps for all content areas--Math, ELA, Science, and Social Studies. **Short Term Outcomes** • District benchmarks that assess Common Core Instructional Priorities for Math and Non-fiction show a 10-15% improvement in percentage of students scoring proficient--*(same short term outcomes as Strategic Objective 1, Strategic Initiative 2*). **Final Outcomes** • MCAS scores meet CPI Growth Targets for Math, Literacy, and Science for all grade levels. • 10% Increase in students scoring advanced in Math, ELA, and Science.	Teaming Networks (see Strategic Objective 1, Initiative 2) are responsible for ensuring effective implementation at both school and district levels. The district networks are also responsible for curricular alignment.

2. Provide support for rigorous planning and delivery of consistent instructional expectations. This summer the district embarked on a plan to revise our tiered model of instruction to better align with Massachusetts Tiered System of Support. The self-assessment indicated that we would not have the capacity to implement an effective tiered system without improving the consistency of tier I or core instruction. Hence, this initiative is written with goal that 100% of students receive effective core instruction on a daily basis. The standards by which we assess classroom effectiveness are integrally tied with the FRPS Educator Evaluation Tool. In particular, the tool provides rubrics by which to assess this effectiveness of core or tier I instruction according to the following standards: • **Standard I: Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment.** The teacher promotes the learning and growth of all students by providing high-quality and coherent instruction, designing and administering authentic and meaningful student assessments, analyzing student performance and growth data, using this data to improve instruction, providing students with constructive feedback on an ongoing basis, and continuously refining learning objectives. This standard includes three indicators: (a) Curriculum and Planning, (b) Assessment, and (c) Analysis • **Standard II: Teaching All Students**. The teacher promotes the learning and growth of all students through instructional practices that establish high expectations, create a safe and effective classroom environment, and demonstrate cultural proficiency. This standard includes four indicators: (a) Instruction, (b) Learning Environment, (c) Cultural Proficiency, and (d) Expectations.	**Early Evidence of Change** • Schools identify teachers not yet meeting Standard I (Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment) and Standard II (Teaching All Students) of the FRPS Teacher Evaluation Tool and prioritize support (e.g., more frequent feedback, professional development, coaching) to those teachers with the outcome of improved practice. The effectiveness of this support will be assessed through an improvement in practice for 90% of identified teaches according to the rubric defined in Standard I and monitored through the School Review Visit Monitoring Tool (Part C). **Short Term Outcomes** • All District Benchmarks (K-12) show a 10-15% decrease in students scoring at the Warning Level. These Benchmarks are given regularly throughout the year and are compiled quarterly by the Office of Instruction and then are reported out at Principals' Meetings and to the School Committee. **Final Outcomes** • MCAS results show median Student Growth Percentiles (SGP) targets are met for Math and ELA across all grade levels. • MCAS results show a 10-15% decline in students scoring in the Warning/Failing Category for Math, ELA, and Science.	Instructional Coaching Networks (see Strategic Objective 1, Initiative 2) are the school embedded supports for teachers to improve instruction.
3. Provide differentiated support to students based on identified academic needs Our data indicates that we are not meeting the academic	**Early Evidence of Change** • All Schools use data analysis to identify students in need of supplemental and/or more targeted instruction. • Instructional Support Teams include instructional coaches	Instructional Coaching networks (see Strategic

needs of far too many of our students. The Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS) provides a framework to help us identify "cracks" in the instructional system. The first of these is the implementation of a rigorous viable curriculum to all students. Strategic Objective 2, Initiatives 1 and 2 are targeting that goal. Even with consistent effective core instruction, some students (approximately 15%) need supplemental or differentiated support. This strategic initiative aims to outline the structures that need to be in place to ensure that the needs of all students, even those in need of supplemental support, are met. The Massachusetts Tiered System of Support serves as the backdrop for this initiative. Given that we began the revision of our tiered system of support during the summer of 2012 much of the early evidence of change describes creating appropriate structures. This differs from other initiatives where structures exist. Hence, we recognize our tiered system of instruction across all schools is at the beginning stages. In addition, while we have worked to develop a continuum of services for our students with disabilities PreK-12, we recognize that services and placements need to be strengthened. To address the achievement gap for our students with disabilities, we will begin restructuring our K-12 placement settings to ensure that all students have access to viable curriculum and rigorous teaching and learning.	and provide targeted feedback and action plans to teachers for students in need of Tier 2 support. The tier 2 plans indicate instructional activities, time and duration of intervention, and protocols for progress monitoring. Instructional Support Teams provide regular feedback and check in's with teachers to ensure students are moving appropriately across Tiers. • Curriculum Accommodation Teams are formed for students not successful with Tier 2 support and include a broader group of experts such as instructional coaches, school psychologists, and ELL and Sped staff. This team provides direction and planning for more intensive interventions that require more frequent progress monitoring and more frequent feedback to teachers implementing the intervention to ensure students are moving appropriately across tiers. • Staff delivering tiered instruction and special education services are observed and provided with regular feedback on performance. Feedback and observations should identify an improvement in instruction, as collected through the SRV process. **Short Term Outcomes** • All District Benchmarks (K-12) show a 10-15% decrease in students scoring at the Warning Level, in the aggregate and for all subgroups. These Benchmarks are given regularly throughout the year and are compiled quarterly by the Office of Instruction and then are reported out at Principals' Meetings and to the School Committee. • ELL benchmark data from Keystones and Avenues show a 10-15% increase in performance (baseline 2012). **Final Outcomes** • All students and high needs subgroups meet annual PPI targets (CPI Growth and SGP). • ACCESS data shows a 15% increase in English Language Learner proficiency rates to obtaining English. • Warning/Failing Categories of MCAS decreases by 10-15% for the aggregate and high needs subgroup. • The number of referrals to Special Education for lack of Academic Achievement will decline by 5% • Substaintally separate and Out of District placements will decrease by 5% and partial inclusion placements will	Objective 1, Initiative 2) participate on Instructional Support Teams to support creation of Tier 2 plans.

	increase by 5% for students with disabilities.	
Strategic Objective 3: Ensure success for all students through the development of students' social and emotional wellness.		
Strategic Initiatives	**Early Evidence of Change, Short-term Outcomes, and Final Outcomes**	**Interdependencies**
1. Create postive school and classroom climate. The purpose of this Strategic Objective is to improve the social emotional learning (SEL) skills of our students so that students develop the habits of mind and skills that will allow them to be successful academically. We utilize the MA DESE SEL Guidelines on Social Emotional Learning, to define those skills as: Self-Awareness, Self-Management, Social Awareness, Relationship Skills, and Responsible Decision Making. As stated in our Wraparound Zone (WAZ) Plan (supported through RTTT funds), we take a multifacted approach to providing the necessary learning conditions and experiences that will maximize the development of social emotional skills. The FRPS WAZ plan is built upon three legs: Positive School and Classroom Climate (Initiative 1 of Strategic Objective 3), and Connections between Home and School (Initiative 2 of Strategic Objective 3), and Positive Youth Development Activitiea (Initiative 3 of Strategic Objective 4). We view these three focus areas as three contexts in which we must maximize students development of social emotional skills. That is, although the settings differ, the outcomes are the same. Therefore, the Long Term Outcomes in each of these first three initiatives of this objective are intentionally the same, and focus on student behavior and SEL Data. For this initiative, *Positive School and Classroom Climate,* we have begun training schools in pro-active classroom management programs. Responsive Classroom is being utilized on the elementary level, where four schools have been trained and a train the trainer model is being planned for remaining district schools. All elementary schools have received comprehensive training in Playworks which assists schools in desiging recess to promote safe, meaningful play, teach conflict resolution, and develop positive play skills during recess time.	**Early Evidence of Change** • Observations indicate an improvement in the climate of classroom as measured against the Standard II, *Teaching All Students:* The teacher promotes the learning and growth of all students through instructional practices that establish high expectations, create a safe and effective classroom environment, and demonstrate cultural proficiency. This indicator will be compiled at the school level through observation protocols, and formative and summative evaluations with a goal of 80% proficiency or above. Results will be included in SRV reports to schools for feedback. **Short Term Outcomes** • Survey data from staff and students indicates a 5-10% improvement in climate and culture as measured by the Conditions for Learning Survey by American Institute for Research. **Long Term Outcomes** • Office referrals, suspensions, and tardies decline by 5%, annually. • 100% of students attend school 95% of time. • Students show a 5% improvement in SEL Skills, as measured by Developmental Studies Center Child Development Project Scales. • The number of referrals to SPED for Emotional and Behavioral Disabilities decline by 5%. • Dropout rate reaches PPI targets for all students and high needs subgroups and cohort graduation rates increase.	Initiatives 1-3 of the this Strategic Objective are three different contexts that aim at the same final outcome. Furthermore, this Strategic Objective aims to provide students with social emotional skills they need to be ready to learn. Therefore, the achievement data outlined in the outcomes for Strategic Objectives 1 and 2 are intertwined with this Objective. Furthermore, there is an understanding that the delivery of instruction identified in Strategic Objective 2 must occur within the context of supporting

The middle schools have received training in the Gudided Discipline methodology. Guided Discipline addresses the formation of positive school wide discipline procedures, positive behavior interventions and supports, and positvie, collaborative classroom management. All four middle schools have received Guided Discipline training. Durfee High School is currently in a self-assessment year regarding climate and culture inititative. They are reviewing several programs including Gudied Discipline to assess which would best meet their needs, but have instituted a freshman advisory program. Durfee High School, thorugh the NEASC accrediation process is preparing to launch an advisory proram for a ll students beginning in the 2013-2014 SY. Stone Therepeautic and Resiliency Preparatory School both have undertaken improving climate and culture specific to the unique needs of their populations either through staffing behavior or counseling specialists, embedding unique programming options that tailor to student needs, or creating activities that enhance school identity.		students development of social emotional skills.
2. Empower parents through enhanced home school connections The Fall River Public Schools recognizes the important role parents play in their child's academic success and strives to increase parental involvement in schools. Parent engagement is focused along three facets: school-wide planning and collaboration (e.g., school council), collaborative problem solving that parents and school-based staff need to engage in to ensure all children are successful, and offerings that support parental empowerment such as ESL classes, or job training.	**Early Evidence of Change:** • Schools increase their parental involvement activities along the three dimensions and according to the needs of their population. The District Parent Coordinator will capture this data for each school and update it quarterly. This data will become part of the SRV Monitoring Tool (See Part F). **Short term Outcomes:** • Formative and Summative Outcomes show at least 85% of staff demonstrate proficiency on Teaching Standard III, Family and Community Engagement: The teacher promotes the learning and growth of all students through effective partnerships with families, caregivers, community members, and organizations. • A (5-10%) increase in family involvement as measured on a family engagement survey. Families articulate that they feel a connection to their school community and view schools as their partners and allies. **Long Term Outcomes:** • Office referrals, suspensions, and tardies decline by 5%,	

	annually. • 100% of students attend school 95% of time. • Students show a 5% improvement in SEL Skills, as measured by Developmental Studies Center Child Development Project Scales. • The number of referrals to SPED for Emotional and Behavioral Disabilities decline by 5%.	
3. Develop and enhance positive youth development opportunities. Positive Youth Development (PYD) activities is crucial to child and adolescent development. Sports, the arts, academic clubs, and civic engagement opportunities are positive youth development opportunities in areas such as sports, health and fitness activities, the arts, leadership opprotunities and civic engagement activities will afford students a greater opprotunity to connect and identify with their school and the larger community as they develop individual social competencies. As of now the district offers many PYD opportunities but they are not necessarily equitable across schools nor is participation monitored. Elementary and Middle schools participating in the WAZ plan will begin to pilot Positive Youth Development Plans, which will track the number of students engaged in such activities while at the same time identifying students who would benefit from such participation. The goal will be to expand the PYD plans to the remaining schools in the district in SY 14.	**Early Evidence of Change:** • Elementary and Middle Wraparound Zone Schools (Viveiros, Kuss, Doran, Talbot, and Fonseca) will pilot Individual Positive Youth Development Plans, with a goal of district roll-out in SY 14. The goal for SY 13 is that a minimum of 50% of students will participate in or belong to a Positive Youth Development Group on a regular basis, with a goal of 10% increase each school year. • Remaining schools will increase the number of Positive Youth Development offerings by at least one. The district Wrararound Zone Coordinator will compile this data bi-annually. **Short Term Outcomes:** • Students on PYD Plans show a 10% improvement in SEL Skills, as measured by Developmental Studies Center Child Development Project Scales. **Long Term Outcomes:** • Office referrals, suspensions, and tardies decline by 5%, annually. • 100% of students attend school 95% of time. • Students, district wide, show a 5% improvement in SEL Skills, as measured by Developmental Studies Center Child Development Project Scales. • The number of referrals to SPED for Emotional and Behavioral Disabilities decline by 5%.	
4. Provide differentiated support to students based on identified social emotional needs. The above wraparound zone initiatives (positive youth development, positive school and classroom climate, and home-school connections) represent core or tier 1 learning conditions in *non-academic* areas of focus. We understand that even with a sound core experience a small percent of students will still need tier 2 and tier 3 supports for the development of social emotional	**Early Evidence of Change** • All Schools use data analysis to identify students in need of supplemental and/or more targeted support for behaviour and social emotional development. • Instructional Support Teams include Student Adjustment Counselors and other SEL team members and provide targeted feedback and action plans to teachers for students in need of Tier 2 support. The tier 2 plans indicate instructional activities, time and duration of	This initiative mirros the academic initiative for differentiated instruction outline in Strategic Objective 2, Intiative 3. Both were based on

skills. Similar to the tiered model of (academic) instruction outlined in Strategic Objective 2, Initiative 3, the district embarked on redesigning a tiered model for non-academic needs based on the MTSS framework during the summer of 2012. The tenets of data driven decision making, referrel to Instructional Support Teams, and progress monitoring written for the academic model of instruction applies to then non-academic needs as well.	intervention, and protocols for progress monitoring. Instructional Support Teams provide regular feedback and check in's with teachers to ensure students are moving appropriately across Tiers. • Curriculum Accommodation Teams are formed for students not successful with Tier 2 support and include a broader group of experts such as instructional coaches, school psychologists, and ELL and Sped staff. This team provides direction and planning for more intensive interventions that require more frequent progress monitoring and more frequent feedback to teachers implementing the intervention to ensure students are moving appropriately across tiers. • Staff delivering tiered instruction are observed and provided with regular feedback on performance. Feedback and observations should identify an improvement in instruction. **Short Term Outcomes** • Students on tier 2 and tier 3 plans show an improvement in SEL skills as measured by selected instruments such as Developmental Studies Center Scales. • Students on tier 2 and tier 3 plans show an increase in pro-social behaviour as measured by a 5% decrease in office referrals, suspensions, and individual student absenteeism, measured at least quarterly. **Final Outcomes** • Students' social emotional learning needs are being met within the tiered model of behaviour and therefore, the number of referrals to Special Education for emotional and behavioural disabilities concerns declines by 5%. • Substaintally separate and Out of District placements will decrease by 5% and partial inclusion placements will increase by 5% for students with behavioral and emotional disabilities. • Student on tier 2 and 3 non-academic support plans show an increase in academic performance as measured by an SGP greater than 51 in grades 4-8, 10 in Math and ELA or 5-10% increase in end of year summative assessments in ELA or Math for grades K-3, 9, and 11-12. • Dropout rate reaches PPI targets for all students and high needs subgroups and cohort graduation rates increase.	the MTSS framework. Implementation is dependent upon effective teaming at the school level (see Strategic Objective 1, Intiative 2).

Strategic Objective 4: Improve quality of all educators (educator quality)		
Strategic Initiatives	**Early Evidence of Change, Short-term Outcomes, and Final Outcomes**	**Interdependencies**
1. ***Develop and implement effective educator evaluation tools and protocols to provide consistent feedback and support to all educators*** The collaborative spirit with which the FRPS administration and the FREA engaged in to create the FRPS Educator Evaluation Tool resulted in the recognition by a broad range of stakeholders that through the implementation of a comprehensive evaluation and educator support system, the district is creating a tool for assessing teaching and leadership practice and for providing transformative and actionable feedback resulting in improved teacher practice, school/district leadership and ultimately, student outcomes. The evaluation system provides an assessment of an educator's ability to demonstrate effective instruction including the use of research based best practice, and assessment of student learning through analysis of formative, interim and benchmark assessments to inform instructional change. The evaluation system will also include consideration of the supports that can be provided to educators to build teaching and leading capacity With that goal in mind, principals have been asked to place teacher need levels into one of three tiered categories: low support, moderate support, and intense support. These tiers correlate with the summative evaluation of staff that places staff on two year self-directed plan, one year self-directed plan, directed plan, or improving plan, but still allowing principal discretion for contexts of individual buildings and staff. The goal of this initiative is to ensure that all educators are provided with effective and consistent feedback that promotes instructional improvement. Hence, early evidence of change indicators will assess the degree to which the differentiated feedback needs of staff members are being met.	**Early Evidence of Change** • Effective feedback as measured against the criteria for ***actionable*** (feedback is concrete enough to affirm effective practice and to provide targeted practice priorities for improvement so that reflects a growth mind-set), ***focused*** (feedback is high leverage to target either school and district wide priorities and/or connected with teachers' professional growth and student learning goals), ***developmental*** (the extent to which the feedback builds on previous feedback along a continuum of improvement), and ***timely*** (feedback is provided to staff within 24 hours of an observation and the quantity of feedback is differentiated according to the need levels of teachers). This data will be collected during the SRV process and captured with the School Review Visit Monitoring Tool (Section D). SRV partners are expected to use the data to provide regular feedback to school-based administrators with the goal that 95% of written feedback is rated effective by end of year. **Short Term Outcomes** • Formative Evaluation Reports rate teachers overall as (a) Unsatisfactory, (b) Needs Improvement, (c) Proficient, and (d) Exemplary. Expectations are that with effective feedback (and PD systems described in following initiatives), all schools will have 75% or more formative evaluations meet the Proficient or Exemplary Status, 20% fall under Needs Improvement, and 5% fall under Unsatisfactory. This data will be compiled at the school level in SRV report outs to schools. **Final Outcomes** • Mirroring the formative evaluation process, Summative Evaluations of Overall Performance are also rated (a) Unsatisfactory, (b) Needs Improvement, (c) Proficient, and (d) Exemplary. Expectations are that with effective feedback (and PD systems described in following initiatives), all schools will have 85% or more summative	This Strategic Objective as a whole is the central to district-wide improvement. That is, the outcomes identified in Strategic Objectives 1-3 are dependent upon the improvement of educator quality. Therefore, the outcomes of this objective are written in terms of the individual teacher but with the understanding that the student performance indicators delineated in above Strategic Objectives will improve as the quality of educator improves.

The focus of this overarching strategic objective and this initiative in particular is to improve educator quality so that we have an effective educator in 100% of the classrooms district wide. The student performance targets outlined in strategic objectives 1-3 will not occur without an effective educator in 100% of the classrooms district wide. Therefore, our short term outcomes and final outcomes are measured at the teacher level rather than student performance level.	evaluations meet the Proficient or Exemplary Status, 10% fall under Needs Improvement, and 5% fall under Unsatisfactory. This data will be compiled at the school level in SRV report outs to schools.	
2. ***Develop a PD system to address the differentiated needs of educators across a career ladder (novice to a master).*** This initiative aims to create a professional development system that is responsive to both district priorities and differentiated needs of educators. Up to this point, much of the professional development opportunities have been driven by district-wide curricular initiatives (e.g., Reading Street Implementation, Responsive Classroom, etc.). Although these professional development supports are necessary, they do not necessarily offer opportunities to create experts in a content area of teachers on the verge of becoming master teachers or provide the pedagogical training necessary for most novice teachers. The FRPS Educator Evaluation Tool provides a framework upon which we can build a Professional Development system that is responsive to both district and individual educator needs. The Educator Evaluation Tool provides a framework for identifying novice to master teachers according to the level of plan a teacher is put on: 2-Yr. Self-Directed, 1-Yr. Self-Directed, Directed, Improvement, or Developing. The Teaching Standards and accompanying rubrics designate levels of competence along the following: Curriculum, Planning and Assessment, Teaching All Students, Family and Community Engagement, and Professional Culture. Consequently, we aim to align our existing professional development options to the above two dimensions—plan level, and teaching standards—so that educators and staff can identify activities/strategies with appropriate professional development. In order to ensure that our system is responsive to all individuals,	**Early Evidence of Change** • 95-100% of Action/Strategies identified in individual Educator Plans support the professional growth and student learning goals stated in the plans, as measured in the SRV Monitoring Tool (Part F). • District and School based PD offerings are modified based on a semi-annual audit of professional practice goals and quantitative analysis of teacher rubric indicators. **Short Term Outcomes** • Formative Evaluation Reports rate teachers in each of the 4 Teaching Standards as (a) Unsatisfactory, (b) Needs Improvement, (c) Proficient, and (d) Exemplary. Expectations are that with effective feedback and PD systems, all schools will have 75% or more formative evaluations meet the Proficient or Exemplary Status, 20% fall under Needs Improvement, and 5% fall under Unsatisfactory in all 4 Teaching Standards. This data will be compiled at the school level in SRV report outs to schools. **Final Outcomes** • Mirroring the formative evaluation process, Summative Evaluations of the 4 Teaching Standards are also rated (a) Unsatisfactory, (b) Needs Improvement, (c) Proficient, and (d) Exemplary. Expectations are that with effective feedback and PD systems, all schools will have 85% or more summative evaluations meet the Proficient or Exemplary Status, 10% fall under Needs Improvement, and 5% fall under Unsatisfactory in all 4 Teaching Standards. This data will be compiled at the school level in SRV reports to schools.	

we plan to conduct semi-annual audits of professional growth goals and ratings on teaching standards and accompanying indicators. The results of this analysis will help identify which professional development is supportive of growth, and which goals and needs must be addressed and/or refined. Similar to the above initiative short term and long term outcomes are assessed at the teacher level with the understanding that improved and more targeted professional development will support improved educator quality which will in turn support improved student performance outlined in Strategic Objectives 1-3.		
3. ***Improve retention of effective educators to ensure increased stability and high quality teaching.*** The Fall River Public Schools Recovery Plan, as written in 2009, addressed significant deficiencies in human resource management. The Plan called for the recruitment and selection of an Executive Director of Human Resources to establish a recruitment plan to create a pool of highly qualified candidates, and implement effective hiring practices. There is now a clear protocol that all principals and directors need to follow as they go through the process of recruiting and hiring new staff. Additionally, the Recovery Plan called for the development of districts systems in order to support building administrators. Overall, as indicated in the district's most recent progress report, the monitor noted, "human resource systems have been put in place that are designed to support and guide the system in developing and retaining a high quality staff. It is critical that the recruitment protocols are used with fidelity." Although the district has launched a comprehensive system designed to guide the district in developing and retaining an effective educator workforce, the district seeks to further refine the system to focus on retaining effective educators. Although the teacher turnover rate has declined in recent years, the effect of losing effective educators serves to only slow momentum on the district's agenda of accelerated student progress. The research on teacher retention highlights four areas where districts' can focus in order to improve (a) supportive and safe	**Early Evidence of Change** • Observation data indicates that novice educators implementing effective instructional practices as directed by feedback from mentors and administrators (as compiled Mentor Coordinator). • Effective educators self-select district and school based opportunities for teacher and administrative leadership (as measured by composition of school-based and district-based ad hoc teams). **Short Term Outcomes** • Mid-cycle or formative evaluation reports of novice teachers indicate 85% of novice teachers are moving towards proficiency. **Final Outcomes** • At the district level, 90% of summative evaluations of novice staff indicate improvement from mid-cycle reviews. • At the district level, the retention rate of effective educators (those whose are evaluated as proficient or exemplary) reaches 85%, measured annually with baseline from SY 13.	

learning environments, (b) professional development opportunities that re-energize staff, (c) high quality mentor and induction programming for novice teachers, and if (d) differentiated roles that give teachers expanded authority for work outside the classroom. This last strategy may influence the retention of teachers in at least two ways. First, those who are less experienced may perceive the roles as a promising, future opportunity and thus decide to remain in schools and the profession. Second, teachers who hold the roles may experience heightened job satisfaction and increased retention. The former two areas are addressed in Strategic Objective 3, Initiative 1 (positive school and classroom climate), and Initiative 2 of this Strategic Objective (developing a PD system responsive to educator needs). This initiative then delineates a path to address the latter two.		

Section 3: District Strategy Sheet

A. District Strategic Objective 1: District systems developed and or strengthened during Recovery support effective school-based implementation of School Improvement Plans through enhanced leadership capacity and administrator quality.		B. Overall Lead (Objective): Meg Mayo-Brown, Superintendent
C. Initiative Number and Description: SO1.1 ***Provide differentiated support to schools through continuation of School Review Visits from Office of Instruction.*** Currently, the achievement levels and needs of each of the district's 16 schools are vast. The purpose of the School Review Visits is to provide differentiated support to schools based on their need level. This support is accomplished through assigning a member of the Office of Instruction to schools as a School Review Visit (SRV) Partner, matching the need of the school with the expertise of the OOI Staff. In addition, schools in greater need are visited more frequently. The SRV Partner works closely with the Principal and the Instructional Leadership Team on school improvement efforts. This work begins with a "Data Think Tank" session conducted collaboratively with Office of Instruction and a school's leadership team to conduct a root cause analysis of the previous year's performance data. That process leads to identifying high leverage short term goals, which then become the focus of the School Review Visits. The goals are set for a 2-3 month increments so as to allow for mid-course corrections and are assessed through early evidence of change and defined short term outcomes, as parallel to the Accelerated Improvement Plan (AIP) structure.	**D. Short term and Final Outcomes from the Initiative:** **Short-term Outcomes** • All schools will have an increase of 10% to15% of students demonstrating proficiency or above using the district benchmarks as identified in the Short Term Goal Template for the given 2-3 month time period. **Final Outcomes** • Schools that showed a decline (Tansey, Letourneau, and Morton) or no change (Henry Lord, Spencer Borden, Fonseca & Watson) as measured by the annual Progress and Performance Index (PPI) less than 50 will improve to an annual PPI of 50 or above for SY 13. • Schools that improved but below target (Silvia, Talbot, and Doran) as measured by an annual PPI between 50 and 74 will accelerate their improvement to achieve an annual PPI of 75 or above in SY 13. • Schools that improved on Target (Greene, Durfee, Viveiros and Kuss) as measured by an annual PPI of 75 or above will maintain a PPI of 75 or above.	**E. Overall Lead (Initiative):** Fran Roy, Chief Academic Officer

F. Which recommendations from the District Review or other evidence does this initiative address?

The primary goal of this initiative is to build capacity of and provide support to the instructional leaders of individual schools. This goal, although connecting with many other goals embedded in the Fall River Public School Recovery Plan, directly addresses Strategy 2 of the Human Resource Management Section: Identify and address the needs of building level administrators with input from a representative committee.

Massachusetts Department of ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY EDUCATION

G. What are the key indicators for this initiative to show early evidence of change?	H. By when?
Early Evidence of Change • School improvement efforts are focused and targeted with regard to short term goals as measured by memos, common planning agendas, professional practice /student learning goals and embedded professional development sessions and recorded in the School Review Visit Monitoring Tool (Part A). Data is compiled bi-weekly for Tier 3 schools (Henry Lord, Tansey, Letourneau, Morton, & Watson), monthly for Tier 2 schools (Durfee, Spencer Borden, Fonseca, Talbot, Doran, RPS, & Stone) and quarterly for Tier 1 schools (Kuss, Viveiros, Greene, & Silvia). SRV Partners will provide feedback on all data collected with the School Review Visit Monitoring Tool to schools according to the tiered schedule described above, providing multiple entry points for mid-course corrections. • Principals are routinely leading school walkthroughs and provided oral and written feedback that is focused on the identified short term goals at least 80% of the time. Data is compiled within School Review Visit Monitoring Tool (Part A).	**October 2012**

Quarter	I. Activities to Achieve the Outcomes for the Initiative	J. Who will Lead?	K. When will it Start?	L. When will it be Complete?	M. What Resources are Needed?
September 2012	SRV Partners are assigned to schools and a short term goal template is designed by OOI team.	Fran Roy	September 2012	September 2012	n/a
September 2012	Data Think Tanks sessions are conducted to identify root causes. SRV Partners and School-Based ILT develop short term goals for Quarter 1. Goals are approved by Superintendent.	Fran Roy	September 2012	October 2012	n/a
October 2012	Cycle I Begins: SRV Partners meet regularly with School ILT to assess progress toward short term goals. Office of Instruction (OOI) Team meets weekly to discuss progress of schools, and develop protocols as necessary	Fran Roy	October 2012	December 2012	n/a
December 2012	OOI Team triangulates district data with short term goal progress, and reports out to Superintendent and school based staff.	Fran Roy	December 2012	December 2012	n/a
January 2013	SRV Partners work with school based ILT to implement midcourse corrections and set short term goals for Jan, Feb, and March.	Fran Roy	January 2013	January 2013	n/a
January 2013	Cycle II Begins: SRV Partners meet regularly with School ILT to assess progress toward short term goals. Office of Instruction (OOI) Team meets weekly to discuss progress of schools, and develop	Fran Roy	January 2013	March 2013	n/a

Massachusetts Department of ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY EDUCATION

	protocols as necessary				
March 2013	OOI Team triangulates district data with short term goal progress, and reports out to Superintendent and school based staff.	Fran Roy	March 2013	March 2013	n/a
March 2013	SRV Partners work with school based ILT to implement midcourse corrections and set short term goals for April, May, and June.	Fran Roy	March 2013	March 2013	n/a
April 2013	Cycle III Begins: SRV Partners meet regularly with School ILT to assess progress toward short term goals. Office of Instruction (OOI) Team meets weekly to discuss progress of schools, and develop protocols as necessary.	Fran Roy	April 2013	June 2013	n/a
June 2013	OOI Team triangulates district data with short term goal progress, and reports out to Superintendent and school based staff.	Fran Roy	June 2013	June 2013	n/a
June 2013	SRV Partners support School Improvement Planning for SY 14 through analysis of SRV reports, MCAS preliminary data, and other sources.	Fran Roy	June 2013	August 2013	n/a

Quarterly Progress Rating (QPR) of the Strategic Initiative

Key: P = Process, O = Outcome

	September 2012	December 2012	January 2012	March 2013	June 2013	August 2013
P						
O						

It is critical to provide a separate rating for the process of implementation (activities) and outcomes (early evidence of change as well as short-term outcomes and final outcomes).

A. District Strategic Objective 1: District systems developed and or strengthened during Recovery support effective school-based implementation of School Improvement Plans through enhanced leadership capacity and administrator quality.		B. Overall Lead (Objective): Meg Mayo-Brown, Superintendent
C. Initiative Number and Description: SO1.2 ***Provide consistent learning environment across all classrooms through communication vehicles among and across district-level and school-level staff through a variety of networks and vertical teams including school based teacher teams.*** This initiative speaks to the need to ensure that all students receive high quality instruction across schools and grade levels. This goal will not be reached without establishing dense communications networks within schools, across schools, and across grade levels. In addition to grade level and content common planning which is common practice for all schools, each school is expected to form a minimum of three vertical content teams—Mathematics, Language and Literacy, and Social Emotional Learning (SEL). At least one member from each of these teams is expected to serve on the school's Instructional Leadership Team. These teams are facilitated by the instructional coaches for Literacy and Math, and a Student Adjustment Counselor (SAC). These facilitators, in turn, participate in district networks of the three areas, Math, Literacy, and Social Emotional Learning (see Strategic Objective 3 for more detail on SEL). Networks meet bi-weekly and are facilitated by a member of the office of instruction. Both the district networks and instructional coaching networks are charged with the consistent implementation of the designated instructional priorities for SY 13. The academic priorities are focused on implementation of the Common Core State Standards: **Literacy Across Content Areas** • Increase the use of non-fiction texts to 50-50 at elementary and 80-20 at secondary, • Reading and writing tasks must be grounded in	**D. Short term and Final Outcomes from the Initiative:** **Short-term Outcomes** • District benchmarks for ELA that assess non-fiction comprehension (e.g., Reading Street for elementary, Non-Fiction District Benchmark grades 2-10) will show an improvement of 10-15% in the percentage of students showing mastery of those passages over the course of a year. This improvement should occur for 100% of grade levels district-wide, 90% of schools, and then for 80% of teachers within a school. • Existing Math District Benchmarks largely are in a multiple choice format, mimicking the structure of MCAS. For SY 13, each math district benchmark will include one or more performance assessments that assess "Deep Understanding" in the form of open response or short answers. Progress will be determined by a 10-15% increase in performance on these items over the course of the academic year. **Final Outcomes** • ELA MCAS data indicates a 10% increase in performance on non-fiction passages from SY 12 to SY 13 across 100% of grade levels and 100% of schools. • Math MCAS data indicates a 10% increase in performance on Short Answers and Open Response Items from SY 12 to SY 13 across 100% of grade levels and 100% of schools.	**E. Overall Lead (Initiative):** Fran Roy, Chief Academic Officer

evidence from text, and • Students are regularly interacting with complex texts and its academic vocabulary. **Mathematics** • Increased emphasis on *Deep Understanding* which enables students to see mathematics as a discipline of (a) connected concepts that are communicated using (b) a variety of representations, and (c) can be applied to authentic situations and problems to solve.		

F. Which recommendations from the District Review or other evidence does this initiative address?	
This initiative speaks to the need to ensure consistency across the district in terms of improvement efforts and goal setting. This goal is delineated in the Teaching and Learning section of the FRPS Recovery Plan, Strategy 1: Through a collaborative strategic planning process, develop a 5 year strategic plan (September 2010- August 2015), a 3 year District Improvement Plan (Sept 2011- August 2013) and yearly School Improvement Plans that are strategically aligned.	
G. What are the key indicators for this initiative to show early evidence of change? **Early Evidence of Change** • At least 80% of SRV walkthrough data indicates that teachers are implementing the instructional priorities as identified for Literacy and Math (see description in box on left). This data will be collected on each walkthrough and feedback will be given to school on a regular basis. This data will be recorded in the School Review Visit Monitoring Tool (Part B) and then presented as feedback to schools on a regular basis.	**H. By when?** December 2012

Quarter	I. Activities to Achieve the Outcomes for the Initiative	J. Who will Lead?	K. When will it Start?	L. When will it be Complete?	M. What Resources are Needed?
August 2012	Principal Institute and Educator's Conference set the instructional priorities for the school year.	Superintendent and Chief Academic Officer	August 2012	August 2012	n/a
August 2012	School-Based Vertical Teams analyse preliminary MCAS data to identify SMART Goals and refine School Improvement Plans.	Principals and assigned SRV Partner	August 2012	August 2012	Stipends
September 2012	Networks of instructional coaches and SACs meet biweekly for facilitation, professional development, and curriculum work.	OOI staff Math-CAO Literacy-Dir. Of PD	September 2012	June 2013	n/a

		SAC's-WAZ Coordinator			
September 2012	District Teams for Math, Literacy, and SEL are formed and include one representative from each school. District Teams will train teams on protocols, and goal setting. Teams will meet monthly.	Office of Instruction Members and Team Facilitators	September 2012	August 2013	Stipends (anticipated 20 hours of work at $30 per hour for a total of 30,000)
October 2012	School-based Teams for Math, Language and Literacy, and SEL begin school-based monitoring of short term implementation goals, identified PD needs, and other school-based needs.	Team Facilitators	October 2012	May 2012	Stipends (anticipated for 15 staff members per school for 40 hours of work at $30 per hour for a total of 288,000).
December 2012	District Teams will collect data on early evidence of change and interim benchmark data as measured against short term outcomes. Reports will occur twice a year and be reported out to Superintendent.	Office of Instruction Members and Team Facilitators	December 2012	December 2012	Stipends (see above)
June 2013	School-based Teams for Math, Language and Literacy, and SEL provide input to School Improvement Plans for SY 2014.	Team Facilitators	June 2013	August 2013	Stipends (see above)
June 203	District Teams will collect data on final outcomes and report out to Superintendent.	Team Facilitators	June 2013	August 2013	Stipends (see above)

Quarterly Progress Rating (QPR) of the Strategic Initiative

Key: P = Process, O = Outcome

	August 2012	September 2012	October 2012	December 2012	June 2013	August 2013
P						
O						

It is critical to provide a separate rating for the process of implementation (activities) and outcomes (early evidence of change as well as short-term outcomes and final outcomes).

A. District Strategic Objective 2: Ensure success for all students through high quality, rigorous teaching and learning leading to high academic achievement.		B. Overall Lead (Objective): Fran Roy, Chief Academic Officer
C. Initiative Number and Description: SO2.1 ***Improve quality and consistency of curriculum through the alignment to 2011 MA Curriculum Frameworks and the establishment of cycle of continuous curriculum review and refinement*** The Common Core State Standards, and its subsequent MA adoption, provides a lens through which to examine the level of rigor in terms of college and career expectations of the district's existing curricula. Issues of text complexity, evidenced and text based discussions, and the ownership of literacy across all content areas signals a significant shift in curriculum. In Mathematics, the emphasis on focus, coherence, and deep understanding support our earlier math curriculum initiatives. However, the movement of topics vertically across grade levels demands a shift and need for re-alignment. Curriculum alignment work began last year through two avenues: ad hoc district vertical teams (science, algebra and ELA 6-12) and instructional coaching networks (elementary math, elementary ELA). This work is in its final stages of completion for Math and ELA but is in initial stages for Science and Social Studies.	**D. Short term and Final Outcomes from the Initiative:** **Short Term Outcomes** • District benchmarks that assess Common Core Instructional Priorities for Math and Non-fiction show a 10-15% improvement in percentage of students scoring proficient--*(same short term outcomes as Strategic Objective 1, Strategic Initiative 2*). **Final Outcomes** • MCAS scores meet CPI Growth Targets for Math, Literacy, and Science for all grade levels. • 10% Increase in students scoring advanced in Math, ELA, and Science.	**E. Overall Lead (Initiative):** Pam Pacheco, Director of Professional Development

F. Which recommendations from the District Review or other evidence does this initiative address?	
This initiative is a continuation of the work begun under the Teaching and Learning section of the Recovery Plan, Strategy 6: Develop a guaranteed viable curriculum that is aligned with the MA DESE Curriculum Frameworks to be completed by August 2010.	
G. What are the key indicators for this initiative to show early evidence of change? **Early Evidence** • 90% of classroom observations indicate that classroom lessons are aligned with existing curriculum maps for all content areas--Math, ELA, Science, and Social Studies	**H. By when?** **December 2013**

Quarter	I. Activities to Achieve the Outcomes for the Initiative	J. Who will Lead?	K. When will it Start?	L. When will it be Complete?	M. What Resources are Needed?
June 2012	Literacy coaches provide PD to teachers on PARCC's framework and how it was used to develop the writing units for grades 3-5.	Pamela Pacheco	June 2012	June 2012	n/a
July 2012	ELA maps for grades 6-12 Units 1 & 2 are complete. Elementary Math Maps are completed for Review by CAO. Curriculum resources are identified and ordered.	Nicholas Bretz Fran Roy	July 2012	August 2012	Customized Core for 6-12. Additional Math texts and supplemental materials.
July 2012	Principals provided PD on Instructional Shifts related to the Common Core during Principal Institute.	Meg Mayo-Brown and Fran Roy	July 2012	July 2012	n/a
September 2012	District Kick of Session on Common Core: Instructional Shifts	Meg Mayo-Brown and Fran Roy	September 4, 2012	September 4, 2012	n/a
September 2012	Launch of ELA Units 1 & 2 for grades 6-12; Launch of writing units (argumentative, explanatory & narrative) for grades 3-5	Nicholas Bretz Pam Pacheco	September 2012	September 2012	n/a
September 2012	Instructional Coaching Networks) revise district benchmark assessments to be aligned with PARCC Model Content Frameworks	Fran Roy Pam Pacheco	September 2012	June 2013	n/a
October 2012	Secondary ELA Vertical Team begins the work on writing units and continues the work on the reading units 3 & 4 for grades 6-12.	Nicholas Bretz	October 2012	December 2012	Stipends (for 10 members for 20 hours of work at a rate of $30 per hour for a total of $6,000).
October 2012	Ad Hoc Science & Social Studies Vertical Teams grades K-12 begin redesign of curriculum maps and district assessments to reflect Standards for Informational Text and ELA Standards for Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects.	Pamela Pacheco & Mark Garceau	October 2012	June 2013	Stipends for Vertical Teams (estimated at 15 members for 30 hours of work at a rate of $30 per hour for a total of $13,500).
October 2012	Literacy coaches provide embedded PD for teachers in grades 3-5 on the rubrics for the writing units	Pam Pacheco	October 2012	June 2013	n/a
December 2012	SRV Cycle I Report is conducted and identifies ***status*** of early evidence of change of this initiative	School Review Partners & Chief	December 2012	December 2012	n/a

	through examination of lesson plans, walkthrough observational data, formal and informal feedback to teachers and other sources. (See Objective 1, Strategic Initiative 1).	Academic Officer			
January 2013	Launch of ELA Units 3 & 4 for grades 6-12	Nicholas Bretz	January 2013	January 2013	n/a
January 2013	Launch Winter District Benchmark Assessments for Science grades 4-8, and Social Studies, grades 4-8.	Fatima Silvia	January 2013	Fatima Silvia	n/a
March 2013	Launch Spring District Benchmark Assessments for Science grades 4-8, and Social Studies, grades 4-8.	Fatima Silvia	March 2013	March 2013	n/a
March 2013	SRV Cycle II Report is conducted and identifies ***change in*** early evidence of change of this initiative through examination of lesson plans, walkthrough observational data, formal and informal feedback to teachers and other sources. (See Obj 1, Strategic Initiative 1).	School Review Partners & Chief Academic Officer	March 2013	March 2013	n/a
June 2013	SRV Cycle III Report is conducted and identifies *end of year status* of early evidence of change of this initiative through examination of lesson plans, walkthrough observational data, formal and informal feedback to teachers and other sources. (See Obj 1, Strategic Initiative 1).	School Review Partners & Chief Academic Officer	June 2013	June 2013	n/a

Quarterly Progress Rating (QPR) of the Strategic Initiative

Key: P = Process, O = Outcome

	July 2012	August 2012	September 2012	October 2012	December 2012	Jan 2013	March 2013	June 2013
P								
O								

It is critical to provide a separate rating for the process of implementation (activities) and outcomes (early evidence of change as well as short-term outcomes and final outcomes).

A. District Strategic Objective 2: Ensure success for all students through high quality, rigorous teaching and learning leading to high academic achievement.		B. Overall Lead (Objective): Fran Roy, Chief Academic Officer
C. Initiative Number and Description: SO2.2 ***Provide support for rigorous planning and delivery of consistent instructional expectations.*** This summer the district embarked on a plan to revise our tiered model of instruction to better align with Massachusetts Tiered System of Support. The self-assessment indicated that we would not have the capacity to implement an effective tiered system without improving the consistency of tier I or core instruction. Hence, this initiative is written with goal that 100% of students receive effective core instruction on a daily basis. The standards by which we assess classroom effectiveness are integrally tied with the FRPS Educator Evaluation Tool. In particular, the tool provides rubrics by which to assess this effectiveness of core or tier I instruction according to the following standards: • **Standard I: Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment.** The teacher promotes the learning and growth of all students by providing high-quality and coherent instruction, designing and administering authentic and meaningful student assessments, analyzing student performance and growth data, using this data to improve instruction, providing students with constructive feedback on an ongoing basis, and continuously refining learning objectives. This standard includes three indicators: (a) Curriculum and Planning, (b) Assessment, and (c) Analysis. • **Standard II: Teaching All Students**. The teacher promotes the learning and growth of all students through instructional practices that establish high expectations, create a safe and effective classroom environment, and demonstrate	**D. Short term and Final Outcomes from the Initiative:** **Short Term Outcomes** • All District Benchmarks (K-12) show a 10-15% decrease in students scoring at the Warning Level. These Benchmarks are given regularly throughout the year and are compiled quarterly by the Office of Instruction and then are reported out at Principals' Meetings and to the School Committee. **Final Outcomes** • MCAS results show median Student Growth Percentiles (SGP) targets are met for Math and ELA across all grade levels. • MCAS results show a 10-15% decline in students scoring in the Warning/Failing Category for Math, ELA, and Science	**E. Overall Lead (Initiative):** Pam Pacheco, Director of Professional Development

cultural proficiency. This standard includes four indicators: (a) Instruction, (b) Learning Environment, (c) Cultural Proficiency, and (d) Expectations.		

F. Which recommendations from the District Review or other evidence does this initiative address?

The initiative is directly linked to Strategy 6 of the Teaching and Learning section of the FRPS Recovery Plan: Developing a viable curriculum aligned to the standards. The MA adoption of the Common Core State Standards will ensure that our curriculum will support the rigor necessary for college and career readiness.

G. What are the key indicators for this initiative to show early evidence of change?

Early Evidence of Change

- Schools identify teachers not yet meeting Standard I (Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment) and Standard II (Teaching All Students) of the FRPS Teacher Evaluation Tool and prioritize support (e.g., more frequent feedback, professional development, coaching) to those teachers with the outcome of improved practice. The effectiveness of this support will be assessed through an improvement in practice for 90% of identified teaches according to the rubric defined in Standard I and monitored through the School Review Visit Monitoring Tool (Part C).

Quarter	I. Activities to Achieve the Outcomes for the Initiative	J. Who will Lead?	K. When will it Start?	L. When will it be Complete?	M. What Resources are Needed?
September 2012	Office of Instruction creates a feedback rubric for effective instructional practices along two dimensions: SEL (Climate and Culture, see strategic objective 3) and Content Based Pedagogy	Mark Garceau	September 2012	September 2012	n/a
October 2012	Professional development is delivered to Principals, other administrators, and coaching networks on norming the rubric.	Mark Garceau	October 2012	October 2012	n/a
November 2012	SRV partners work with schools (Principal, administrators, and coaches) on using the rubric to provide consistent feedback to teaching staff.	SRV Partner	November 2012	November 2012	n/a
November 2012	School-based Instructional Leadership Teams provide embedded PD on tenets of effective instruction and connections to existing Evaluation Instrument (See Strategic Objective 4)	SRV Partners	December 2012	December 2012	n/a
November 2012	Schools utilize rubric to provide feedback on school-wide walkthroughs and to individual teachers. SRV partners use rubric to collect observational data on classroom practice.	SRV Partners	November 2013	January 2013	n/a
January 2013	Data from walkthroughs is compiled into SRV Report out of Cycle I, with specific attention to identifying short-term school-wide or teacher-specific goals and embedded PD.	SRV Partners	January 2013	January 2013	n/a
January 2013	Cycle II begins. Schools utilize rubric to provide feedback on school-wide walkthroughs and to individual teachers. SRV partners use rubric to collect observational data on classroom practice.	SRV Partners	January 2013	March 2013	n/a
March 2013	Data from walkthroughs is compiled into SRV Report out of Cycle II, with specific attention to identifying short-term school-wide or teacher-specific goals and embedded PD.	SRV Partners	March 2013	March 2013	n/a
March 2013	Cycle III begins. Schools utilize rubric to provide feedback on school-wide walkthroughs and to individual teachers. SRV partners use rubric to collect observational data on classroom practice.	SRV Partners	March 2013	May 2013	n/a
May 2013	Data from walkthroughs is compiled into SRV	SRV Partners	May 2013	May 2013	n/a

	Report out of Cycle III, with specific attention to identifying short-term school-wide or teacher-specific goals and embedded PD.				
June 2013	Data collected on instructional rubric is embedded to the School Improvement Plan for SY 14.	Principals	June 2013	June 2013	n/a

	September 2012	October 2012	November 2012	January 2013	March 2013	May 2013	August 2013
P							
O							

Massachusetts Department of ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY EDUCATION

A. District Strategic Objective 2: Ensure success for all students through high quality, rigorous teaching and learning leading to high academic achievement.		B. Overall Lead (Objective): Fran Roy, Chief Academic Officer
C. Initiative Number and Description: SO2.3 ***Provide differentiated support to students based on identified academic needs.*** Our data indicates that we are not meeting the academic needs of far too many of our students. The Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS) provides a framework to help us identify "cracks" in the instructional system. The first of these is the implementation of a rigorous viable curriculum to all students. Strategic Objective 2, Initiatives 1 and 2 are targeting that goal. Even with consistent effective core instruction, some students (approximately 15%) need supplemental or differentiated support. This strategic initiative aims to outline the structures that need to be in place to ensure that the needs of all students, even those in need of supplemental support, are met. The Massachusetts Tiered System of Support serves as the backdrop for this initiative. Given that we began the revision of our tiered system of support during the summer of 2012 much of the early evidence of change describes creating appropriate structures. This differs from other initiatives where structures exist. Hence, we recognize our tiered system of instruction across all schools is at the beginning stages. In addition, while we have worked to develop a continuum of services for our students with disabilities PreK-12, we recognize that services and placements need to be strengthened. To address the achievement gap for our students with disabilities, we will begin restructuring our K-12 placement settings to ensure that all students have access to viable curriculum and rigorous teaching and learning.	**D. Short term and Final Outcomes from the Initiative:** **Short Term Outcomes** • All District Benchmarks (K-12) show a 10-15% decrease in students scoring at the Warning Level, in the aggregate and for all subgroups. These Benchmarks are given regularly throughout the year and are compiled quarterly by the Office of Instruction and then are reported out at Principals' Meetings and to the School Committee. • ELL benchmark data from Keystones and Avenues show a 10-15% increase in performance (baseline 2012). **Final Outcomes** • All students and high needs subgroups meet annual PPI targets (CPI Growth and SGP). • ACCESS data shows a 15% increase in English Language Learner proficiency rates to obtaining English. • Warning/Failing Categories of MCAS decreases by 10-15% for the aggregate and high needs subgroup. • The number of referrals to Special Education for lack of Academic Achievement will decline by 5% • Substaintally separate and Out of District placements will decrease by 5% and partial inclusion placements will increase by 5% for students with disabilities.	**E. Overall Lead (Initiative):** Pam Pacheco, Director of Professional Development Ivone Medeiros, Executive Director of Special Education

F. Which recommendations from the District Review or other evidence does this initiative address?

Targeting the needs of all learners is cross cutting from the specific needs of students with disabilities, those who are English Language Learners, to those who are simply behind and need supplemental support. Specific actions steps in the Recovery Plan that address this issue includes the following Strategies form the Teaching and Learning Section:

- Strengthen the ELL expertise of teachers and staff in coordination with revised policies, procedures and plans (e.g., the DIP, SIP, and ELE

CAP) to improve the achievement of English language learners, • Strengthen the expertise of teachers to improve the achievement of students with disabilities, and • Strengthen educator capacity to use student assessment data to improve instruction and achievement. However, the successes of these goals are interdependent in many ways to ensure that instruction is data-driven and targeted based on need rather than assumptions. Hence, we utilize the MTSS framework to outline the action steps needed to meet the goals of this initiative.	
G. What are the key indicators for this initiative to show early evidence of change? **Early Evidence of Change** • Observations indicate an improvement in the climate of classroom as measured against the Standard II, *Teaching All Students:* The teacher promotes the Flearning and growth of all students through instructional practices that establish high expectations, create a safe and effective classroom environment, and demonstrate cultural proficiency. This indicator will be compiled at the school level through observation protocols, and formative and summative evaluations with a goal of 80% proficiency or above. Results will be included in SRV reports to schools for feedback.	**H. By when?** **January 2013**

Quarter	Activities to Achieve the Outcomes for the Initiative	Who will Lead?	When will it Start?	When will it be Complete?	What Resources are Needed?
September 2012	The Language and Literacy, Math and SEL Teams meet to analyse data and create a plan of action (see Strategic Initiative 2). Teams report out to staff with regard to data and the plan of action with regard to large and small group instruction.	Team Facilitators	September 2012	September 2012	n/a
October 2012	Teams conduct a needs assessment to identify supplemental and intensive interventions The teams create a list of interventions and an "if/then" column to help teachers identify appropriate interventions for students and appropriate assessments, both in terms of diagnostic and progress monitoring assessments. Additional Supplemental Interventions and additional training is identified and reported out at Instructional coaching networks (Math, Literacy, and SAC) for central office coordination and support.	Pam Pacheco (Literacy) Fran Roy (Math) Lisa Aguiar (SEL)	October 2012	October 2012	Funds to purchase additional interventional material and training. TBD.
November 2012	Instructional coaching networks coordinate plans for professional development of teachers for tier II and tier III interventions.	Pam Pacheco (Literacy) Fran Roy (Math) Lisa Aguiar	November 2012	November 2012	Stipends for Teachers TBD

Massachusetts Department of ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY EDUCATION

		(SEL)			
November 2012	School-Based Vertical Teams analyze Fall benchmarks to identify school *trends*, strengths, and weaknesses, as well as students in need of supplemental support, disaggregated by subgroup. School-Based Vertical teams, then create an action plan to improve large and small group instruction.	Team Facilitators	January 2013	January 2013	n/a
November 2012	RTI District Team reconvenes to examine Fall data, including referrals to the Curriculum Accommodation Team (CAT), revisit policies and procedures, and identify school-based training.	Pam Pacheco	November 2012	November 2012	Stipends for RTI, TBD
December 2012	Summer MTSS Pilot Schools (Greene, Silvia, and Spencer Borden) update the MTSS Self-Assessment.	Pam Pacheco	December 2012	January 2012	n/a
February 2013	School-Based Vertical Teams analyze Winter benchmarks to identify school *trends*, strengths, and weaknesses, as well as students in need of supplemental support, disaggregated by subgroup. School-Based Vertical teams, then create an action plan to improve large and small group instruction.	Team Facilitators	February 2013	February 2013	n/a
February 2013	RTI District Team reconvenes to examine Winter data, including referrals to the Curriculum Accommodation Team (CAT), revisit policies and procedures, and identify school-based training.	Pam Pacheco	February 2013	February 2013	Stipends, TBD
May 2013	School-Based Vertical Teams analyze Spring benchmarks to identify school *trends*, strengths, and weaknesses, as well as students in need of supplemental support, disaggregated by subgroup. School-Based Vertical teams, then create an action plan to improve large and small group instruction.	Team Facilitators	May 2013	May 2013	n/a

May 2013	RTI District Team reconvenes to examine Spring data, including referrals to the Curriculum Accommodation Team (CAT), revisit policies and procedures, and identify school-based training.	Pam Pacheco	May 2013	May 2013	Stipends, TBD
June 2013	Summer MTSS Pilot Schools (Greene, Silvia, and Spencer Borden) update the MTSS Self-Assessment.	Pam Pacheco	June 2012	June 2012	n/a
July 2013	RTI plan is expanded to all district schools, based on lessons learned from Pilot Year.	Pam Pacheco	July 2013	August 2013	Stipends, TBD

Quarterly Progress Rating (QPR) of the Strategic Initiative

Key: P = Process, O = Outcome

	September 2012	October 2012	November 2012	December 2012	February 2013	May 2013	June 2013	August 2013
P								
O								

It is critical to provide a separate rating for the process of implementation (activities) and outcomes (early evidence of change as well as short-term outcomes and final outcomes).

A. District Strategic Objective 3: Ensure success for all students through the development of students' social and emotional wellness.		B. Overall Lead (Objective): Fran Roy, Chief Academic Officer
C. Initiative Number and Description: SO3.1 ***Create positive school culture and classroom climate.*** The purpose of this Strategic Objective is to improve the social emotional learning (SEL) skills of our students so that students develop the habits of mind and skills that will allow them to be successful academically. We utilize the MA DESE SEL Guidelines on Social Emotional Learning, to define those skills as: Self-Awareness, Self-Management, Social Awareness, Relationship Skills, and Responsible Decision Making. As stated in our Wraparound Zone (WAZ) Plan (supported through RTTT funds), we take a multifacted approach to providing the necessary learning conditions and experiences that will maximize the development of social emotional skills. The FRPS WAZ plan is built upon three legs: Positive School and Classroom Climate (Initiative 1 of Strategic Objective 3), and Connections between Home and School (Initiative 2 of Strategic Objective 3), and Positive Youth Development Activitiea (Initiative 3 of Strategic Objective 4). We view these three focus areas as three contexts in which we must maximize students development of social emotional skills. That is, although the settings differ, the outcomes are the same. Therefore, the Long Term Outcomes in each of these first three initiatives of this objective are intentionally the same, and focus on student behavior and SEL Data.	**D. Short term and Final Outcomes from the Initiative:** **Short Term Outcomes** • Survey data from staff and students indicates a 5-10% improvement in climate and culture as measured by the Conditions for Learning Survey by American Institute for Research. **Long Term Outcomes** • Office referrals, suspensions, and tardies decline by 5%, annually. • 100% of students attend school 95% of time. • Students show a 5% improvement in SEL Skills, as measured by Developmental Studies Center Child Development Project Scales. • The number of referrals to SPED for Emotional and Behavioral Disabilities decline by 5%. • Dropout rate reaches PPI targets for all students and high needs subgroups and cohort graduation rates increase.	**E. Overall Lead (Initiative):** District Wrap Around Zone Coordinator

For this initiative, *Positive School and Classroom Climate,* we have begun training schools in pro-active classroom management programs. Responsive Classroom is being utilized on the elementary level, where four schools have been trained and a train the trainer model is being planned for remaining district schools. All elementary schools have received comprehensive training in Playworks which assists schools in desiging recess to promote safe, meaningful play, teach conflict resolution, and develop positive play skills during recess time. The middle schools have received training in the Gudided Discipline methodology. Guided Discipline addresses the formation of positive school wide discipline procedures, positive behavior interventions and supports, and positvie, collaborative classroom management. All four middle schools have received Guided Discipline training. Durfee High School is currently in a self-assessment year regarding climate and culture inititative. They are reviewing several programs including Gudied Discipline to assess which would best meet their needs, but have instituted a freshman advisory program. Durfee High School, thorugh the NEASC accrediation process is preparing to launch an advisory proram for a ll students beginning in the 2013-2014 SY. Stone Therepeautic and Resiliency Preparatory School both have undertaken improving climate and culture specific to the unique needs of their populations either through staffing behavior or counseling specialists, embedding unique programming options that tailor to student needs, or creating activities that enhance school identity. For this initiative, *Positive School and Classroom*		

Climate, we have begun training schools in pro-active classroom management programs. Responsive Classroom is being utilized on the elementary level, where four schools have been trained a train the trainer model is being planned for remaining district schools. All elementary schools have received comprehensive training in Playworks which assists schools in desiging recess to promote safe, meaningful play, teach conflict resolution, and develop positive play skills during recess time. The middle schools have received training in the Gudided Discipline methodology. Guided Discipline addresses the formation of positive school wide discipline procedures, positive behavior interventions and supports, and positvie, collaborative classroom management. All four middle schools have received Guided Discipline training. Durfee High School is currently in an exploration year regarding climate and culture inititative. They are reviewing several programs including Gudied Discipline to assess which would best meet their needs, but have instituted a freshman advisory program. Stone Therepeautic and Resiliency Preparatory School both have undertaken improving climate and culture specific to the unique needs of their populations either through staffing behavior or counseling speciliastsque, embedding unique programming options that tailor to student needs, or creating activities that enhance school identity.		

F. Which recommendations from the District Review or other evidence does this initiative address?	
The framework for the development of students' social emotional wellness through positive school and classroom climate, home school connections, and positive youth development through community partnerships comes from the district's Wraparound Zone Initiative (WAZ). The WAZ initiative is a Race to the Top Project that provided us with financial and technical assistance to develop WAZ plans in a cohort of schools (Doran, Kuss, and Viveiros for year 1, and Talbot, Fonseca, and Durfee for year 2). By embedding these initiatives in the District's Accelerated Improvement Plan, we aim to expand the social emotional supports throughout all schools in the district.	
G. What are the key indicators for this initiative to show early evidence of change? **Early Evidence of Change** • Observations indicate an improvement in the climate of classroom as measured against the Standard II, *Teaching All Students:* The teacher promotes the learning and growth of all students through instructional practices that establish high expectations, create a safe and effective classroom environment, and demonstrate cultural proficiency. This indicator will be compiled at the school level through observation protocols, and formative and summative evaluations with a goal of 80% proficiency or above. Results will be included in SRV reports to schools for feedback.	**H. By when?** Initial monitoring visits will be completed by November 2012.

Quarter	I. Activities to Achieve the Outcomes for the Initiative	J. Who will Lead?	K. When will it Start?	L. When will it be Complete?	M. What Resources are Needed?
June 2012	Faculty in the Wrap Around Schools and all middle schools attend Responsive Classroom or Guided Discipline Professional Development training.	District Wrap Around Zone Coordinator	June 2012	August 2012	n/a
Sept. 2012	Development of a school based Social-Emotional Learning team to develop and monitor social emotional initiatives in the school.	District Wrap Around Zone Coordinator	Sept. 2012	Sept. 2012	n/a
October 2012	Students are administered a school culture and climate survey to gather base line data.	District Wrap Around Zone Coordinator	October 2012	November 2012	Survey Tool
October 2012	Positive classroom climate observations will take place to monitor for fidelity to the principals of Responsive Classroom and Guided Discipline and SEL initiatives from school based SEL teams.	District Wrap Around Zone Coordinator	October 2012	June 2013	Responsive Classroom and Guided Discipline Assessment Tool for Administrators
January 2013	SEL teams monitor implementation strategies to ensure school-based goals are met.	District Wrap Around Zone Coordinator	January 2013	January 2013	n/a

Massachusetts Department of ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY EDUCATION

May 2013	Climate and culture survey administer and data analysed to monitor gains and make adjustments for upcoming year.	SEL Team	May 2013	June 2013	Survey Tool

Quarterly Progress Rating (QPR) of the Strategic Initiative

Key: P = Process, O = Outcome

	Oct 2011	Jan 2012	April 2012	July 2012	Oct 2012	Jan 2013	April 2013	July 2013	Oct 2013
P									
O									

It is critical to provide a separate rating for the process of implementation (activities) and outcomes (early evidence of change as well as short-term outcomes and final outcomes).

A. District Strategic Objective 3: Ensure success for all students through the development of students' social and emotional wellness.		B. Overall Lead (Objective): Fran Roy, Chief Academic Officer
C. Initiative Number and Description: SO3.2 ***Empower parents through enhanced home school connections.*** The Fall River Public Schools recognizes the important role parents play in their child's academic success and strives to increase parental involvement in schools. Parent engagement is focused along three facets: school-wide planning and collaboration (e.g., school council), collaborative problem solving that parents and school-based staff need to engage in to ensure all children are successful, and offerings that support parental empowerment such as ESL classes, or job training.	**D. Short term and Final Outcomes from the Initiative:** **Short term Outcomes:** • Formative and Summative Outcomes show at least 85% of staff demonstrate proficiency on Teaching Standard III, Family and Community Engagement: The teacher promotes the learning and growth of all students through effective partnerships with families, caregivers, community members, and organizations. • A (5-10%) increase in family involvement as measured on a family engagement survey. Families articulate that they feel a connection to their school community and view schools as their partners and allies. **Long Term Outcomes:** • Office referrals, suspensions, and tardies decline by 5%, annually. • 100% of students attend school 95% of time. • Students show a 5% improvement in SEL Skills, as measured by Developmental Studies Center Child Development Project Scales. • The number of referrals to SPED for Emotional and Behavioral Disabilities decline by 5%.	**E. Overall Lead (Initiative):** District Wraparound Zone Coordinator

F. Which recommendations from the District Review or other evidence does this initiative address?

(Intentionally the same as SO3.1). The framework for the development of students' social emotional wellness through positive school and classroom climate, home school connections, and positive youth development through community partnerships comes from the district's Wraparound Zone Initiative (WAZ). The WAZ initiative is a Race to the Top Project that provided us with financial and technical assistance to develop WAZ plans in a cohort of schools (Doran, Kuss, and Viveiros for year 1, and Talbot, Fonseca, and Durfee for year 2). By embedding these initiatives in the District's Accelerated Improvement Plan, we aim to expand the social emotional supports throughout all schools in the district.

G. What are the key indicators for this initiative to show early evidence of change?	H. By when?
Early Evidence of Change: • Schools increase their parental involvement activities along the three dimensions and according to the needs of their population. The District Parent Coordinator will capture this data for each school and update it quarterly. This data will become part of the SRV Monitoring Tool (See Part F).	December 2012

Quarter	I. Activities to Achieve the Outcomes for the Initiative	J. Who will Lead?	K. When will it Start?	L. When will it be Complete?	M. What Resources are Needed?
November 2012	SEL team meets to develop a strategies to increase parent engagement through school-wide planning, collaborative problem solving with families and the development of parent empowerment activities.	Wraparound Zone Coordinator	November 2012	On-going	N/A
November 2012	Family engagement surveys will be distributed to gather base line data.	Wraparound Zone Coordinator	November 2012	December 2012	Survey Tool
December 2012	SEL team develops programs to engage and empower parents based on survey results.	Wraparound Zone Coordinator	December 2012	December 2012	N/A
January 2013	Parental initiatives are monitored to insure maximum parental participation.	Wraparound Zone Coordinator	January 2013	On-going	N/A
February 2013	SEL team continues to develop family engagement opportunities as needs arise.	Wraparound Zone Coordinator	February 2013	On-going	N/A
May 2013	Family engagement survey re-administered to monitor program success or need for adjustment.	Wraparound Zone Coordinator	May 2013	May 2013	Survey Tool

Quarterly Progress Rating (QPR) of the Strategic Initiative

Key: P = Process, O = Outcome

	Oct 2011	Jan 2012	April 2012	July 2012	Oct 2012	Jan 2013	April 2013	July 2013	Oct 2013
P									
O									

It is critical to provide a separate rating for the process of implementation (activities) and outcomes (early evidence of change as well as short-term outcomes and final outcomes).

Massachusetts Department of ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY EDUCATION

A. District Strategic Objective 3: Ensure success for all students through the development of students' social and emotional wellness.		B. Overall Lead (Objective): Fran Roy, Chief Academic Officer
C. Initiative Number and Description SO3.3 ***Develop and enhance positive youth development.*** Positive Youth Development (PYD) activities is crucial to child and adolescent development. Sports, the arts, academic clubs, and civic engagement opportunities are positive youth development opportunities in areas such as sports, health and fitness activities, the arts, leadership opprotunities and civic engagement activities will afford students a greater opprotunity to connect and identify with their school and the larger community as they develop individual social competencies. As of now the district offers many PYD opportunities but they are not necessarily equitable across schools nor is participation monitored. Elementary and Middle schools participating in the WAZ plan will begin to pilot Positive Youth Development Plans, which will track the number of students engaged in such activities while at the same time identifying students who would benefit from such participation. The goal will be to expand the PYD plans to the remaining schools in the district in SY 14.	**D. Short term and Final Outcomes from the Initiative:** **Short Term Outcomes:** • Students on PYD Plans show a 10% improvement in SEL Skills, as measured by Developmental Studies Center Child Development Project Scales. **Long Term Outcomes:** • Office referrals, suspensions, and tardies decline by 5%, annually. • 100% of students attend school 95% of time. • Students, district wide, show a 5% improvement in SEL Skills, as measured by Developmental Studies Center Child Development Project Scales. • The number of referrals to SPED for Emotional and Behavioral Disabilities decline by 5%.	**E. Overall Lead (Initiative):** District Wrap Around Zone Coordinator

F. Which recommendations from the District Review or other evidence does this initiative address?	
(Intentionally the same as SO3.1). The framework for the development of students' social emotional wellness through positive school and classroom climate, home school connections, and positive youth development through community partnerships comes from the district's Wraparound Zone Initiative (WAZ). The WAZ initiative is a Race to the Top Project that provided us with financial and technical assistance to develop WAZ plans in a cohort of schools (Doran, Kuss, and Viveiros for year 1, and Talbot, Fonseca, and Durfee for year 2). By embedding these initiatives in the District's Accelerated Improvement Plan, we aim to expand the social emotional supports throughout all schools in the district.	
G. What are the key indicators for this initiative to show early evidence of change?	**H. By when?**

Early Evidence of Change: • Elementary and Middle Wraparound Zone Schools (Viveiros, Kuss, Doran, Talbot, and Fonseca) will pilot Individual Positive Youth Development Plans, with a goal of district roll-out in SY 14. The goal for SY 13 is that a minimum of 50% of students will participate in or belong to a Positive Youth Development Group on a regular basis, with a goal of 10% increase each school year. • Remaining schools will increase the number of Positive Youth Development offerings by at least one. The district Wrararound Zone Coordinator will compile this data bi-annually.	January 2013

Quarter	I. Activities to Achieve the Outcomes for the Initiative	J. Who will Lead?	K. When will it Start?	L. When will it be Complete?	M. What Resources are Needed?
October 2012	Formation of a Community Agency Partnership Coalition which will include key community stake holders (Boys & Girls Club, YMCA, Community Recreation Center) to assist in the development of positive youth development activities.	District Wrap Around Zone Coordinator	October 2012	June of 2013 (Will meet monthly).	N/A
October 2012	Schools will conduct a positive youth development survey to gather data regarding the number of students currently engaged in PYD and what types of PYD activities students and families would like to participate in.	District Wrap Around Zone Coordinator	October 2012	October 2012	PYD Survey Tool
November 2012	Collaborate with community agencies to provide positive youth development activities based on survey results and individual school needs.	District Wrap Around Zone Coordinator	November 2012	On-going	n/a
November 2012	SEL teams and SSC team will develop a Positive Youth Development Plan to be piloted at the WAZ schools.	District Wrap Around Zone Coordinator	November 2012	November 2012	n/a
Jan 2013	SEL Teams monitor PYD activities for quality and sustainability.	District Wrap Around Zone Coordinator	January 2013	On-going	n/a
May 2013	Students administered Developmental Studies Center Child Development Project Scales	District Wrap Around Zone Coordinator	May 2013	May 2013	Developmental Studies Center Child Development Project Scales

(QPR) of the Strategic Initiative

Key: P = Process, O = Outcome

	Oct 2011	Jan 2012	April 2012	July 2012	Oct 2012	Jan 2013	April 2013	July 2013	Oct 2013
P									
O									

It is critical to provide a separate rating for the process of implementation (activities) and outcomes (early evidence of change as well as short-term outcomes and final outcomes).

A. District Strategic Objective 3: Ensure success for all students through the development of students' social and emotional wellness.		B. Overall Lead (Objective): Ivone Medeiros, Executive Director of Special Education
C. Initiative Number and Description: SO3.4 ***Provide differentiated support to students based on identified social emotional needs.*** The above wraparound zone initiatives (positive youth development, positive school and classroom climate, and home-school connections) represent core or tier 1 learning conditions in *non-academic* areas of focus. We understand that even with a sound core experience a small percent of students will still need tier 2 and tier 3 supports for the development of social emotional skills. Similar to the tiered model of (academic) instruction outlined in Strategic Objective 2, Initiative 3, the district embarked on redesigning a tiered model for non-academic needs based on the MTSS framework during the summer of 2012. The tenets of data driven decision making, referrel to Instructional Support Teams, and progress monitoring written for the academic model of instruction applies to then non-academic needs as well.	**D. Short term and Final Outcomes from the Initiative:** **Short Term Outcomes** • Students on tier 2 and tier 3 plans show an improvement in SEL skills as measured by selected instruments such as Developmental Studies Center Scales. • Students on tier 2 and tier 3 plans show an increase in pro-social behaviour as measured by a 5% decrease in office referrals, suspensions, and individual student absenteeism, measured at least quarterly. **Final Outcomes** • Students' social emotional learning needs are being met within the tiered model of behaviour and therefore, the number of referrals to Special Education for emotional and behavioural disabilities concerns declines by 5%. • Substaintally separate and Out of District placements will decrease by 5% and partial inclusion placements will increase by 5% for students with behavioral and emotional disabilities. • Student on tier 2 and 3 non-academic support plans show an increase in academic performance as measured by an SGP greater than 51 in grades 4-8, 10 in Math and ELA or 5-10% increase in end of year summative assessments in ELA or Math for grades K-3, 9, and 11-12. • Dropout rate reaches PPI targets for all students and high needs subgroups and cohort graduation rates increase..	**E. Overall Lead (Initiative):** District Wrap Around Zone Coordinator

F. Which recommendations from the District Review or other evidence does this initiative address?

This initiative mirrors, Strategic Objective 2, Initiative 4 in that is based upon the Massachusetts Tiered System of Support for non-academic needs. The

ability of educators to differentiate instruction and target identified needs regardless if those areas are academic, non-academic, or both are represented in the recovery plan in Strategy 4 of the FRPS Recover Plan, strengthen educator capacity to use student assessment data to improve instruction and achievement, and Strategy 3, Strengthen the expertise of teachers to improve the achievement of students with disabilities.	
G. What are the key indicators for this initiative to show early evidence of change? **Early Evidence of Change** • All Schools use data analysis to identify students in need of supplemental and/or more targeted support for behaviour and social emotional development. • Instructional Support Teams include Student Adjustment Counselors and other SEL team members and provide targeted feedback and action plans to teachers for students in need of Tier 2 support. The tier 2 plans indicate instructional activities, time and duration of intervention, and protocols for progress monitoring. Instructional Support Teams provide regular feedback and check in's with teachers to ensure students are moving appropriately across Tiers. • Curriculum Accommodation Teams are formed for students not successful with Tier 2 support and include a broader group of experts such as instructional coaches, school psychologists, and ELL and Sped staff. This team provides direction and planning for more intensive interventions that require more frequent progress monitoring and more frequent feedback to teachers implementing the intervention to ensure students are moving appropriately across tiers. • Staff delivering tiered instruction are observed and provided with regular feedback on performance. Feedback and observations should identify an improvement in instruction.	**H. By when?**

Quarter	Activities to Achieve the Outcomes for the Initiative	Who will Lead?	When will it Start?	When will it be Complete?	What Resources are Needed?
October 2012	Student Adjustment Counselors (SAC's) begin monthly meetings. The goals of the initial meeting are to come to a common understanding of the RTI process for non-academic needs as well as identify difference in approaches for students' in need of Tier I, II, or III support. The remaining meetings will be utilized to use data to identify school-based SEL improvement foci.	Wraparound Zone Coordinator	October 2012	June 2013	Funds to purchase additional intervention material and training.
November 2012	SAC representative presents to building principals at Principal's meeting on Tiered System of Support for Non-Academic needs.	Wraparound Zone Coordinator	November 2012	November 2012	n/a
November 2012	SAC's facilitate school-based SEL vertical teams and participate in schools' Instructional Support Teams for RTI process (see Strategic Objective 2, Initiative 3). School-Based Vertical Teams analyze Fall benchmarks to identify school *trends*, strengths, and weaknesses, as well as students in need of supplemental support, disaggregated by subgroup as measured by SEL data (e.g., survey, office referrals, etc.). School-Based Vertical teams, then create an action plan to improve large and small group instruction.	Wraparound Zone Coordinator	November 2012	June 2013	Stipends for Teachers to participate on SEL teams.
November 2012	RTI District Team reconvenes to examine Fall data, including referrals to the Curriculum Accommodation Team (CAT), revisit policies and procedures, and identify school-based training.	Pam Pacheco	November 2012	November 2012	Stipends
November 2012	SAC Network compiles data for the district in terms of progress of SEL skills of students in each of the tiers of support. This data is then used to identify school-based SEL foci.	Wraparound Zone Coordinator	November 2012	November 2012	n/a
December 2012	Summer MTSS Pilot Schools (Greene, Silvia, and Spencer Borden) update the MTSS Self-Assessment.	Pam Pacheco	December 2012	January 2012	n/a

February 2013	School-Based Vertical Teams analyze Winter benchmarks to identify school *trends*, strengths, and weaknesses, as well as students in need of supplemental support, disaggregated by subgroup. School-Based Vertical teams, then create an action plan to improve large and small group instruction.	Wraparound Zone Coordinator	February 2013	February 2013	n/a
February 2013	RTI District Team reconvenes to examine Winter data, including referrals to the Curriculum Accommodation Team (CAT), revisit policies and procedures, and identify school-based training.	Pam Pacheco	February 2013	February 2013	Stipends, TBD
February 2012	SAC Network compiles data for the district in terms of progress of SEL skills of students in each of the tiers of support. This data is then used to identify school-based SEL foci.	Wraparound Zone Coordinator	February 2013	February 2013	n/a
May 2013	School-Based Vertical Teams analyze Spring benchmarks to identify school *trends*, strengths, and weaknesses, as well as students in need of supplemental support, disaggregated by subgroup. School-Based Vertical teams, then create an action plan to improve large and small group instruction.	Wraparound Zone Coordinator	May 2013	May 2013	n/a
May 2013	RTI District Team reconvenes to examine Spring data, including referrals to the Curriculum Accommodation Team (CAT), revisit policies and procedures, and identify school-based training.	Pam Pacheco	May 2013	May 2013	Stipends
May 2013	SAC Network compiles data for the district in terms of progress of SEL skills of students in each of the tiers of support. This data is then used to identify school-based SEL foci.	Wraparound Zone Coordinator	May 2013	May 2013	n/a
June 2013	Summer MTSS Pilot Schools (Greene, Silvia, and Spencer Borden) update the MTSS Self-Assessment.	Pam Pacheco	June 2012	June 2012	n/a
July - August 2013	RTI plan is expanded to all district schools, based on lessons learned from Pilot Year.	Pam Pacheco	July 2013	August 2013	Stipends, TBD

Quarterly Progress Rating (QPR) of the Strategic Initiative

Key: P = Process, O = Outcome

	Oct 2011	Jan 2012	April 2012	July 2012	Oct 2012	Jan 2013	April 2013	July 2013	Oct 2013
P									
O									

It is critical to provide a separate rating for the process of implementation (activities) and outcomes (early evidence of change as well as short-term outcomes and final outcomes).

A. District Strategic Objective 4: Improve quality of all educators.		B. Overall Lead (Objective): Joany Santa, Executive Director of Human Resources
B. **Initiative Number and Description: SO4.1** ***Develop and implement effective educator evaluation tools and protocols to provide consistent feedback and support to all educators.*** The collaborative spirit with which the FRPS administration and the FREA engaged in to create the FRPS Educator Evaluation Tool resulted in the recognition by a broad range of stakeholders that through the implementation of a comprehensive evaluation and educator support system, the district is creating a tool for assessing teaching and leadership practice and for providing transformative and actionable feedback resulting in improved teacher practice, school/district leadership and ultimately, student outcomes. The evaluation system provides an assessment of an educator's ability to demonstrate effective instruction including the use of research based best practice, and assessment of student learning through analysis of formative, interim and benchmark assessments to inform instructional change. The evaluation system will also include consideration of the supports that can be provided to educators to build teaching and leading capacity With that goal in mind, principals have been asked to place teacher need levels into one of three tiered categories: low support, moderate support, and intense support. These tiers correlate with the summative evaluation of staff that places staff on two year self-directed plan, one year self-directed plan, directed plan, or improving plan, but still allowing principal discretion for contexts of individual buildings and staff.	**D. Short term and Final Outcomes from the Initiative:** **Short Term Outcomes** • Formative Evaluation Reports rate teachers overall as (a) Unsatisfactory, (b) Needs Improvement, (c) Proficient, and (d) Exemplary. Expectations are that with effective feedback (and PD systems described in following initiatives), all schools will have 75% or more formative evaluations meet the Proficient or Exemplary Status, 20% fall under Needs Improvement, and 5% fall under Unsatisfactory. This data will be compiled at the school level in SRV report outs to schools. **Final Outcomes** • Mirroring the formative evaluation process, Summative Evaluations of Overall Performance are also rated (a) Unsatisfactory, (b) Needs Improvement, (c) Proficient, and (d) Exemplary. Expectations are that with effective feedback (and PD systems described in following initiatives), all schools will have 90% or more formative evaluations meet the Proficient or Exemplary Status, 5% fall under Needs Improvement, and 5% fall under Unsatisfactory. This data will be compiled at the school level in SRV report outs to schools.	**E. Overall Lead (Initiative):** Mark Garceau, Director of Instructional Services

The goal of this initiative is to ensure that all educators are provided with effective and consistent feedback that promotes instructional improvement. Hence, early evidence of change indicators will assess the degree to which the differentiated feedback needs of staff members are being met. The focus of this overarching strategic objective and this initiative in particular is to improve educator quality so that we have an effective educator in 100% of the classrooms district wide. The student performance targets outlined in strategic objectives 1-3 will not occur without an effective educator in 100% of the classrooms district wide. Therefore, our short term outcomes and final outcomes are measured at the teacher level rather than student performance level.		

F. Which recommendations from the District Review or other evidence does this initiative address?

This initiative is leveraging the new educator evaluation regulations as well as Strategy 3 in the FRPS section on Human Resources (Develop, revise and update evaluation instruments for all school personnel including all district administrative level positions, support staff, and all other service and support departments), as a framework and opportunity to improve educator effectiveness.The work of building capacity among all the educators (teachers and administrators) in order to sustain a fully embedded change in practice in the Fall River School District is crucial in improvement efforts. The use of an Evaluation Handbook aligned with the new regulations will provide a vehicle for administrators and teachers to engage in a reflective coaching conversation with explicit feedback focused on student success and the educator's professional development.

G. What are the key indicators for this initiative to show early evidence of change?	H. By when?
Early Evidence of Change • Effective feedback as measured against the criteria for ***actionable*** (feedback is concrete enough to affirm effective practice and to provide targeted practice priorities for improvement so that reflects a growth mind-set), ***focused*** (feedback is high leverage to target either school and district wide priorities and/or connected with teachers' professional growth and student learning goals), ***developmental*** (the extent to which the feedback builds on previous feedback along a continuum of improvement), and ***timely*** (feedback is provided to staff within 24 hours of an observation and the quantity of feedback is differentiated according to the need levels of teachers). This data will be collected during the SRV process and captured with the School Review Visit Monitoring Tool (Section D). SRV partners are expected to use the data to provide regular (at least quarterly) feedback to school-based administrators with the goal that 95% of written feedback is rated effective by end of year.	December 2012 January 2013

Quarter	I. Activities to Achieve the Outcomes for the Initiative	J. Who will Lead?	K. When will it Start?	L. When will it be Complete?	M. What Resources are Needed?
August 2012	Adopt and ratify new evaluation system.	Superintendent	August 2012	Pending	n/a
May 2012	Provide training to all evaluators on the system.	Executive Director of HR	May 2012	October 2012	n/a
September 2012	All educators develop and submit Professional Growth and Student Learning Goals.	Executive Director of HR	September 2012	Pending	n/a
September 2012	Administrators receive PD on effective feedback and processing constructive conversations during feedback with staff during Instructional Leadership Seminars (monthly).	Executive Director of HR	September 2012	June 2012	n/a
October 2012	OOI Staff develop rubric for measuring quality of evaluator feedback as component of SRV monitoring tool.	Executive Director of HR	October 2012	October 2012	n/a
October 2012	SRV partners provide feedback to evaluators on the quality and frequency of feedback, and report out to schools formally at the end of each SRV Cycle (December, March, and April) so that midcourse corrections can be made.	SRV Partners	October 2012	June 2013	n/a
January 2013	Evaluators conduct mid-cycle formative evaluations with teachers in order to review progress on and/or revise PPG and Student Learning Goals. Data is compiled by SRV partner to identify teachers that are proficient and those that are in need of more intense support.	Executive Director of HR	January 2013	February 2013	n/a
May 2013	Evaluators review all observational and documentary evidence and assign final educator effectiveness ratings. HR and SRV partners review all evaluation data in order to inform staffing and PD decision making.	Executive Director of HR	May 2013	June 2013	n/a
June 2013	HR and Office of Instruction schedule training for evaluators and educators for 2013-2014 based on evaluation data.	Executive Director of HR	Summer 2013	Summer 2013	N/a

Quarterly Progress Rating (QPR) of the Strategic Initiative

Key: P = Process, O = Outcome

Massachusetts Department of ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY EDUCATION

	September 2012	December 2012	January 2012	March 2013	June 2013	August 2013
P						
O						

It is critical to provide a separate rating for the process of implementation (activities) and outcomes (early evidence of change as well as short-term outcomes and final outcomes).

A. District Strategic Objective 4: Improve quality of all educators.		B. Overall Lead (Objective): Joany Santa, Executive Director of Human Resources
C. Strategic Initiative: SO4.2 ***Develop a PD system to address the differentiated needs of educators across a career ladder (novice to a master).*** This initiative aims to create a professional development system that is responsive to both district priorities and differentiated needs of educators. Up to this point, much of the professional development opportunities have been driven by district-wide curricular initiatives (e.g., Reading Street Implementation, Responsive Classroom, etc.). Although these professional development supports are necessary, they do not necessarily offer opportunities to create experts in a content area of teachers on the verge of becoming master teachers or provide the pedagogical training necessary for most novice teachers. The FRPS Educator Evaluation Tool provides a framework upon which we can build a Professional Development system that is responsive to both district and individual educator needs. The Educator Evaluation Tool provides a framework for identifying novice to master teachers according to the level of plan a teacher is put on: 2-Yr. Self-Directed, 1-Yr. Self-Directed, Directed, Improvement, or Developing. The Teaching Standards and accompanying rubrics designate levels of competence along the following: Curriculum, Planning and Assessment, Teaching All Students, Family and Community Engagement, and Professional Culture. Consequently, we aim to align our existing professional development option to the above two dimensions—plan level, and teaching standards—so that educators and staff can identify plan activities/strategies with appropriate professional development. In order to ensure that our system is responsive to all	**D. Short term and Final Outcomes from the Initiative:** **Short Term Outcomes** • Formative Evaluation Reports rate teachers in each of the 4 Teaching Standards as (a) Unsatisfactory, (b) Needs Improvement, (c) Proficient, and (d) Exemplary. Expectations are that with effective feedback and PD systems, all schools will have 75% or more formative evaluations meet the Proficient or Exemplary Status, 20% fall under Needs Improvement, and 5% fall under Unsatisfactory in all 4 Teaching Standards. This data will be compiled at the school level in SRV report outs to schools. **Final Outcomes** • Mirroring the formative evaluation process, Summative Evaluations of the 4 Teaching Standards are also rated (a) Unsatisfactory, (b) Needs Improvement, (c) Proficient, and (d) Exemplary. Expectations are that with effective feedback and PD systems, all schools will have 90% or more summative evaluations meet the Proficient or Exemplary Status, 5% fall under Needs Improvement, and 5% fall under Unsatisfactory in all 4 Teaching Standards. This data will be compiled at the school level in SRV reports to schools.	**E. Overall Lead (Initiative):** Pamela Pacheco, Director of Professional Development

individuals, we plan to conduct semi-annual audits of professional growth goals and ratings on teaching standards and accompanying indicators. The results of this analysis will help identify which professional development is supportive of growth, and which goals and needs must be addressed and/or refined. Similar to the above initiative short term and long term outcomes are assessed at the teacher level with the understanding that improved and more targeted professional development will support improved educator quality which will in turn support improved student performance outlined in Strategic Objectives 1-3.		
F. Which recommendations from the District Review or other evidence does this initiative address? The aim of this initiative is to improve the effectiveness of all educators through targeted and differentiated professional development. Similar to the above initiative we leverage the evaluation tool to make the decisions about the professional development needs of educators. This initiative then broadly impacts the strategies that full under the Teaching and Learning sections of the recovery plan and in particular strategy 2 (improve expertise of educators of English Language Learners), strategy 3 (build expertise of educators to improve achievement of students with special needs), and strategy 4 (strengthen educator capacity to utilize assessment data to improve instruction).		
G. What are the key indicators for this initiative to show early evidence of change? **Early Evidence of Change** • 95-100% of Action/Strategies identified in individual Educator Plans support the professional growth and student learning goals stated in the plans, as measured in the SRV Monitoring Tool (Part F). • District and School based PD offerings are modified based on a semi-annual audit of professional practice goals and quantitative analysis of teacher rubric indicators.		**H. By when?** December 2012 (upon ratification) June 2013

Quarter	I. Activities to Achieve the Outcomes for the Initiative	J. Who will Lead?	K. When will it Start?	L. When will it be Complete?	M. What Resources are Needed?
September 2012	All educators are provided training on district and building-level school improvement priorities for SY2012-2013.	Principals	September 2012	September 2012	SIPs
September 2012	All educators conduct self-assessment and draft professional practice growth goals and student learning goals.	Teachers and Principals	September 2012	Pending	n/a
September 2012	Evaluators review Professional Practice Goals (PPG) for alignment with Improvement plans and district priorities and approve goals.	Principals	September 2012	Pending	SIPs, AIP
October 2012	OOI reviews PPG growth goals to check for alignment with PD activities—will activities lead to accomplished goals?	SRV partners	October 2012	October 2012	n/a
November 2012	District level Professional Development Committee is convened examine evaluations of PD offerings, catalogue existing PD according to Teacher Standards and Level of Plan (self-directed, directed, etc.) as defined in Educator Evaluation Handbook, and to define gaps in PD system based on cited needs and goals of educators.	Director of Professional Development	November 2012	December 2012	n/a
December 2012	Newly aligned catalogue of PD offerings are made available to staff electronically.	Director of Professional Development	December 2012	December 2012	n/a
January 2013	Evaluators conduct mid-cycle formative evaluations with teachers in order to review progress on and/or revise PPG and Student Learning Goals. Data is compiled by SRV partner to identify teachers that are in need of more support and ensure proposed PD activities will meet intended outcomes.	Executive Director of HR & SRV Partner	January 2013	February 2013	n/a
March 2013	PD Committee review mid-cycle evaluation data, PD evaluations, and other documentation to identify needed additions/changes to PD offerings for Spring and Summer 2013.	Pan Pacheco	March 2013	March 2013	n/a
April 2013	Newly aligned catalogue of spring and summer PD offerings are made available to staff electronically.	Director of Professional Development	April 2013	April 2013	n/a
June	Summer PD offerings, are aligned with district	Director of	June 2013	August 2013	Stipends for teachers and

2013	priorities and teachers' needs, and are made available to teachers.	Professional Development			funding for PD providers.

Quarterly Progress Rating (QPR) of the Strategic Initiative

Key: P = Process, O = Outcome

	September 2012	December 2012	January 2012	March 2013	June 2013	August 2013
P						
O						

It is critical to provide a separate rating for the process of implementation (activities) and outcomes (early evidence of change as well as short-term outcomes and final outcomes).

A. District Strategic Objective 4: Improve quality of all educators.		B. Overall Lead (Objective): Meg Mayo-Brown, Superintendent
A. Initiative Number and Description: SO4.3 ***Improve retention of effective educators to ensure increased stability and high quality teaching.*** The Fall River Public Schools Recovery Plan, as written in 2009, addressed significant deficiencies in human resource management. The Plan called for the recruitment and selection of an Executive Director of Human Resources to establish a recruitment plan to create a pool of highly qualified candidates, and implement effective hiring practices. There is now a clear protocol that all principals and directors need to follow as they go through the process of recruiting and hiring new staff. Additionally, the Recovery Plan called for the development of districts systems in order to support building administrators. Overall, as indicated in the district's most recent progress report, the monitor noted, "human resource systems have been put in place that are designed to support and guide the system in developing and retaining a high quality staff. It is critical that the recruitment protocols are used with fidelity." Although the district has launched a comprehensive system designed to guide the district in developing and retaining an effective educator workforce, the district seeks to further refine the system to focus on retaining effective educators. Although the teacher turnover rate has declined in recent years, the effect of losing effective educators serves to only slow momentum on the district's agenda of accelerated student progress. The research on teacher retention highlights four areas where districts' can focus in order to improve (a) supportive and safe learning environments, (b) professional development opportunities that re-energize staff, (c) high quality mentor and induction programming for novice teachers, and if (d)	**D. Short term and Final Outcomes from the Initiative:** **Short Term Outcomes** • Mid-cycle or formative evaluation reports of novice teachers indicate 85% of novice teachers are moving towards proficiency. **Final Outcomes** • At the district level, 90% of summative evaluations of novice staff indicate improvement from mid-cycle reviews. • At the district level, the retention rate of effective educators (those whose are evaluated as proficient or exemplary) reaches 85%, measured annually with a baseline from SY 13.	**E. Overall Lead (Initiative):** Joany Santa, Executive Director of Human Resources

differentiated roles that give teachers expanded authority for work outside the classroom. This last strategy may influence the retention of teachers in at least two ways. First, those who are less experienced may perceive the roles as a promising, future opportunity and thus decide to remain in schools and the profession. Second, teachers who hold the roles may experience heightened job satisfaction and increased retention. The former two areas are addressed in Strategic Objective 3, Initiative 1 (positive school and classroom climate), and Initiative 2 of this Strategic Objective (developing a PD system responsive to educator needs). This initiative then delineates a path to address the latter two.		
F. Which recommendations from the District Review or other evidence does this initiative address? The FRPS Recovery Plan identified areas in need of improvement in the area of Human Resources. The first step to improving this system was to hire an Executive Director of Human Resources. That goal was accomplished in 2010. One of the initial projects was to create a recruitment plan and procedure to be utilized by all administrators. The plan was successful as recruitment is on the upswing. We now, in this initiative, turn more focused attention to retention of high quality educators.		
G. What are the key indicators for this initiative to show early evidence of change? **Early Evidence of Change** • Observation data indicates that novice educators implementing effective instructional practices as directed by feedback from mentors and administrators (as compiled Mentor Coordinator). • Effective educators self-select district and school based opportunities for teacher and administrative leadership (as measured by composition of school-based and district-based ad hoc teams).		**H. By when?** June 2013

Quarter	I. Activities to Achieve the Outcomes for the Initiative	J. Who will Lead?	K. When will it Start?	L. When will it be Complete?	M. What Resources are Needed?
August 2012	Novice teachers receive three day orientation and formally assigned a district mentor.	Mentor Coordinator	August 2012	August 2012	n/a
August 2012	Teacher teams convene for school and district based initiatives (e.g., vertical teams, see SO1.2. RTI see SO2.3)	Principals and OOI	August 2012	June 2013	stipends
September 2012	Novice teachers meet bi-weekly with mentor for support and feedback.	Mentor Coordinator	September 2012	June 2013	n/a
October 2013	Mentors submit monthly collaborative assessment logs to Mentor Coordinator for feedback.	Mentor Coordinator and	October 2012	May 2013	n/a
January 2013	HR compiles formative evaluations of novice teachers to identify novice teachers in need of more support. HR connects with Mentor Coordinator to ensure support plans are meeting needs of novice educators.	Executive Director of HR	January 2013	January 2013	n/a
June 2013	HR compiles summative evaluation ratings for novice teachers and works with Mentor Coordinator to improve mentor/induction process for upcoming year.	Executive Director of HR	June 2013	August 2013	n/a
August 2013	The Human Resources department compiles a report on retention of effective educators (proficient or exemplary). Report is delivered to Superintendent and any teacher voice participation opportunities are redesigned.	Executive Director of HR	August 2013	August 2013	n/a

Quarterly Progress Rating (QPR) of the Strategic Initiative

Key: P = Process, O = Outcome

	September 2012	December 2012	January 2012	March 2013	June 2013	August 2013
P						
O						

It is critical to provide a separate rating for the process of implementation (activities) and outcomes (early evidence of change as well as short-term outcomes and final outcomes).

Section 4: Running Notes of Progress

Date	Running Notes of Progress and/or Barriers to Achieve the Outcomes	Initial

Section 4.5: Level 4 District Plan Highlight Template

District	
Report Date	
Superintendent	
Level 4 Plan Manager	
Reporting period	
Report no	
Start date	
Audience	

Highlights **>** *current project stage* **>** *key milestones/deliverables met with dates >early evidence of change indicators/ activities undertaken*
Budget/Resource status **>** *project budget/resource* **>** *project spend/resources sourced and allocated* **>** *remaining budget/resource unallocated*

Massachusetts Department of ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY EDUCATION

Exceptions *> key milestones/deliverables missed> absence of early evidence of change > key barriers to change identified> why > recovery plan/action to be taken*
Issues / risks to be raised (new or changed) *> description of issue > impact of issue > action required > who > date required* *> description of risk > probability > impact > mitigation > action > who > date required*
Work for next period *> key milestone > deliverables > decision points with dates > planned activities>date of next report*

2009-2012 Progress and Performance Index (PPI) Calculator

Go forward to the 2010-13 Calculator

Use the tool on this tab to calculate 2009-12 annual PPIs and the 2012 cumulative PPI for a district, school, or subgroup. **Use the tool on the next tab** to **project** the 2013 annual and 2013 cumulative PPIs based on the the data inputted into this tab.

Instructions: Refer to the 2012 accountability data for your district, school, or subgroup. For each group you wish to examine, enter a value of 0, 25, 50, 75, or 100 into the blue cells for the narrowing proficiency gaps, growth, and high school indicators. Next, enter a value of 25 into the blue cells for the extra credit indicators for which the group was awarded 25 PPI points. Leave blank all cells for which no PPI points were awarded. (For example, if a school does not assess students in science, all of the cells next to the science gap narrowing and extra credit indicators should be left blank.) The group's annual PPIs for the years 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012 and the group's 2012 cumulative PPI will be calculated automatically.

Notes: To ensure that the underlying formulas work correctly, you may only enter data into the blue cells. For a group to have a valid annual PPI in a given year, it must assess at least 20 students in the aggregate and at least 30 students in a subgroup on ELA and mathematics MCAS tests. For a group to have a valid 2012 cumulative PPI, it must have at least three annual PPIs, including the 2012 annual PPI. If a group is not eligible to receive a cumulative PPI because it does not have at least three annual PPIs, annual PPI(s) may still be calculated for the group, and the 2012 cumulative PPI figure should be ignored.

	Calculate 2009-12 annual PPIs and 2012 cumulative PPI	PPI Points Awarded			
		2009	2010	2011	2012
English language arts	Narrowing proficiency gaps (Composite Performance Index)	75	25	50	25
	Growth (Student Growth Percentiles)	50	50	50	50
	Extra credit for decreasing % Warning/Failing (10% or more)				
	Extra credit for increasing % Advanced (10% or more)	25		25	
Mathematics	Narrowing proficiency gaps (Composite Performance Index)	50	50	50	25
	Growth (Student Growth Percentiles)	50	75	50	50
	Extra credit for decreasing % Warning/Failing (10% or more)		25		
	Extra credit for increasing % Advanced (10% or more)		25		
Science	Narrowing proficiency gaps (Composite Performance Index)	50	50	25	
	Extra credit for decreasing % Warning/Failing (10% or more)		25		
	Extra credit for increasing % Advanced (10% or more)	25			25
High School	Cohort Graduation Rate		75	75	25
	Annual Dropout Rate	25	50	50	50

Points awarded for narrowing proficiency gaps, growth, and high school indicators	300	375	350	225
Points awarded for extra credit	50	75	25	25
Total points awarded	350	450	375	250
Number of proficiency gap narrowing, growth, and high school indicators	6	7	7	6
2009, 2010, 2011, & 2012 Annual PPIs = (Total points / number of indicators)	**58**	**64**	**54**	**42**
Cumulative PPI Weighting	10%	20%	30%	40%
2012 Cumulative PPI = (2009*1 + 2010*2 + 2011*3 + 2012*4 / 10)	**51**	**Did Not Meet Target**		

NOTE: Annual and cumulative PPI figures may not be identical to figures displayed in 2012 accountability data due to rounding. If you have questions about these calculations, please email esea@doe.mass.edu or call 781-338-3550.

2010-2013 Progress and Performance Index (PPI) Calculator

Go back to the 2009-12 Calculator

Use the tool on the first tab to calculate 2009-12 annual PPIs and the 2012 cumulative PPI for a district, school, or subgroup. **Use the tool on this tab** to project the 2013 annual and 2013 cumulative PPIs based on the the data inputted into the first tab.

Instructions: To use this tool to project the 2013 annual PPI and 2013 cumulative PPI for a district, school, or subgroup, you must first input 2010, 2011, and 2012 annual PPI data into the 2009-12 calculator into the appropriate blue cells on the first tab. For each group you wish to examine, enter a value of 0, 25, 50, 75, or 100 into the blue cells in the 2013 column for the narrowing proficiency gaps, growth, and high school indicators. Next, enter a value of 25 into the blue cells for the extra credit indicators for which the group was awarded 25 PPI points. Leave blank all cells for which no PPI points were awarded. (For example, if a school does not assess students in science, all of the cells next to the science gap narrowing and extra credit indicators should be left blank.) The group's annual PPIs for the years 2010, 2011, and 2012 will automatically carry over from the data inputted into the first tab; the group's projected 2013 annual PPI and 2013 cumulative PPI will be calculated automatically once data are inputted into the 2013 column.

Notes: To ensure that the underlying formulas work correctly, you may only enter data into the blue cells. For a group to have a valid annual PPI in a given year, it must assess at least 20 students in the aggregate and at least 30 students in a subgroup on ELA and mathematics MCAS tests. For a group to have a valid 2013 cumulative PPI, it must have at least three annual PPIs, including the 2013 annual PPI. If a group is not eligible to receive a 2013 cumulative PPI because it does not have at least three annual PPIs, the 2013 annual PPI may still be calculated for the group as long as data exist for 2012. In this case, the 2013 cumulative PPI figure should be ignored.

Project the 2013 annual PPI and 2013 cumulative PPI		PPI Points Awarded			
		2010	2011	2012	Projected 2013
English language arts	Narrowing proficiency gaps (Composite Performance Index)	25		25	75
	Growth (Student Growth Percentiles)	50	50	50	100
	Extra credit for decreasing % Warning/Failing (10% or more)				25
	Extra credit for increasing % Advanced (10% or more)		25		25
Mathematics	Narrowing proficiency gaps (Composite Performance Index)	50	50	25	75
	Growth (Student Growth Percentiles)	75	50	50	100
	Extra credit for decreasing % Warning/Failing (10% or more)	25			25
	Extra credit for increasing % Advanced (10% or more)	25			25
Science	Narrowing proficiency gaps (Composite Performance Index)	50	25		75
	Extra credit for decreasing % Warning/Failing (10% or more)	25			25
	Extra credit for increasing % Advanced (10% or more)			25	25

Massachusetts Department of ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY EDUCATION

High School	Cohort Graduation Rate	75	75	25	50
	Annual Dropout Rate	50	50	50	100
Points awarded for narrowing proficiency gaps, growth, and high school indicators		375	350	225	575
Points awarded for extra credit		75	25	25	150
Total points awarded		450	375	250	725
Number of proficiency gap narrowing, growth, and high school indicators		7	7	6	7
Actual 2010, 2011, 2012, & *Projected* 2013 Annual PPIs = (Total points / number of indicators)		**64**	**54**	**42**	**104**
Cumulative PPI Weighting		10%	20%	30%	40%
***Projected* 2013 Cumulative PPI = (2010*1 + 2011*2 + 2012*3 + 2013*4 / 10)**		**71**	**Did Not Meet Target**		

NOTE: Annual and cumulative PPI figures may not be identical to figures displayed in 2012 accountability data due to rounding. If you have questions about these calculations, please email esea@doe.mass.edu or call 781-338-3550.