

Coordination and Integration of funds

All Worcester Public Schools must integrate services and programs with the aim of upgrading the entire educational program of the whole school and to help all students reach proficient and advanced levels of achievement. Integration of services will include the following areas of focus:

Equity of Access: Ensuring all students have access to high quality instruction/materials and resources. For example: through Title I, II and III, Focused Instructional Coaches; through Title I, II and Title III supplemental activities including After School and Out-of-School Time activities; Title IVA, technology, supplemental activities and payment of AP fees; SRG, support of additional time for teachers including activities that address equity of access; IDEA activities that support individualized learning, and through Perkins funding, access to materials and credentials for college/career readiness.

Engagement: Engagement with families and the various sectors of our community in developing opportunities for all students; Support through Title I of our Parent Information Center and community engagement; Title II, coordination of professional development activities involving engagement; Title III, supplemental parental engagement activities; IDEA, contracted services for health and through Perkins funding, career exploration activities.

Safe and Healthy Students: Create supportive, safe, and orderly learning environments marked by respectful interactions, acceptance, inclusiveness, and responsibilities to one another: Title I, personnel including Wraparound coordinators; Homeless Liaison; Title II coordination of all professional development including PD on SEL; Title III, professional development on co-teaching; Title IV, safety training, safety planning and school safety supplies; IDEA; professional development and through Perkins, professional development on safety training.

High quality teaching and learning: To support excellent instruction that improves student skills to prepare them for global citizenship; through Title I, II and III, coaches; Title II, support of professional development activities; Title IV, professional development on technology; IDEA professional development and through Perkins, professional development for teachers.

College and Career Readiness: In support of current standards, activities that help students become college and career ready: Through Title I and Title III, supplemental academic support for struggling students; Title II, coordination of professional development for all college/career readiness activities; Title IV, support of technology and accompanying professional development to increase teacher proficiency and payment for AP fees; IDEA, funding for instructional assistants and Perkins, funding for college/career readiness contractual service provider at our vocational-technical high school.

Worcester Public School Transition Plan for Assisting Preschool Children

Worcester Public Schools support a transition plan for assisting preschool children to schoolwide Title I programs, which is based upon best practices promulgated by the National Center on Parent, Family, and Community Engagement (NCPFCE) and the National Center on Quality Teaching and Learning (NCQTL). Smooth transitions from preschool to kindergarten depend on connections made between participants in the process, such as those between schools and families, and between preschool teachers and kindergarten teachers and classrooms, especially connections made prior to kindergarten entry. The WPS transition plan incorporates NCPFCE models to implement best practices.

Child-School activities foster the familiarity of children with the classroom setting and those people within it. Preschool teachers and children visit a kindergarten classroom, children practice kindergarten rituals, and a spring orientation is held for preschool children. These activities are designed to increase comfort, decrease anxiety, and build teacher-child relationships.

Family-School activities foster family collaboration and involvement with the school transition process through school visits, open houses, and meetings with principals and kindergarten teachers. WPS has prepared and disseminates literacy resource materials for in-home learning activities.

School-School activities foster inter-school collaboration among preschool teachers and kindergarten teachers to align programs and classroom practices.

Community: The WPS collaborates with an extensive network of interagency and community service organizations which support child-specific programs and enables WPS to get accurate information into the community, including the kindergarten registration process. WPS transition activities effectively introduce preschool children into schoolwide Title I programs.

SECTION I: Executive Summary

Introduction

The Goddard School of Science and Technology is a Pre-Kindergarten through Grade 6 program in Worcester's Main South neighborhood. The building is a repurposed high school with 520 students currently enrolled. The 2016-2017 demographics indicate the student population has a higher percentage of high needs (95%), economically disadvantaged (71%), and English Language Learners, ELLs, (52%) than either the district or the state. The majority of students are Hispanic (57%).

While the school's state assigned Accountability and Assistance level has remained at Level 3 for the past six years, student achievement has continued to decline and, in 2016, dramatically declined from the ninth to second percentile ranking for performance. In 2016, the school did not meet any of its gap-narrowing or student growth targets.

This proposal is a plan to "turn around" the Goddard School's student achievement by: (1) creating a shared foundation of professional knowledge to support increased student achievement through improved instructional impact; (2) creating and implementing a schoolwide schedule that ensures all students, and particularly Students with Disabilities (SWD) and English Learners (EL), receive coordinated and cohesive instruction; and (3) creating extended year and extended day professional development (PD) opportunities, aligned to the turnaround plan, to support the development of distributive leadership and teacher leaders across grade levels and disciplines. Extended year and extended day PD will be optional with participating staff receiving the contractual stipend.

Within this DESE proposal, funding will target staffing, time and resources as key levers to lay the foundation to accelerate student achievement at Goddard. Funding will specifically be used to: (1) hire a part-time literacy consultant to establish the necessary foundational structures and direct initial PD ; (2) hire a part-time behavioral coach to provide job embedded PD, in the context of the classroom, to support implementation of structures and systems that support individual student's successful participation in class while developing teachers' repertoires to address diverse needs, and (3) provide funding for optional professional development opportunities that extend the school year (e.g., August, June) and day (e.g., 45 minutes before the start of the day and two hours after school weekly) while empowering teachers and developing distributive leadership structures.

This turnaround plan operates under the umbrella of specifically targeting instructional planning and delivery in English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics. It is structured to establish and embed differentiated structures of feedback that will support staff in their work to align and improve instruction. It is assumed that ELA strategies and skills are applicable across disciplines and, so, will be applied in science, social studies, physical education and the arts.

School Structure

Goddard School has been an Innovation School as defined by the state since 2011-2012. The school's Innovation Plan was renewed in 2014 and again on April 27, 2017 by the Worcester School Committee. The original autonomies negotiated with the Educational Association of Worcester (EAW) and approved by the Worcester School Committee remain in place: (1) staffing, (2) scheduling, and (3) budget. Each renewal allowed for some modifications to the Innovation Plan which were reviewed and approved by stakeholders as the process requires. The 2017 renewal modifications are: (1) ending the first Wednesday of the month half day for students and extended meeting for staff to return to a more frequent staff meeting schedule as contractually agreed in the district; (2) in response to ending the first Wednesday, half day session for students, the schedule returns to the traditional daily start and end time; and (3) as

funding permits, teachers will be provided optional, extended day and/or extended year professional development for which attending staff will be paid the contractual rate (e.g., offerings and target audience may vary by grade, discipline, and funding source).

Critical Concern

Student performance is a critical concern at Goddard. The state data trends, particularly the steep downward shift from 2015 to 2016, are evidence that the current instructional structures, processes and procedures have failed to meet the needs of Goddard's students.

In 2016, only 19 % of the 227 student in Grades 3 through 6 met expectations (Level 4) in ELA. No student exceeded expectations. Grades 5 and 6 had the comparatively stronger performance with 38% of Grade 5 students and 18% of Grade 6 students meeting expectations. As alarming as these proficiency rates are, the Grade 4 ELA Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) scores are most troubling with only 10% of student meeting expectations and a transitional student growth percentile (SGP) of 14.5%. The SGP for Grades 4 through 6 was 36%, characterized as low growth. The SGPs for Grades 5 and 6 suggest student growth at those grade levels was equal to approximately half of the students' state wide or the median. Grade 5 had a SGP of 55% and Grade 6 a SGP of 50%.

PARCC Mathematics achievement was similar and significantly lower. In Mathematics 2016, only 11% of the 228 students Grades 3 through 6 met or exceeded expectations on PARCC. Across the grades, only in Grade 3 were expectations exceeded (e.g., 2% achieved Level 5). The SGP for Grades 4 through 6 was 20%. Grade 6 (4%) and Grade 4 (5%) had the lowest percentile of students meeting expectations. The SGP for Grade 4 (12%) and Grade 5 (22%) were also below an acceptable range (e.g., 40-60%). Grade 6 minimally met the expectation with an SGP of 40%.

The 2016 Grade 5 Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) Science, Technology and Engineering achievement also demonstrated significant decline in student achievement, similar in ELA and Math, but was even lower. The CPI of 41.3 was a decline of 13.5 from 2015. All subgroups significantly declined. No PPI gains were realized in 2016 or 2015.

Proposed Action Steps

The following action steps are assumed in implementation of this proposal:

Turnaround Practice #1: Leadership, shared responsibility and professional collaboration

The strategies needed to ensure that the school's structures, processes and procedures support the development of "deliberate, distributive leadership to increase student achievement" are: (1) a change in the school's administrative leadership which happened in December 2016; (2) increased shared vision and leadership capacity through the establishment of professional committees to align, support, monitor, communicate and further guide the work by discipline or topic; (3) hiring a part-time literacy specialist to support educators and lead initial PD; and (4) a well communicated and supportive system of observations to expand feedback and accountability for high quality instruction utilizing the DESE "Educator Effectiveness Guidebook for Inclusive Practice" and the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation System.

Turnaround Practice #2: Intentional practices for improving instruction

Key to getting the elements of Practice #2 in place is: (1) the establishment of assessment practices and data use to inform instruction; (2) the communication of a clearly articulated instructional focus and related expectations and (3) the hiring of a part-time behavioral coach to support learning in classrooms while developing teachers' repertoire of strategies to support student participation.

Turnaround Practice #3: Student-specific supports and instruction to all students

Student specific supports and interventions informed by data will be provisioned for through: (1) the implementation of an effective Student Support Process (SSP) to collaboratively problem-solve questions of student progress and access; (2) implementation and monitoring of a coordinated strategic instructional schedule with particular attention to a cohesive instructional program for EL and SWD and (3) a tiered instructional program for students with ELA and Mathematics interventions based on and monitored through data collection.

Turnaround Practice #4 : School Culture and Climate

Turnaround Practices 1 through 3 supports “establishing and maintaining an orderly and respectful learning environment for students and a collegial, collaborative, and professional culture for teachers.” (Retrieved April 22, 2017 from:

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

The overall umbrella to this will be: (1) further development of the building’s tiered behavioral expectations program [e.g., Positive Behavior Intervention & Support - (PBIS)]; (2) designing and formalizing structures to support the social and emotional needs of students; and (3) the design and coordination of structures to engage families and community partners in supporting students’ progress in school.

Conclusion

This Level 3 Turnaround Plan proposal for the Goddard School of Science and Technology is based on “The Turnaround Actions in Practice” document (July 2014), “A Practice Guide and Policy Analysis” conducted for the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education by The Institute for Strategic Leadership and Learning. It builds on lessons learned from successful Level 4 turnaround work in the state, draws particularly on the work at Union Hill Elementary School in Worcester, and adjusts to the specific, contextual needs of the Goddard School. At its essence, this is a plan to ensure the students of Goddard receive an education that will advantage them as they grow. It does this by re-establishing a school culture and climate focused on research based best practices that are driven by an aligned school staff in relation to the needs of their students and the state standards.

SECTION II: Turnaround Practices for the School and District

Turnaround Practice #1: Leadership, shared responsibility and professional collaboration

Narrative: Data Analysis and Challenges, Strategies and Rationale, District Monitoring and Support

Analysis and Challenges:

Turnaround Practice #1 is in place when “[t]he school has established a community of practice through leadership, shared responsibility, and professional collaboration”. (Retrieved April 22, 2017 from: <http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ese/accountability/turnaround/practices-report-2014.pdf>)

Goddard administration is committed to developing, “deliberate, distributive leadership to increase student achievement.” The stakeholders have identified three challenges to resolve in this pursuit: (1) the absence of high quality professional development (2) the lack of a shared vision of quality instruction and the related, necessary, professional ownership and leadership and (3) the ineffective use of the staffing autonomy. These are detailed below.

1. Absence of High Quality Professional Development

Over the past two years, PD was essentially limited training that lacked focus, support and accountability. The Innovation Plan of 2014 through 2017 inadvertently reduced opportunities for collaboration between teachers. The PD model, defined by the 2014 Goddard Innovation Plan renewal, utilized the autonomy of the school schedule for providing professional development. Teachers through June 2017 were to meet the first Wednesday of each month from 12:30 to 4 p.m. Students were given an early dismissal with minutes added to the daily student schedule as an adjustment to meet the required instructional minutes.

This has led to limited collaborative efforts as teachers do not attend bi-weekly faculty meetings. Currently, teachers attend a 30-minute grade level meeting each week to receive guidance on planning and implementation of programs. These include: National Geographic’s “Reach for Reading” Program, “Go Math” and Engage New York (EngageNY). The current coaching model is a “stand and deliver” or “direction and debrief” by the instructional coach. Missing is collegial support, in class coaching/instructional rounds and targeted feedback on effective instruction in relation to the state standards. Alignment of the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks (heretofore noted as “Frameworks”) has been driven by use of programs as opposed to curriculum mapping and definitive approaches to a standards-based instruction framework. Thus far, Goddard School has not seen a positive impact on student achievement as a result of this PD structure and dedicated time.

The January 2017 Monitoring Site Visit (MSV) Report on Goddard by the American Institutes of Research (AIR) was a requirement for this application. As noted in Area 1.6, *Time Use for Professional Development and Collaboration* is rated as “developing.” Staff interviews indicated, “mixed opinions about whether the professional development offerings are relevant to practice” (pg. 8) and surveys questioned whether there was enough time for teachers to meet as a group (pg. 9). Subsequent staff discussions and reviews of school documents indicate recent PD topics included training in Responsive Classroom, Playworks, Response to Intervention, “Getting the Gist of What You Read,” Reviewing Looking at Student Work (LSW) Protocols, and reviewing the MA DESE Model Curriculum Units. Teachers described these trainings as sporadic, lacking a cohesive approach and not in response to students’ needs. Teachers reported they had not participated in professional development related to standards based teaching, strategy instruction and assessment [e.g. curriculum mapping exercises, Wilson *Foundations* training, Benchmark Assessment System (BAS) administration, scoring and interpretation or grade-level Mathematics instruction].

In October of 2016, based on the school data and the structure of the ELA program within and across grades, the District recognized the need for urgent, increased, targeted professional development at Goddard. Training for all staff members on the National Geographic's "Reach for Reading" program began in the first Wednesday meeting slot as teachers piloted the program. Beginning in December, as part of the DESE Turnaround Grant, four teachers began to attend Research for Better Teaching (RBT) as part of the district turn around initiative for the six lowest performing schools. Staff members were selected based on representatives of the primary, intermediate and special education domain along with an instructional coach. These staff members are providing feedback at faculty meetings regarding best practices. The original plan to train all elementary staff in RBT's "The Skillful Teacher," with the five other schools, was abandoned due to safety concerns in the fall semester; student behavior in the classrooms and in the hallways during instruction was a serious, ongoing issue.

The absence of High Quality Professional Development in literacy and mathematics has negatively impacted teaching and learning at Goddard. With regard to lesson planning and implementation, PD has focused mostly on preparation of lessons. However, lesson plan development remains weak throughout the school. For example, primary teachers implement the Wilson *Foundations* Reading program, planning a daily lesson without regard to differentiating the Tier 1 (core) and Tier II (re-teaching/double dose) instruction. Across teachers, different and individualized lesson plan templates that include the standards, pacing, recommended materials, and activities are available but in contrast to classroom observations and discussion with teachers. The reality of lesson implementation is that there is little or no differentiation to address the varying levels of students' needs. There is no common definition or understanding of high quality teaching and learning or how to plan for it.

Effective literacy and mathematics instruction begins with knowing each student's strengths and accurately and strategically teaching "next steps" in their journey toward becoming responsible, independent learners who are able to process complex texts and logically represent their thinking, as well as being able to listen and appreciate the ideas of others. Instituting school-wide literacy and mathematical best practices in assessment, curriculum, and instruction, that involve an aligned framework across all grade levels, will provide for efficiency and consistency of teacher collaboration and student learning progression. This will occur through a structured, focused system of PD that will empower and develop teacher leaders on staff.

2. Lack of Shared Vision and Ownership of Quality Instruction

As noted in the January 2017 MSV, Goddard received a holistic rating of "developing" for Turnaround Practice #1, with a rating of "developing" for *Communication with Staff* (1.7). Both *Vision and Theory of Action* (1.3) and *Sustainability* (1.8) received a "limited evidence" rating. (pg.4) Problematic were staff misconceptions about the performance levels of students, and/or a consistent approach to monitoring outcomes, resulting in varying expectations and a lack of common understanding of the overall achievement levels of students: "further it is unclear how consistently staff members administer benchmark assessments, raising questions for some staff members about the potential validity of the data" and "focus group responses suggest Goddard does not yet have a consistent system to ensure all teachers are determining action steps and monitoring the result of their actions using data." (pg.13) As one instructional leader noted, "each teacher might be at a different place" (pg. 13). The MSV noted that staff report the school did not offer a common vision and targeted plan for improvement due to a variance of administrators over the past years, "...with different philosophies on what is should be or what it could be...has gotten jumbled" (pg. 6). Additionally, results from the 2015 – 2016 WPS instructional staff survey indicate that, on average, instructional staff members have mixed opinions about "the extent to which Goddard staff has a shared sense of responsibility for student success."

3. Ineffective Implementation of Innovation Plan Staffing Authority

Although leadership changed at the school in December of 2016, the churn within the instructional staff and related need to employ substitutes, who do not know the procedures and routines for effective instruction

and reliable assessment, has led to continued inconsistent educational expectations as PD and structures for collaboration are interrupted; pacing and implementation of lessons is disrupted; and assessment practices are negatively impacted.

The School Year (SY) 2016-2017 gives some insight into the significant churn in staffing that Goddard has experienced: (1) a year-long leave of absence for an EL teacher which reduced support services to second language learners; (2) multiple staffing changes in Grade 2 (e.g., each class now has their 4th teacher this year); (3) hiring of a sixth-grade teacher after the school year started due to large class sizes in August; (4) leaves of absence for three teachers for an unknown period of time; and (5) absence of an instructional coach for three weeks.

The unusual churn will change as the staff becomes cohesive under new leadership with a specific, research-based, plan of action. The DESE identifies “principal staffing authority” as a condition for school effectiveness. As defined in Goddard’s Innovation Plan, the staffing autonomy implemented by prior administration was utilized yet student outcomes on both state and district assessments do not indicate it contributed to improved student achievement. While the Innovation Plan did not outline specific positions to address areas of need for rapid improvement, it is important to note that funding for additional positions is not available through the innovation status or designation. Staffing positions are allocated by the district with regard to the budget. The staffing autonomy has the potential, when strategically used, to build a cohesive staff with a shared vision. Open positions for SY 2017 – 2018 will provide the principal the opportunity to interview and hire instructional staff who demonstrates the exemplary qualifications required to increase student achievement in a demanding and historically underperforming school.

Strategies to Address Challenges and Rationale (How it will make a difference)

1. Change in Leadership

In December 2016, the Superintendent of the Worcester Public Schools (WPS) Maureen F. Binienda, requested Dr. Karrie Allen transition to Goddard School of Science and Technology as principal from Norrback Avenue School. Norrback is currently at Level 1 status and has held this status for three years under Dr. Allen’s leadership. At Norrback, over the past three years, the percent of students Not Meeting Expectations on the BAS has decreased from Fall to Spring administrations and has decreased in general year-over-year. With more than 15 years of successful experience as an administrator, Dr. Allen’s background includes honorable military service (United States Marine Corps) and completion of varying degrees including a M.S. in Education (Simmons College), a M.Ed. (Boston College) and a Doctorate in Educational Administration, Ed.D. , (Boston College). Dr. Allen has a proven record of building teams of successful educators where teacher input is valued, leadership among staff is encouraged, and student needs and improvement is the focal point of all decision making. Feedback from faculty indicates high outcomes (WPS Teacher Survey, 2016).

2. Develop Shared Vision, Ownership and Leadership Capacity

Goals for Goddard’s Turnaround Plan include extension of leadership capacity school wide. First, the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) concept will be re-established with representatives from all grades and support areas (e.g., Special Education, EL) represented. Second, teachers will be invited and encouraged to participate in a “rotating” PBIS committee that will meet quarterly to review school data including discipline (times and locations of where possible needs exist), brainstorm solutions to reducing targeted behaviors, seek celebratory events and investigate paths to increase family involvement in supporting our schoolwide behavior program. Third, beginning in August, bi-weekly meetings will be held to guide the pace and level of impact for students and adults. Feedback from staff will guide the professional development model in literacy and math in regards to resources needed. Additionally, this grant proposal will support extension of the school day (45 minutes each morning two times per week and two hours once per week after school) to provide additional time for the ILT to meet frequently with elementary, Special Education and EL teachers on specific ELA and

mathematics professional development topics. This time will be optional and participating staff will be compensated the contractual rate. Fourth, an Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) Team, consisting of staff in Grades 5 and 6, will be extended with district support provided to promote strategies of “organization” and “collaboration” among students for the promotion of skills required for college and career readiness. This team will meet monthly with team leaders and district wide staff to increase “buy in” among teachers and students and provide a targeted approach. Purchasing of student materials (binders, notebooks) has been secured for all students and will be ready for use for the first day of school. Parent involvement is a key element as signatures for binders are required each week. Workshops will be provided to families at the start of the year to explain AVID and the related processes for parent support. Finally, a mentoring program will be created for newly arrived staff members. Regardless of years of experience or expertise, new staff members will attend bi-weekly mentor meetings facilitated by the Assistant Principal and teacher leaders from the Goddard staff. This provides educators support and guidance regarding schoolwide procedures, policies as it also consistently communicates expectations.

The contractual monthly staff meetings that the district negotiated for all schools will be reinstated. These PD sessions are strategy meetings that will be held twice monthly (90 minutes each) as contractually negotiated. These strategy meetings will be differentiated based on content and needs of individualized grade levels. Action plan templates will be created and utilized that will provide documentation. In addition, grade level meetings will be continued once a week with increased focus on analyzing student outcomes and lesson plan development based on those outcomes.

Funding from this proposal will be used to offer extended year, summer PD (five days in August 2017 and two days in June 2018). It will also be used to extend the school day for teachers (e.g. instructional coaches, elementary classroom teachers, special education teachers and EL teachers). The extension of the school day, as mentioned previously, will provide additional time for the ILT to meet and communicate with staff in building-based PD. This PD, extending the school year and school day, will be optional with attendees receiving the contractual rate. From this format, teacher leaders across the grades and within particular disciplines are expected to emerge and support the schoolwide improvement. It is important to note that in the staff vote for this proposal, 100% were in agreement with the need for PD and indicated their willingness to participate in the optional extensions of the day and year.

3. Consultant/Reading Specialist to Lead Professional Development

To address the urgent needs at Goddard, tutoring positions at the school were converted to allow for the hiring of a literacy consultant in January of 2017. With more than twenty years in the field of education, Pat Andersen’s extensive background includes certification as a *Foundations* building trainer (levels Kindergarten through Grade 3), extensive experience creating, planning, and providing year-long researched based professional development in literacy as an instructional coach, and creator of a series of protocols for looking at student work (LASW).

In January, preschool through Grade 2 were identified as the grade levels in urgent need of professional development. Mrs. Andersen created an action plan geared towards a balanced literacy program with an initial focus on *Wilson Foundations* instruction and assessment (e.g. *BAS*, *Foundations* unit tests, and Reading Inventories). Please see *Attachment A* for the guidance document used to address achievement gaps. A needs assessment was completed by primary staff members and was used to create the professional development plan. With the approval of teachers, a new schedule of faculty meetings was created. This action is already bearing results as evidenced by the classroom observations and input from classroom teachers. *Foundations* instruction is defined as “improved.” Specifically, blocks of instruction have increased, targeted activities are implemented with better accuracy, and several teachers have volunteered to be videoed for further professional development coaching. Teachers now utilize *Foundations’* lesson plans and are recording data into a collection system. In March, after two months-worth of work, intervention groupings began in these

classrooms. Mrs. Andersen continues to conduct in-depth research of literacy resources for students and teachers to support balanced literacy instruction. She and Dr. Allen worked together for eight years at Norrback Avenue School and their collaborative instructional leadership efforts drove the acceleration of student achievement at the school.

Goals for staffing autonomies for this Turnaround Plan grant proposal include funding to retain the Literacy Consultant position to facilitate professional development.

4. Targeted Professional Development Schedule/Extended Time

A system of observations will be created and implemented to expand feedback and accountability of high quality instruction utilizing the “Educator Effectiveness Guidebook for Inclusive Practice” and the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation System. Support for individual teachers will be provided based on needs and differentiated to ensure appropriate support (e.g., use of district liaisons, continuation of RBT’s “Skillful Teacher” PD, utilization of instructional coaches to guide implementation).

In relation to this, teachers’ creation of Student Learning Goals (SLG) will be based on a growth model. For example, a fall BAS baseline is provided and, after analysis, a calculated/target for mid-year goals and end-of-year goals is determined with a focus on reduction of achievement gaps for students. A defined, targeted method to analyzing student outcomes will guide teachers in understanding a methodology for measuring student growth and reducing the achievement gap. Additional PD, both contractual and optional, will support the planning and implementation of lessons to achieve the desired outcomes.

Teachers’ development of Professional Practice Goals (PPG) will be defined through the professional development plan and will include consistent participation and active leadership in all aspects of our school day. Expectations will include extending leadership beyond classroom walls (e.g., Goddard Community Group, ILT, PBIS committee, AVID committee, community partnerships committee, and organizational facilitators for our book room, family workshops and community events).

Benchmarking Progress:
Leadership, shared responsibility and professional collaboration

<p>MAGs for Student Achievement (set by ESE)</p>	<p>We will meet our annual accountability targets as set by ESE, including targets for low-income students, English Language Learners, and students with disabilities (along with graduation and dropout rates for high school).</p>
<p>Interim Benchmarks for Teachers/Practitioners</p>	<p>1. By September 2017, results oriented Instructional Leadership Team will be created with bi-weekly meetings held to make instructional decisions and increase shared responsibility of staff members.</p> <p>Teachers will create improved lesson plans to measure fidelity to instruction as defined in the professional development plan and Massachusetts Frameworks/Standards</p> <p>izing <i>The Massachusetts Framework for Educator Evaluation</i> process and the <i>Educator Effectiveness Guidebook for Inclusive Practice</i>, staff members will receive frequent, meaningful feedback to increase effective instructional practices</p>

Interim Benchmarks for Students

1. Utilizing spring 2017 BAS as baseline and the “matrix”, 100% of all students who reach fall benchmark 2017, will reach spring benchmark 2018 or higher. 65 % of students who did not reach fall benchmark 2017 will make 1.5 years progress on spring benchmark 2018.
2. 55% of all students will reach MAP projected growth (Fall 2017 to Spring 2018) in Grades 3 through 6.
3. 80% of students (or higher) will reach mastery as defined by *Foundations* Unit Assessments in preschool through Grade 2.

Turnaround Practice #2: Intentional practices for improving instruction

Narrative: Data Analysis and Challenges, Strategies and Rationale, District Monitoring and Support

Analysis and Challenges:

Turnaround Practice #2 requires that “[t]he school employs intentional practices for improving teacher-specific and student-responsive instruction”. (Retrieved April 22, 2017 from: <http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ese/accountability/turnaround/practices-report-2014.pdf>) Key steps in getting Practice 2 in place are: (1) the establishment of assessment practices and data use to inform instruction; (2) the communication of a clearly articulated instructional focus; and (3) addressing behaviors that disrupt learning. These are detailed below.

1. Inadequate Assessment Practices and Data Use

Assessment practices, including administration, interpretation, and use of results need to improve. The MSV report provides a conflicting interpretation: *Student Assessment Data Use* (for classroom instruction) (2.6) was rated “providing” yet *Identifying and Addressing Student Academic Needs* (2.3) was rated “developing” and *Student Assessment Use* (for school wide decision making) (2.5) was rated as “developing”. Raters noted “little evidence of administration and teacher using data from assessment to guide instructional practices and decide on priorities” and “on average, instructional staff have mixed opinion about whether students’ needs are identified and addressed in a systematic and collaborative manner” (p. 12). There has not been adequate professional development in assessment practices, progress monitoring systems, or targeted use of student results to make instructional decisions and determine effective use of resources. This has resulted in varying expectations and a lack of common understanding and identification of the overall performance levels of students. The MSV report states, “further it is unclear how consistently staff members administer benchmark assessments, raising questions for some staff members about the potential validity of the data” and “focus group responses suggest Goddard does not yet have a consistent system to ensure all teachers are determining action steps and monitoring the result of their actions using data. As one instructional leader noted, ‘each teacher might be at a different place’ (p.13). Putting a consistent, aligned, developmental data system in place for all teachers will contribute to a higher rating for this indicator.

2. Lack of a Standards-Based Aligned Instructional Focus

Student performance is a critical concern at Goddard. The state data trends, particularly the steep downward shift from 2015 to 2016, are evidence that the current instructional structures, processes and procedures have failed to meet the needs of Goddard's students.

Students at the school took the PARCC in 2015 and 2016. In 2016, only 19 percent of 227 students in Grades 3 through 6 met expectations (Level 4) in ELA. No student exceeded expectations. Grades 5 and 6 had the comparatively stronger performance with 38% of Grade 5 students and 18% of Grade 6 students meeting expectations. As alarming as these proficiency rates are, the Grade 4 ELA PARCC scores are most alarming with only 10% of students meeting expectations and a transitional student growth percentile (SGP) of 14.5%. The SGP for Grades 4-6 was 36%, low. The SGP for Grades 5 and 6 suggest student growth at those grade levels was equal to approximately half of the students’ state wide or the median. Grade 5 had a SGP of 55% and Grade 6 a SGP of 50%.

PARCC Mathematics was similar and significantly lower. In Mathematics 2016, only 11% of the 228 students Grades 3 through 6 met or exceeded expectations on PARCC. Across the grades, only in Grade 3 were expectations exceeded (e.g., 2% achieved Level 5). The SGP for Grades 4 through 6 was 20%. Grade 6 (4%) and Grade 4 (5%) had the lowest percentile of students meeting expectations. The SGP for Grade 4 (12%) and

Grade 5 (22%) were also below an acceptable range (e.g., 40-60%). Grade 6 minimally met the expectation with an SGP of 40%.

The 2016 Grade 5 Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) Science, Technology and Engineering achievement followed the significant decline in student achievement in ELA and Math but were even lower. The CPI of 41.3 was a decline of 13.5 from 2015. All subgroups significantly declined. No PPI gains were realized in either 2016 or 2015.

Student results on district assessments such as BAS support this conclusion. Over the past three years, the percent of students Not Meeting Expectations on the BAS has increased from Fall to Spring, exceeding 50% nearly each time the assessment was administered.

Goddard BAS Performance

2014/15				
	Exceeding Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Not Meeting Expectations
Fall	19%	21%	17%	43%
Winter	21%	8%	15%	56%
Spring	21%	8%	15%	57%
2015/16				
	Exceeding Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Not Meeting Expectations
Fall	21%	7%	17%	55%
Winter	19%	10%	11%	60%
Spring	18%	9%	13%	60%
2016/17				
	Exceeding Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Not Meeting Expectations
Fall	29%	9%	10%	52%
Winter				
Spring				

The impetus to improve student achievement at Goddard was impeded by the absence of a coordinated approach to providing feedback to classroom teachers. Feedback is integral to informing instructional conversations to improve teacher practice and accelerate student outcomes. The absence of cohesive assessment practices has led to misconceptions regarding performance levels of students and this has reduced the impact of core instruction and interventions because teaching content and skills is not targeted toward students' unique and diverse needs. Since January 2017, meetings held between the principal and teaching staff illuminated an overarching misalignment of assessment practices and the related instruction. Monitoring of instruction was not in place. Lack of classroom observations and observation protocols meant the communication of expectations of mastery of skills, concepts and tiered instruction was not clear. The MSV report refers to *Instructional expectations* (2.1) and states: "practices are not consistently understood by staff members"; "Focus group and interview participants identified various initiatives or strategies, but responses demonstrate that a cohesive set of expectations for instruction is not yet understood by all staff members"; and, "Without this guidance, it appears the school has suffered from lack of instructional focus" (pp.10-11).

3. Negative Impact of Student Behaviors on Teaching and Student Learning

In October 2016, as part of routine school visits, Central Office supervisors observed unsafe behaviors both in classrooms and hallways during instructional periods that were alarming. This launched a strategic and intensive intervention at Goddard School.

Initial analysis of reported discipline incidents did not reflect the reality of disruption observed. Upon further investigation, Central Office supervisors found a significant number of incident reports had not been entered into the student information system. Additionally, once the data was entered, it was noted that additional students had been removed from school periodically without documentation.

From December 2016 to March 2017, an increase of suspensions is documented coinciding with the arrival of the new principal and implementation of an accurate system of data reporting. The following chart demonstrates both the historical and current data.

Goddard Discipline Trends: The table below displays trends in student suspensions over the past three years. In 2016, five percent of students received an out-of-school suspension down from 7.5 percent in 2014. The percent of students receiving an in-school suspension also declined during this period from 2.8 percent to 2.1 percent. ***As of March 2017, 107 students have been suspended/emergency removal. This represents data from August 28, 2016 through March 31, 2017.***

Academic Year	Number of Students	# Disciplined	% In-School Suspension	% Out-of-School Suspension/Emergency Removal
2016	559	43	2.1	5
2015	563	25	0.5	4.1
2014	636	58	2.8	7.5

Safety concerns were addressed at the district level with school administration beginning in October 2016. District managers of Social Emotional Learning (SEL), Special Education, and Elementary Education met bi-weekly with the administrative team to restart the Tier 1, schoolwide, PBIS program. Two PBIS trained, district level counselors first interviewed staff to assess the status of understanding and implementation of PBIS. Their report and subsequent meetings of district managers and staff led to the December 2016 reorganization and implementation of PBIS at Goddard with a revised matrix and clear, shared expectations. Implementation of the schoolwide system began in late December 2016. The first step was to settle routines and procedures such as hallway transitions, arrival, lunch/recess and dismissal. This was successfully done before the December break. The work continues and is now being addressed at the classroom level through coordinated Student Support Process (SSP) meetings that include school adjustment counselors and district behavior consultants as appropriate to the situation.

Strategies to Address Challenges and Rationale (How it will make a difference)

Key to getting elements of turnaround Practice #2 in place is: (1) the establishment of assessment practices and data use to inform instruction; (2) the communication of a clearly articulated instructional focus and related expectations and (3) the hiring of a part time behavioral coach to provide job embedded PD.

1. Implementation of Effective Assessment Practices

A critical focus of the Goddard improvement work is to implement research based assessment practices to ensure consistent administration and precision in utilization of outcomes to drive instruction. In ELA, the *Benchmark Assessment System, Version 3 (BAS)* will be administered, with fidelity, three times during the

school year (Grades 1 through 6) and will give detailed assessment guidelines enabling teachers to sharpen their observation of students' reading behaviors and strengthen the connection from assessment to instruction. Collegial discussion and reflection on teachers' assessments, analysis and observations will support the planning and implementation of rich and comprehensive literacy experiences that meet learners where they are and bring them forward with intention and precision. (Fountas & Pinnell, 2016) This proposal will support the purchase of current Fountas and Pinnell materials such as the BAS (Version 3), "The Continuum of Learning", and "Guiding Readers and Writers" to ensure staff members have the needed tools to implement the professional development. *Foundations* Unit Assessments will be reviewed both for administration, analysis and re-teaching protocols in preschool through Grade 3. The NWEA's MAP Reading Assessment will also be administered properly and the data will be analyzed in grade level teams to support application of results to instructional planning.

In mathematics, formative assessment, administration, analysis and the link to instructional planning will be the focus preschool through grade 6. Common assessments will be developed with support of the district mathematics liaison. Additionally, the NWEA's Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Mathematics Assessment will also be administered properly and the data will be analyzed in grade level teams to support application of results to instructional planning.

2. Standards-Aligned Instruction for All

Standards-based instruction aligned to the Massachusetts Frameworks for ELA and Mathematics will be delivered to all students, in all classrooms, every day. Daily instructional delivery in content areas will be defined through professional learning opportunities using the workshop model (e.g., see *The Readers' and Writers' Workshop*) a tool for an aligned, focused approach to planning and instruction. Key elements of the workshop model will be evident in lesson plans and instruction:

ASSESSMENT: Use of classroom, district and state assessment data to design instruction that meets students' needs with formative and summative assessments to inform instruction. Re-teaching, remediation and enrichment will be adjusted based on assessment outcomes.

KNOWLEDGE OF LEARNERS: Changes in instructional approaches will be based on the developmental levels of students with levels of complexity instructed through varied differentiated activities.

PLANNING and INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY: Use of both formative and summative assessments to guide planning and development of plans that are clear, logical, sequential, and aligned to the MA Frameworks. Lesson plans will be created and implemented skillfully using appropriate strategies, and will connect students' knowledge and interests to increase engagement in the learning process.

Professional Development in Literacy

The ELA PD plan proposed will provide primary teachers a year-long model of training with an emphasis on a balanced literacy approach including targeted tiered instruction and intervention. Pre-Kindergarten through Grade 2 staff will be provided training in Wilson's *Foundations* which will ensure all students are being given a systematic approach to decoding in the early grades. This program, utilized in combination with curriculum mapping activities in the foundations of reading, will provide a targeted approach to teaching the state frameworks. *Wilson Foundations* and early literacy instruction will lay the ground work for a tiered system of instruction and intervention for students within the context of classroom instruction. *Foundations* Unit assessments will define specific skills not mastered and primary teachers will "double dose" lessons based on reading and spelling inventories in addition to *Wilson Foundations* unit assessments. Results of inventories and unit assessments will provide teachers with an accurate understanding of student performance levels and needed interventions

In conjunction with the BAS, *Version 3*, a year-long, embedded, professional development, preschool through Grade 6, that is based on “*The Fountas & Pinnell Literacy Continuum: Expanded Edition* “ will be provided. Teachers will become more reflective, responsive, and knowledgeable in planning instruction that will effectively and efficiently meet the literacy needs of all students.

Professional Development in Mathematics:

Utilizing outcomes from the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment in Grades 3 through 6, instructional staff will analyze outcomes for students based on RIT scores (e.g., RIT is an abbreviation for “Rausch Unit.” A student’s RIT score indicates the level at which the student was answering correctly 50 % of the time.). As a result, they will be coached and work together to provide instruction intentionally focused on *The Standards for Mathematical Practice 1(SMP 1)* (Massachusetts Curriculum Framework). The standards describe varieties of expertise that mathematics educators at all levels should seek to develop in their students.

SMP 1 (making sense of problems and preserving in solving them) encourages students to monitor and evaluate their progress in mathematical practice and adjust their approach if needed to continually ask themselves if their outcomes make sense. In other words, students will be explicitly taught self-regulation strategies. PD will also include the mapping of the frameworks and development of essential questions to address SMP 1.

3. Part-time Behavior Consultant: The hiring of a part-time Behavioral Coach is an initial, critical step in providing job embedded PD for classroom management at his time. The part-time position will be utilized to provide customized professional development for our teachers and to develop a proactive approach to address the social/emotional needs of targeted students. This focus includes the tier 1 reinforcement of classroom management techniques such as those in RBT’s “Skillful Teacher” and the schoolwide PBIS program as well as more differentiated responses including the use of positive incentive plans, coordination with parents/guardians and outside therapists, as well as any necessary data collection and teacher development of a tiered response/redirection protocols.

Benchmarking Progress:
Intentional practices for improving instruction

<p>MAGs for Student Achievement (set by ESE)</p>	<p>We will meet our annual accountability targets as set by ESE, including targets for low-income students, English Language Learners, and students with disabilities (along with graduation and dropout rates for high school).</p>
<p>Other Measurable Annual Goals See Appendix A of Turnaround Plan Guidance for sample MAGs in these areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Student acquisition of twenty-first century skills ● Development of college readiness, including at the elementary and middle school levels ● Developmentally appropriate child 	<p>CESS 2018, 55% of EL will have a SGP of 40 or higher</p> <p>5th and 6th graders will demonstrate mastery (as defined by rubric) of organizational skills as defined by AVID</p> <p>students who do not reach projected MAP growth (MAP) will engage in Khan Academy in areas defined as needing improvement</p> <p>students (or higher) will reach mastery as defined by <i>Foundations</i> Unit Assessments in preschool through Grade 2.</p>

assessments from pre-kindergarten through third grade, if applicable	
Interim Benchmarks for Teachers/Practitioners	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will administer reliable assessments to determine student needs and utilize outcomes to inform next instructional steps as based on the professional development plan. 2. 100% of teachers will implement the agreed on literacy and math frameworks as aligned in the professional development plan. 3. 100% of teachers will have a Student Learning Goal and Professional Practice Goal that aligns with the literacy and math framework and receive formal and informal feedback as defined by the MA Educator Evaluator System.
Interim Benchmarks for Students	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilizing spring 2017 BAS as baseline and the “matrix”, 100% of all students who reach fall benchmark 2017, will reach spring benchmark 2018 or higher. 65 % of students who did not reach fall benchmark 2017 will make 1.5 years progress on spring benchmark 2018. 2. 55% of all students will reach MAP projected growth (Fall 2017 to Spring 2018) in Grade 3 through 6. 3. 80% of students (or higher) will reach mastery as defined by <i>Foundations</i> Unit Assessments in preschool through Grade 2.

Turnaround Practice #3: Student-specific supports and instruction to all students

Narrative: Data Analysis and Challenges, Strategies and Rationale, District Monitoring and Support

Analysis and Challenges

In Turnaround Practice #3, “The school is able to provide student-specific supports and interventions informed by data and the identification of student-specific needs”. (Retrieved April 22, 2017 from: <http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ese/accountability/turnaround/practices-report-2014.pdf>). The student achievement data indicates this is not happening at Goddard because: (1) core instruction is neither standards based nor utilizing a tiered system of support based in and monitored with data; (2). the school schedule is neither coordinated nor cohesive so instructional delivery to EL or SWD is disjointed; and (3). the Student Support Process (SSP) was ineffective/did not lead to improved student outcomes.

1. Lack of Data-Based Tiered Support System in Core Instruction

Examination of current practices at Goddard regarding specific supports and interventions for students of varying needs has shown that these supports and interventions vary extensively. There is no universal system in place. Staff interviews with AIR suggest implementation of intervention models and strategies for interventions have varied over time. Similarly, the 2016 WPS staff survey indicated “on average”, instructional staff have mixed opinions as to whether there are adequate resources and time to support struggling students. While current literacy and mathematics instruction is based on “programs” including National Geographic’s “Reach for Reading,” “Go Math” and EngageNY, and these programs each have intervention components, resources and activities for differentiation, many general education teachers “expressed concerns about the extent they are able to meet the needs of EL and students with special needs” in the MSV report. (p. 16)

2. Inadequate Schoolwide Schedule

It was observed that the schoolwide schedule presented obstacles to teaching and learning. For example, conflicts in instructional schedules include discrepancies in the timing of services for EL and SWD. It was also noted that fidelity to blocks of instruction was not occurring due to multiple factors including students’ behaviors. A 5th grade teacher estimated 6 to 45 minutes of instruction is lost due to lack of discipline. There are minimal communication structures or formats in place between staff regarding targeted instruction in small blocks of time. Scheduling “barriers” are described by staff as problematic particularly for students who need multiple services. The MSV report on *Academic Intervention for Students with Disabilities* (3.6) gave a “providing” rating and stated “specific, research-based interventions for students with disabilities are defined, planned, and regularly provided,” however; teachers report and observations confirm that it is difficult to align services with general education instruction within the current structure (p. 16).

In January 2017, classroom schedules were provided to administration and the beginning stages of reviewing conflicts of services has started. Fidelity to instructional blocks (for example, requirement of five times per week/45-minute instruction for *Foundations*, Kindergarten through Grade 3) is reinforced through coordinated PD that began in January and ongoing supervision. Administrative walkthroughs of classrooms have increased with 3 to 4 formal classroom observations weekly. Instructional Coaches, with the Reading Specialist, have scheduled 3 to 5 classroom visits each week. Disruptions to instruction have decreased with the implementation of a schoolwide behavior program in December 2016.

In February 2017, a federal mandate required a revision of the schedule for EL. This has resulted in significant pull-out services with large groups of 20 or more students exiting core instruction. Students miss content instruction because the current schoolwide schedule does not promote the fluidity of instruction and a plan of classroom intervention when students miss classroom instruction. EL teachers attend portions of professional

development with classroom teachers yet there is not yet a structured approach toward collaborative meetings between staff. Services are neither coordinated nor cohesive in delivery to students.

A significant portion of Goddard students are EL and thus participate in the World-class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners[®] (ACCESS) for EL proficiency test. Goddard has more students ranked in the lower proficiency levels (e.g., Entering, Emerging, and Developing) when compared to district percentages. Students in the early stages of English language acquisition require specific supports that scaffold both language and content knowledge to access the curriculum. (e.g., SEI strategies, vocabulary development, extended discussion).

TABLE: EL ACCESS ASSESSMENT DATA

ACCESS LEVELS	Goddard %	District %
1 Entering	18%	14%
2 Emerging	15%	13%
3 Developing	23%	22%
4 Expanding	25%	24%
5 Bridging	16%	21%

3. Ineffective SSP Process and Interventions

Identification of students' needs for academic and social areas begins with the SSP process which is facilitated by the Assistant Principal and School Adjustment Counselor (SAC). However, procedures to develop student goals, monitor student progress and develop systems for interventions are not well understood, structured or monitored yet. Additionally, the SAC is newly hired this year and has limited experience with the processes at Goddard. Over the years, staff report the level of needs of students, both behaviorally and academically, overwhelmed the process and, despite the attempts of the Assistant Principal, the SSP process did not identify students in need or interventions to better support them. The inefficient and ineffective SSP process, over time, has created misconceptions and misunderstandings of expectations of staff in regards to their level of preparedness (e.g., what data to bring to meetings to document student outcomes and/or progress and staff responsibilities to implement and collect data between meetings). The MSV report states, "schoolwide performance is not yet reviewed regularly or used to reassign students to interventions" (p. 16).

Contributing to the lack of effective, differentiated student supports, is the lack of a systematic collaboration between classroom teachers and specialists (e.g., EL and special education staff). This was identified by staff as the "largest barrier" to meeting EL and SWD needs in the MSV report: "the lack of available time for staff to collaborate on efforts to support students" was an obstacle. Focus group respondents also stated that some teachers demonstrate a lack of understanding about the services students receive (pp. 17-18). As indicated earlier, Goddard demographics indicate that the school has a larger proportion of high needs students than other schools in the district. Many students are classified as EL, SWD or both. An effective, efficient SSP system and dedicated, strategic meeting time between elementary teachers, EL and special education teachers, in conjunction with a strategic schedule, requires deliberate planning and monitoring to eliminate this concern.

Strategies to Address Challenges and Rationale (How it will make a difference)

Student specific supports and interventions informed by data will be provisioned for through: (1) the implementation of an effective Student Support Process (SSP) to collaboratively problem solve questions of student progress and access; (2) implementation and monitoring of a coordinated, strategic instructional schedule with particular attention to a cohesive instructional program for EL and SWD ; and (3) a tiered

instructional program with ELA and Mathematics interventions based on and monitored through data collection.

1. Design and Implement an Effective SSP System

As outlined before, three areas of targeted PD will address the beginning stages of intentional practices for improving instruction. Targeted is supporting the development of teacher expertise in identifying, implementing and evaluating appropriate accommodations and interventions for all students. Utilizing this knowledge, teachers will be better able to analyze obstacles to student learning, provide specific data to monitor student progress and implement interventions through Tier II instructional approaches. Those elements of instruction can then be presented at SSPs which will in turn, lead to a functional approach to identifying targeted goals for students.

The SSP process itself will be revisited by the Principal, Assistant Principal, SAC, ILT and district managers and will include: (1) a protocol for required data to be presented at SSP meetings (e.g., BAS, *Foundations* Unit Assessments, running records, MAP scores, teacher created assessments, conferencing notes, math assessments Reader's Notebooks, student work samples and anecdotal notes as appropriate to concerns) will be identified and professional development will be provided to teachers to ensure a consistent system throughout Goddard. A logical timeline for follow up meetings (three to six weeks) will be implemented and a coherent method of requesting screenings will be identified.

2. Design a School wide Schedule to Ensure a Coordinated System of Support for EL and SWD

Goals for the Turnaround Plan include the creation of a schoolwide schedule that will first address required SWD and EL. Thirty minute content instruction blocks will be created to provide in-depth analysis of instruction. A schoolwide schedule will be created in spring 2017 to be implemented in fall 2017 to ensure elimination of conflicting schedules for support services and to provide specifics regarding fidelity to instructional blocks of time within 30 minute intervals. Creation of the schedule in spring 2017 will be drafted by Special Education and EL teachers to ensure an effective model of supports provides the foundation for the schedule. Additional service providers, including Speech/Language therapists, Occupational Therapists (OT), Physical Therapists (PT) and Adaptive Physical Education services will be revisited and schedules adjusted to increase inclusionary services when appropriate and increase communication among stakeholders (e.g., as inclusive supports are provided, communication will increase). District personnel will be requested to assist in creation of the schedule, including assurances of support in regards to staffing requests. Specials (e.g., art, music, and physical education) will be scheduled based on the developmental needs of students and grade levels. Scheduling input from grade level teachers will be required in order to complete final adjustments.

Classroom schedules will be provided to administration and meetings will be held with grade level teachers to identify conflicts of services. Fidelity to instructional blocks (e.g., for example, requirement of five times per week/45-minute instruction for *Foundations*) will be reinforced through professional development and observations.

Revised Model/Schedule of Special Education: Creation of an extended schedule that identifies Wilson instructional interventions will be developed. Identification of students diagnosed with Specific Learning Disabilities and selection of one to two special education teachers to provide Wilson instruction only will be defined. Collaboration with the Special Education Department will support targeted professional development for special education staff to include: (1) Wilson intervention instructional group training, (2) monitoring of Wilson instruction through a district Wilson trainer as a yearlong PD model; and (3) quarterly review of student outcomes based on standardized assessment practices and review of groups to ensure targeted movement for student progress.

3. Design Effective Collaborative Professional Time

Increased systems of communication between classroom teachers, EL and Special Education teachers will take place. Utilizing portions of the extended day model and opportunities in the regular schedule, meetings will take place between teachers with a focused approach on: (1) students’ IEP objectives; (2) targeted WIDA standards for EL students; (3) LASW strategies to ensure generalization and transfer of skills; and (4) sharing and further development of intervention strategies utilizing the expertise of all educators.

Protocols will be developed to guide and align this work including a collaborative template to be utilized as a tool of discussion among teachers during meetings. Staff will be requested to meet bi-weekly on targeted students to discuss, share, and provide feedback on student progress toward learning objectives. Special Education and EL staff will attend professional development alongside classroom teachers in areas of Reading Workshop and mathematics.

Benchmarking Progress:
Student-specific supports and instruction to all students

<p>MAGs for Student Achievement (set by ESE)</p>	<p>We will meet our annual accountability targets as set by ESE, including targets for low-income students, English Language Learners, and students with disabilities (along with graduation and dropout rates for high school).</p>
<p>Interim Benchmarks for Teachers/Practitioners</p>	<p>1. 100% of teachers will utilize the SSP process in a timely manner with required documentation and implement interventions as recommended.</p> <p>2. 100% of teachers will follow instructional schedules as defined in order that coordination of services remains intact.</p> <p>3. 100% of teachers will assign students to coordinated Khan Academy activities as a form of intervention for students who do not reach projected MAP growth on MAP Math.</p> <p>4. 100% of teachers will provide tiered support in literacy through implementation of the Reading Workshop Model (e.g., Independent Reading, Readers Notebooks, Guided Reading, and Conferencing).</p> <p>5. 100% of teachers will demonstrate proficiency or higher on the Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice: Teacher Rubric in II-A-3 (<i>Meeting Diverse Needs</i>) by May 2018 - <i>Uses appropriate practices, including tiered instruction and scaffolds, to accommodate differences in learning styles, needs, interests, and levels of readiness, including those of students with disabilities and English learners.</i></p>
<p>Interim Benchmarks for Students</p>	<p>1. Utilizing Spring 2017 BAS as baseline and the “matrix”, 100% of all students who reach fall benchmark 2017, will reach Spring benchmark 2018 or higher. 65 % of students who did not reach Fall benchmark 2017 will make 1.5 years progress on Spring benchmark 2018.</p> <p>2. 55% of all students will reach Math MAP projected growth (Fall 2017 to Spring 2018) in Grades 3 through 6.</p> <p>3. 80% of students (or higher) will reach mastery as defined by <i>Foundations Unit</i></p>

Turnaround Practice #4: School Culture and Climate

Narrative: Data Analysis and Challenges, Strategies and Rationale, District Monitoring and Support

Analysis and Challenges

All of the Turnaround Practices are grounded in establishing and maintaining an orderly and respectful learning environment for students as well as a collegial, collaborative, and professional culture for teachers. This is the importance of Turnaround Practice #4. The data highlights that this is not happening at Goddard because of the absence of structures, processes and procedures to: (1) support classroom and schoolwide behavioral expectations; (2) monitor and support the social and emotional needs of students; and (3) coordinate efforts to engage families and community partners.

1. Absence of Structures to Support Classroom and Schoolwide Behavior Expectations

Ensuring effective disciplinary practices were implemented by directly addressing student discipline issues as well as the overall safety of students and staff was a priority in December 2016 when Dr. Allen transitioned to Goddard School. From August to December 2016, there was no school wide behavior program implemented. The MSV report in *Schoolwide Behavior Plan* (4.1) noted: “Past practices at Goddard did not include a schoolwide behavior plan and while some individual classrooms were successfully implementing behavior management strategies, alignment to expectation was limited.” (p. 19) Plans to address behavior approaches through PBIS and SSP meetings were discontinued earlier in the school year for unknown reasons.

The gap in addressing student behavioral needs was described in the MSV report as “in crisis” with substitutes reportedly not willing to come to Goddard and “[having] walked out in the middle of the day because they just couldn’t take it anymore.” Observations by Central Office staff from September 2016 through December 2016 included verbal assaults and threats that were student to student as well as student to school employees. The observed failure of students to comply with directions and requests of school personnel resulted in frequent policy violations. Specifically violations were high in the areas of repeated school violations(Rule 10, Worcester Public Schools Code of Conduct), disruption and obstruction of the school (Rule 17, WPS Code of Conduct) and inciting disturbances (Rule 21, WPS Code of Conduct) contributing to an unsafe environment . Historically, school personnel struggled with collection of data regarding the frequency and intensity of violations of the discipline code due to the sheer number of incidents.

2. Insufficient Structures to Support the Social-Emotional Needs of Students

Current structures for addressing the social-emotional needs of students are limited. Although Goddard has one full time SAC and one Wrap Around Coordinator, the “stressors” impacting student learning are significant. The MSV reported responses from staff indicate mixed opinions about whether structures are in place to support adult-student relationships and deliver emotional supports to students. Yet, according to district data, students at Goddard were more likely to receive services classified as Basic Needs and Resources (e.g., food, clothing and shelter), Academic Intervention (e.g., tutoring, EL supports, SPED referrals), Enrichment/Recreation (e.g., physical activity, youth development) and Parent Support and Services (e.g.. district/community services, social emotional support) than other students in the district with Wrap Around Zone coordinators. Structures to coordinate existing services are necessary.

The attendance rate at Goddard has remained relatively consistent over the past several years with only fluctuations. Chronic absenteeism is a priority concern with nearly 15 % of students missing more than 10 percent of school session days. Males (15.6 %), Hispanic, (17.3%) and Special Education students (18.8%) are specific subpopulations that have higher rates of chronic absenteeism. The early grades (preschool,

kindergarten and Grade 1) as well as Grade 5 have chronic absenteeism rates higher than other grades.

3. Inconsistent Structures to Engage Families and Community Partners

Goddard has one Wrap Around Coordinator and the defined role and responsibilities of that coordinator have varied over the years. Limited district guidance has been provided and, as a result, promotion of a proactive system to identify student needs and integration of resources to tailor services from both the school and community has been limited. Similarly, there is a lack of collaborative approach between the school-based health clinic and various members of the school staff, including the Wraparound Coordinator, SAC and members of the administration.

Engagement of families in schooling has varied over the years as well. A Goddard Community Group meets once each month with the Principal and Wrap Around Coordinator yet, there has been no formal framework developed for advancing involvement of families in student learning.

Opportunities for community links are extensive for Goddard School yet a proactive stance to establish meaningful partnerships with local businesses, community organizations and higher education institutions is not well developed. Currently, ties with Clark University include field placement of student teachers and membership on the Governance Board. In addition, the Main South Community Development Corporation is linked with Goddard and assists with neighborhood issues including lighting of streets, a police presence and links to housing opportunities. The Worcester Public Library is located at Goddard School and extended hours provide students access to resources such as books and computers. Better coordination and expansion of community links will be essential to add capacity to Goddard's improvement work.

Strategies to Address Challenges and Rationale (How it will make a difference)

Turnaround Practice #4, Climate and Culture is the foundation of the turnaround at Goddard and is embedded in each of the turnaround practices. To ensure the climate and culture of the school community continues to improve, this plan structures for: (1) creation, implementation and monitoring of a schoolwide behavioral expectations program (e.g., PBIS); (2) the design and formalization of structures to support the social and emotional needs of students including the tracking and analyzing of discipline and attendance data; and (3) the formalization of coordinated, collaborative structures to engage families and community partners in support of increased student achievement.

1. Create Structures to Support Classroom and Schoolwide Behavior Expectations

In order to introduce a consistent set of classroom and schoolwide expectations, a schoolwide behavior program will be further developed by staff members and implemented consistently throughout Goddard. Explicit teaching and modeling of positive behavioral expectations will be reviewed through targeted professional development with the creation of and implementation of a behavior matrix that will explicitly define measurable behaviors in all environments throughout Goddard.

To support implementation, monitor progress and assess impact, the creation and formalization of a "Culture and Climate Team" will take place with varying grade level and specialty staff represented. This team will create specific guidelines regarding how data collection and analysis of student behavior can be shared among staff and utilized to guide interventions. Data will be reviewed in joint meetings of the Culture and Climate Team and district representatives (Child Study Department) to assist in formulating strategies to decrease discipline challenges at Goddard. For example, identifying areas in need of increased supervision, targeting modeling of specific expectations and schoolwide celebrations to promote positive behaviors. With district support, an accurate baseline of discipline data will be established with increased attention to submitting and tracking of this information.

The hiring of a part-time Behavior Coach is recommended to assist in creating professional development opportunities for faculty members in addressing the social/emotional impact of learning. Working alongside the Principal, the Behavior Coach will: (1) create a professional development plan for teachers to increase knowledge of the challenges faced by students; (2) expand learning opportunities for teachers in fostering student-adult relations through behavioral interventions based on individual needs; and (3) assist in targeting Tier II interventions for students. Classroom and schoolwide behavior programs will be a focal point as the Behavior Coach will assist in reviewing implementation of the programs to ensure fidelity; monitoring and adjustments are explicit to the implementation process. As defined, the hiring of a part time Behavior Coach will support teachers increased knowledge and understanding of the challenges faced by students and expand learning opportunities for teachers in fostering student-adult relations through behavioral interventions based on individual needs. This will be job embedded, contextual professional development as it will focus solely on the unique needs of Goddard's students.

Increased efforts will be placed on the creation and support of Goddard's Student Council. Representatives from the Council will meet once a month with the administration to provide guidance and feedback surrounding student perspectives of the climate of the school. Evidence of Student Council input will include presentations at assemblies, presentations to grade levels, visual displays and family involvement to celebrate student membership and leadership.

2. Design and Formalize Structures to Address the Social/Emotional Needs of Students

Revision of the Wraparound Coordinator's role will include a data collection system combined with a targeted approach to interventions based on students' needs. A categorized system of data collection will include barriers such as poverty, cultural/linguistic needs, homelessness, unemployment and lack of health care. Student services will be tailored with an eye to the family unit's needs and will range based on needs, to encompass prevention, enrichment, and connections to relevant agencies. Examination of school data (e.g., academic, discipline, attendance) will identify whether coordinated interventions reduce behavioral issues, negative attendance patterns and support increasing academic achievement. A weekly meeting will be conducted to review all students who receive Tier II and III supports.

Family engagement will be an explicit responsibility of our Wrap Around Coordinator in collaboration with teachers. Alongside identification of student and family strengths and needs, an increase in the connection between the home-school links will be sought. Collaborative efforts between our coordinator and teaching staff will assist in identification of supportive "learning at home" activities including parent/guardian workshops, increased efforts for volunteer opportunities within our school, and the creation of a formal Site Council among the Goddard Community Group. Collaborative efforts of Goddard's SAC, Wrap Around Coordinator and administration are essential in order to ensure a proactive system of identification of students' needs and the creation of targeted support networks. Understanding family strengths will enable the recruiting of adults for active, purposeful participation in the school community as we seek to coordinate supports for their needs.

3. Design Structures to Engage Families and Community Partners

The full time SAC and Wraparound Coordinator will collaborate with teachers, administrators, the school nurse, health clinic staff, families, and social service agencies to ensure students attend school daily, arrive on time and are ready to learn. As defined above, revision of the role of Goddard's Wrap Around Coordinator and close collaborative efforts will assist the school in developing positive relations with families.

Goddard School will make expectations clear to families and regularly communicate student progress with detailed student outcomes. Student progress, behavioral and academic, will be shared during conferences,

in monthly newsletters, and at quarterly attendance meetings for targeted families. Informal meetings and clinics, frequent meetings held for higher incident needs, will be in place. We will revise our progress reports in order to communicate student progress in a clear manner and ensure information is aligned with current assessment practices. A series of family education programs and workshops will be organized based on the school calendar and needs of students (e.g., MCAS workshops, nutrition information, and strategies to improve attendance patterns).

The faculty of Goddard recognizes that the school must strengthen their partnership with community agencies in order to provide programs and services to better meet the needs of the students. The relationship sought between the school and partners will align and enhance the turnaround priorities defined prior. Increased collaborative efforts with the following institutions will provide improved support for students and families:

Clark University: Increase professional development opportunities for staff, cultural opportunities students, and increase college students presence through tutoring, student teaching and work study

Family Health Center of Worcester (FHCW): The mission of the Family Health Center of Worcester is to improve the health and well-being of all residents in the Greater Worcester area, especially culturally diverse populations, by providing affordable, high-quality, integrated, comprehensive, respectful primary health care and social services, regardless of patients’ ability to pay. The clinic at Goddard is one of six they now operate in Worcester. Goddard will grow and deepen their collaborative work with this group.

Main South CDC: Increased links with the Main South CDC members includes opportunities for the faculty to gain an understanding of the neighborhood challenges students face. Professional learning will include a tour of recent developments in the neighborhood, presentations to provide information regarding resources provided and administrative attendance at monthly neighborhood meetings.

Boys and Girls Club: Cultivation of this relationship will include a “field trip” for faculty, the use of club facilities for field trips and increased opportunities for families to become aware of this valuable resource.

Benchmarking Progress: **School Culture and Climate**

<p>MAGs for Student Achievement (set by ESE)</p>	<p>We will meet our annual accountability targets as set by ESE, including targets for low-income students, English Language Learners, and students with disabilities (along with graduation and dropout rates for high school).</p>
<p>Other Measurable Annual Goals <i>See Appendix A in the Turnaround Guidance for sample MAGs in these areas:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Parent and family engagement</i> 2. <i>Building a culture of academic success among students</i> 3. <i>Building a culture of student support and</i> 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By June 2018, 100% of teachers will demonstrate proficiency on the following indicator on the Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice: Teacher Rubric (Two-Way Communication III-C-1) – <i>Regularly uses two-way communication with families about student performance and learning and responds promptly and carefully to communications from families.</i> 2. 100% of students will set reading goals measured by the administration of the BAS as scheduled (Fall/Winter/Spring). 3. By June 2018, 100% of teachers will demonstrate proficiency on the following indicator on the Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching

<p><i>success among school faculty and staff</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. <i>student attendance, dismissal rates, and exclusion rates</i> 5. <i>student safety and discipline</i> 6. <i>student promotion and dropout rates</i> 7. <i>graduation rates (high schools only)</i> 	<p>Practice: Teacher Rubric II-B-1 (Safe Learning Environment II-B-1) – <i>Uses rituals, routines, and proactive responses that create and maintain a safe physical and intellectual environment where students take academic risks and most behaviors that interfere with learning are prevented.</i></p> <p>4. By June 17-18, Goddard’s chronic absenteeism rate will not exceed 13.5%, down from 14.7% in SY 15-16</p> <p>5. By June 2018, a system will be in place that accurately tracks all disciplinary issues by infraction code, as defined by the WPS Code of Conduct, with the goal of establishing baseline disciplinary data.</p> <p>6. By June of 2018, 100% of teachers will utilize the SSP process in a timely manner with required documentation and implement interventions as recommended.</p> <p>7. Not Applicable.</p>
<p>Interim Benchmarks for Teachers/Practitioners</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By June 2018, 100% of teachers will demonstrate proficiency on the following indicator on the Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice: Teacher Rubric (Two-Way Communication III-C-1) – <i>Regularly uses two-way communication with families about student performance and learning and responds promptly and carefully to communications from families.</i> 2. By June 2018, 100% of teachers will demonstrate proficiency on the following indicator on the Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice: Teacher Rubric II-B-1 (Safe Learning Environment II-B-1) – <i>Uses rituals, routines, and proactive responses that create and maintain a safe physical and intellectual environment where students take academic risks and most behaviors that interfere with learning are prevented.</i>
<p>Interim Benchmarks for Students</p>	<p>Using Spring 2017 BAS as baseline and the “matrix”, 100% of all students who reach fall benchmark 2017, will reach Spring benchmark 2018 or higher. 65 % of students who did not reach Fall benchmark 2017 will make 1.5 years progress on Spring benchmark 2018.</p> <p>65% of all students will reach MAP projected growth (Fall 2017 to Spring 2018) in Grade 3 through 6.</p> <p>65% of students (or higher) will reach mastery as defined by <i>Foundations</i> Unit Assessments in preschool through Grade 2.</p>

SECTION III: Financial Plan

This section is only required for schools and districts applying for the Level 3 Turnaround Planning grant.

We are applying for implementation funds for our proposal and wanted to share with you the summary of our financial plan for the school. We anticipate that spending in FY 19 will be in line with FY 18. The 2017 renewal of the Goddard Innovation Plan provides Goddard administration with full school budget autonomy regarding the allocation of staff and all non-staff financial resources provided to the school through the budget process. Traditionally the school's allocation of staff and non-staff resources are based on the overall district budget status, and differentiation of the allocation may vary by individual school based upon special populations served, programs offered or other needs of the school.

The district is prepared to allocate the resources necessary to sustain this Turnaround Proposal after the grant funding period, although the district may look to adjust this initial budget based on increased capacity building strategies, impacting staff development and instructional coaching, as the level of individual teacher capacity increases. The Worcester Public Schools is prepared and has the capacity to provide direct instructional, financial and human resources support during the grant funding period using existing resources available to the district. This includes a district-level administrator position that has been assigned to provide direct support to the school. As capacity is developed at the school level, the level of district support will be adjusted accordingly during the period.

School Year		
Stipends for Instructional Staff		
Before school for teachers Stipend for teachers to participate in (non mandatory) professional development offering at \$35 per hour before school; 45 minutes per day.	1.5 hours (45 minutes per day x 2 days)per week x 37 weeks x \$35 per hour x 32 staff = \$62,160	\$62,160
After school for teachers Stipend for teachers to participate in (non mandatory) professional development offering at \$35 per hour; 2 hours per week.	2 hours per week X 1 days per week X 37 weeks x \$35 per hour x 32 staff = \$82,880	\$82,880
Instructional Leadership Team and Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) teams Stipend for teacher groups focusing on Instructional Leadership Team and PBIS; two teams with six members each team at \$35 per hour one a week for 19 weeks.	1 hours per week x 19 weeks x \$35 per hour x 12 staff = \$7,980	\$7,980
Contractual		
Consultant Literacy consultant to provide PD for teachers geared toward a balanced literacy program with an initial focus on <i>Wilson Foundations</i> instruction and assessment; consultant works during school year a total of 30.5 hours per week.	\$70 per hour x 25 hours per week x 37 weeks' \$70 per hour x 1.5 hours per week x 37 weeks; \$70 per hour x 2 hours per week x 37 weeks and \$70 per hour x 2 hours per week x 37 weeks = \$78,995	\$78,995
Behavioral Coach	\$45 per hour x 20 hours per week x	\$33,300

To provide job embedded PD, in the context of the classroom, to support implementation of structures and systems that support individual student's successful participation in class while developing teachers' repertoires to address diverse needs, Behavioral coach will help build capacity among instructional staff at \$45 per hour for 20 hours per week.	37 weeks	
AIR Evaluation – Monitoring Site Visit Required by grant.		\$25,000
Materials		
Materials needed to support the interventions outlined in this plan. These include purchase of teacher professional development materials; assessment materials and materials for a schoolwide book study.		\$26,225
SUBTOTAL SCHOOL YEAR		\$316,540
Summer		
Stipends for Instructional Staff Stipends for instructional staff to participate in non-mandatory professional development offering for after the school year (2 days – June 2018) and before the school year (5 days – August 2017) at \$35 per hour rate.	7 days x 6 hours per day x \$35 per hour x 32 staff = \$47,040	\$47,040
Consultant Literacy consultant to provide PD for teachers geared toward a balance literacy program during the above-mentioned times	\$70 per hour x 7 days x 8 hours per day = \$3,920	\$3,920
SUBTOTAL SUMMER		\$50,960
Indirect: At the agreed upon rate of 2% by City of Worcester		\$7,500
Total		\$375,000

SECTION IV: Stakeholder Input and Recommendations

Advisory Board Members:

Affiliation	Local Stakeholder Group Member Name
ESE designee	Deborah Lantaigne, district liaison
School committee chair/designee	Jack Foley, WPS School Committee
Union president/designee	Roger Nugent, Educational Association of Worcester (EAW)
Administrator from the school (Superintendent choice)	Karrie Allen, Principal of the Goddard School
Teacher from the school (faculty choice)	Kara Scichilone, Assistant Principal
Parent from the school (parent association)	Rev. Jesse Gibson
Social service representative (Superintendent choice)	Casey Starr, Director of Community Initiatives, Main South CDC
EEC rep or DHE rep (EEC commissioner or secretary choice)	Hilda Ramirez, Assistant Director, Latino Education Institute at Worcester State University
Community member (chief executive of town choice)	Tim Garvin, (CEO/President of United Way of Central Massachusetts)
Other:	Susan O'Neil, Manager of Instruction and School Leadership, Worcester Public Schools
Other:	Jennifer Davis Carey, Executive Director/Worcester Education Collaborative
Other:	Sarai Rivera, Worcester City Councilor, District 4
Other:	Tom del Prete, Director, Adam Institute for Urban Teacher and School Practice, Clark University

Attach or list here Local Stakeholder Group's final recommendations:

Turnaround Practice #1: Leadership, shared responsibility and professional collaboration

Recommendations: To address the decline in student performance, the lack of high quality professional development, build a shared vision of quality instruction and leadership/ownership and contend with numerous staff turnovers the following is recommended for inclusion in this plan:

- Autonomy in staffing: Flexibility in bringing staff into the building to meet the various needs of students
- Flexibility in bringing in community partners to meet the school's needs
- Support teachers in their ability to address instruction based on the social emotional needs of their students
- Support teachers in developing strategies to employ classroom management techniques & modalities focused on instruction vs. control
- More coaching & support from administration
- Implement PD that doesn't impact time on learning for kids
- Professional development: extended time for professional development; professional development in

assessment practices; professional development in literacy; professional development in Mathematics

Turnaround Practice #2: Intentional Practices for Improving instruction

Recommendations: To address the lack of effective employment of assessment practices and fidelity of data collection; murky instructional focus; disconnected system for feedback and evaluation and staffing at the school, the following is recommended for inclusion in this plan:

- Efficient, cyclical and integrated system of assessment that is part of the culture (including students), drives instruction & intervention, considers mobility, meets students' needs
- Support the development of a positive school culture & climate for students and teachers across grade Levels that focuses on safety, shared responsibility (leaders, parents, community providers), respect, teamwork and positive learning environments
- Data cycle = Assessment--Review of Data--Reteach preparation--reteach--assessment
- Use of formative assessment to progress monitor
- Recruitment/retention: Utilization of the staffing autonomy under the school's Innovation Plan to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers

Turnaround Practice #3: Student-specific supports and instruction to all students

Recommendations: To address the lack of tiered support systems, failure to identify students who are in need of intervention through the use of the SSP process; a coordinated system of support for ELLs and children with special needs and lack of available time for staff to collaborate on efforts to support students, the following is recommended for inclusion in this plan:

- Creation of a clear protocol for a high functioning SSP system that identifies students who need intervention.
- Creation of a school-wide schedule to ensure a coordinated system of support for ELL and children with special needs
- Collaborative planning time between general education teachers and specialists including ELL and Special Education teachers

Turnaround Practice #4: School Culture and Climate

Recommendations: To address the historical lack of accurate data collection; limited structures that are in place to support the needs of student learning and the scattered efforts at coordination among families and community the following is recommended for inclusion in this plan:

- Creation of a structure that will support a consistent system of routines and procedures across the school
- Enhance the use of Wrap Around services to make the connection to the appropriate services both in our school and outside of the school
- Facilitate a stronger school-family-community culture (interested in improved communication; recruit community groups and partners to fulfill needs - resources to respond to needs; review current partnerships to ensure alignment with school needs and formulate Formulate/Review ways to improve interaction points between school and families.