Connecticut State Department of Education
SIG 1003(g) | Application Cover Page

District (LEA):			
Hartford Public Schools/McDonough Expeditionary Learning School			
Contact Person:		Contact Title:	
Jonathan Swan Catherine Carbone		Chief School Improvement Officer Associate Superintendent for Instructional Leadership	
Telephone:	Fax Number:	E-mail Address:	
860-695-8860 860-695-8492		SwanJ002@hartfordschools.org Catherine.carbone@hartfordschools.org	
Street Address:		City:	Zip Code:
960 Main Street, 8th Floor		Hartford	06103
Name of Superintendent:			
Dr. Beth Schiavino-Narvaez			
Signature of Superintendent:			Date:
			May 14, 2015
Name of Board Chair:			
Richard Wareing			
Signature of Board Chair:			Date:
			May 14, 2015

Directions: Please identify in the chart below the eligible schools in your district for which you are submitting a SIG application, and identify the model selected for each school. ***LEAs pursuing the closure model need only complete this cover page the School Closure Application found on page 16.***

School Name:	Turnaround	Restart	Early Learning	Whole-School Reform	Closure	Transformation
McDonough Expeditionary Learning School	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	X
Burns Latino Studies Academy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	X
Hartford Culinary Arts Academy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	X
Simpson-Waverly School	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	X
M.L.King Jr. Elementary School						X
Museum Academy at Wish						X

SIG Application Scoring Rubric

Overview:		
SIG applications will be evaluated using the criteria shown at right. Each section of the application, inclusive of Part I: LEA Strategy and Part II: School Plan, will be rated as 1 – Below Standard, 2 – Developing, 3 – Proficient, or 4 – Exemplary. Sections of the SIG application are weighted differently. Each section will be scored from 1 to 4 and multiplied by the factor indicated below. Plans can receive up to 120 possible points. SIG is a competitive grant; awards and award amounts will be based on the quality and transformative potential of the application.		
Sections and Points Available:		
Part I: LEA Strategy	Weighting	Points Available
1. LEA Capacity and Organizational Structure	x3	12
2. Conditions for Success	x3	12
3. Accountability and Monitoring	x2	8
4. Budget and Budget Narrative	X2	8
5. Reform Sustainability	x1	4
LEA Strategy Subtotal:		**44**
Part II: School Plan	Weighting	Points Available
1. Needs Analysis (including Appendix G: Audit Tool)	x2	8
2. Reform Model and Rationale	x3	12
3. Overarching SMART Goals	x1	4
4. Talent	x3	12
5. Academics	x3	12
6. Culture and Climate	x3	12
7. Operations	x2	8
8. Stakeholder Engagement	X1	4
9. Implementation Timeline	x1	4
School Plan Subtotal:		**76**
Total Points Available:		**120**

Rating Key:
1 – Below Standard: The response lacks meaningful detail, demonstrates a lack of preparation, or otherwise raises substantial concerns about the applicant's understanding of the issues in concept and/or ability to meet the requirement in practice. Proposed strategies are not transformative in nature.
2 – Developing: The response lacks critical details in certain areas. The response requires additional information in order to be considered reasonably comprehensive and transformative, and to demonstrate a clear vision for the school.
3 – Proficient: The response indicates solid preparation and a grasp of the key issues, as demonstrated by a comprehensive and sufficiently transformative response. It provides a clear, realistic picture of how the school will operate. The response demonstrates the ability of the applicant to execute the vision described in the response.
4 – Exemplary: The response reflects a thorough understanding of key issues. The response indicates thorough preparation, and a clear and compelling picture of how the school will operate. The response demonstrates the readiness of the applicant to successfully execute the vision described in the response.

Part I: LEA Strategy

Directions: Part I of the SIG application requires the district to describe its strategy and structure to support school turnaround efforts at the district level. Specifically, LEAs must describe central office capacity to support low-performing schools, conditions that will enable bold reform, ongoing monitoring and accountability structures, and a sustainable and thoughtful financial resourcing strategy. Please respond to the questions outlined below. Part I responses should not exceed 10 pages.

Section 1: LEA Capacity and Organizational Structure. The LEA must demonstrate that it has the capacity and an intentional organizational structure to support turnaround efforts in its lowest-performing schools.

- Describe the district's strategy, theory of change, or approach as pertaining to school turnaround. Ensure alignment to the district's Alliance District plan.
- Provide a clear overview of the LEA's capacity and staffing structure to support its lowest-performing schools. Specially, describe the supports and technical assistance provided by the LEA to its low-performing schools.
- Describe the district's readiness and capacity to support school turnaround, identifying organizational strengths and weaknesses.
- Identify external partners supporting turnaround efforts, if applicable.

- *Describe the district's strategy, theory of change, or approach as pertaining to school turnaround. Ensure alignment to the district's Alliance District plan.*

The overall approach of Hartford Public Schools toward improving student performance and closing the achievement gap began with the initiation in 2006 of a school reform model that included two components: a portfolio system of schools and a managed performance empowerment model. As one of 16 Portfolio School Districts partnered with the Center on Reinventing Public Education at the University of Washington, HPS has adopted a portfolio strategy that consists of 7 components:

1. High-level options and choices for all families
2. School autonomy
3. Student-based funding
4. Talent management approach
5. Theme-based partnerships
6. Performance-based accountability for schools
7. Extensive public engagement

Under the Managed Performance Empowerment strategy, the school district defines its relationship with each school on the basis of performance, using the Overall School Index (OSI), an index developed to measure school performance and growth.

- Relatively high performing and/or significantly improving schools will be given considerable programmatic autonomy and freedom from bureaucratic operating constraints.
- Chronically low performing schools that fail to improve will be subject to district intervention, redesign, closure or replacement with higher performing school models.
- Schools in the mid-range will be provided with "defined autonomy" relative to program and operations to build their capacity for improvement.

Schools are accessible to students through a choice system based on a lottery. Two choice models are employed: inter-district choice schools provide regional opportunities for the integration of city and suburban

students and intra-district choice schools provide preference to students in their neighborhood with remaining seats available to other Hartford schools. A Student-Based Budgeting system is in place that funds schools according to student numbers and needs, and funds follow the child to their school of choice. A number of effective programmatic choices are optimized through K-12 feeder patterns. Within the portfolio, parents have choices within transportation zones from a greater number of schools available through external providers or public/private partnerships.

Following a second phase of reform under Superintendent Christina Kishimoto that focused on strategic alignment and defined three key academic outcomes (see below). In July 2014, Dr. Beth Schiavino-Narvaez became superintendent of schools and began her work with a transition plan that centered on extensive discussions with stakeholders in the Hartford community, with more than 1,700 people providing input. From these discussions, Dr. Narvaez identified six major thrusts for her leadership: educational equity (among and within schools); an urgency to improve neighborhood schools and overall performance; meaningful engagement, effective communication and relationships; central office transformation around supporting schools; talent development and leadership; and leveraging governance structures to strengthen city-wide collaboration and commitment.

A strategic planning process is currently under way to develop specific strategies, measures and timetables for this work. However, in the first year, major efforts have targeted leadership, including central office re-organization; learning as strategy(use of data district-wide for improvement, adult learning, putting students at the center);and increasing knowledge of schools and students to inform a case management approach and address issues such as chronic absenteeism, suspensions and special education requirements. Still in place are the three academic outcomes defined in the reform initiative's second phase, which are:

1. Third Grade Promise: All students who enter a Hartford Public School at grade Pre-K or K will read at or above grade level by the end of third grade.
2. Middle Years Redesign: All middle grades students will demonstrate a sustained performance gains that will prepare them for the rigor of a college-ready high school curriculum.
3. College Readiness: All students earning a Hartford Public School diploma will demonstrate college readiness.

The requested SIG funding for the various schools is aligned with and will reinforce the priorities described in the HPS Alliance District plan, which include:

1. Talent: funding for the Chief School Improvement Officer and the six Associate Superintendents for Instructional Leadership, along with professional development for the Associate Superintendents; an Executive Leadership Coach to work with resident principals and struggling school leaders; support for two Resident Principal positions, which are an integral part of the district's leadership pipeline; building district capacity to meet the needs of English Language Learners through teachers participating in ARTELL; providing engaging and relevant professional learning to ESL and bilingual teachers; and building a culture of reflective practice. All these strategies will help to address issues that are especially challenging in our low-performing schools, including especially the need for skilled leadership, and increasing capacity to effectively instruct our growing number of ESL students.

2. Academics: the effective use of DIBELS Next assessment data to provide targeted instruction; a plan to implement the K-2 Connecticut Core Standards-aligned curriculum; a focus on writing across genres; use of and training in DIAL 4 screening for Pre-K students; a K-2 literacy plot curriculum expansion; grades 3-8 ELA cohort network to create a community of practice for aligned instruction to the CCSS; middle grades implementation of Eureka Math curriculum and training; development of AVID sites for instructional

acceleration in math; a pilot redesign of common assessments; computer-based resources to support Tier I instruction (blended learning); further development and implementation of schools' intervention structure; Early Start summer program for students whose performance indicates a need; student-centered learning and intervention for tier II and tier III reading support through Lexia; creating PLCs to increase rigor and relevance in high school classrooms; enhancing our Early College Model high schools; SAT school day administration and PSAT administration; creation of district-level school counselor leadership positions; further developing 6-12th grade career pathways and internship opportunities; professional development for school counselors; funding for College Career Specialists. These district-level strategies will provide resources and capacity-building to support school-level efforts to improve student achievement.

3. Culture and Climate: Support (primarily PD) for character education programming/frameworks in the schools; implementation of strategies in the context of school character education programs to reduce the overall suspension and expulsion rate; systematizing referral practices and procedures through use of best practices; training for parents on existing protocols for discipline and opportunities for parents to provide input. These strategies are aimed at reducing chronic absenteeism, suspensions and expulsions, and improving school safety, which are significant concerns in all the applicant schools.

4. Operations: There are no strategies within the Operations category.

- *Provide a clear overview of the LEA's capacity and staffing structure to support its lowest-performing schools. Specifically, describe the supports and technical assistance provided by the LEA to its low-performing schools.*

The School Quality Process provides the major Central Office structure for driving gains in Hartford's lowest-performing schools. Operating under the Office of the Chief School Improvement Officer, the School Quality Process includes six School Quality teams, each one headed by an Associate Superintendent for Instructional Leadership and including a Special Education Director, Intervention Specialist, Curriculum Director, Staffing Specialist, ELL Coach, and Budget Advisor. Each of these teams is responsible for 7 to 9 schools, with the distribution for each team including schools at a range of performance levels. This team works directly with school principals and school data to identify areas of good practice and areas of difficulty and develop strategies and activities to address issues. All schools undergo a quarterly school quality review where quarterly data is studied and school plans are put in place to address the school's needs.

At the Cabinet level, an acceleration agenda has been developed that has identified specific schools at high risk, and special systems and support are being created to enhance teaching and learning in those schools and accelerate their progress. These schools have become a priority for the school district. All the SIG applicant schools are included in the acceleration agenda.

Data plays a critical role in school turnaround. Not only is school/student progress tracked through data, but the level of school autonomy (further described below) is based on an annual calculation of school performance that depends on a number of data points. The district is supported in this process by the Department of Data and Accountability.

- *Describe the district's readiness and capacity to support school turnaround, identifying organizational strengths and weaknesses.*

Hartford Public Schools has demonstrated its capacity and readiness to support school turnaround through its history, experience and success with school reform since 2006. At this point, following seven years of reform, Hartford Public Schools has made significant progress. In the first phase of reform, from 2006-2011, the district achieved five consecutive years of growth in achievement and outpaced the state rate of growth. Some of the highlights of this growth from 2006-2011 include:

- 22.3% growth in 3rd grade reading as measured by the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT)
- 20.9% growth 4th grade mathematics as measured by the CMT
- Reading scores increased by 7.7% and writing by 13.9% on the 10th grade Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT)
- 25.4% increase in the graduation rate
- 4.3% increase in post-secondary enrollment

More recent progress metrics include:

As measured by MAP Reading from Spring 2013 to Spring 2014:

- All grades 1-10 improved in reading performance at or above the national norm with an average gain of 5%
- 36 out of 45 schools improved (23 non-magnet with average gain of 6%, 14 magnet with average gain of 9%)

As measured by MAP Mathematics from Spring 2013 to Spring 2014:

- Grades 1-4 and 7 improved in mathematics performance at or above the national norm with an average gain of 2%
- 25 out of 45 schools improved (16 non-magnet with average gain of 4%, 9 magnet with average gain of 6.5%)

The SDE District Performance Index (DPI) increased 1.9 points for CMT and 1l2 points for CAPT between the baseline average (1010-2012) and 2013.

- 15 schools met their CMT/CAPT School Performance Index (SPI) targets in 2013, 6 non-magnet and 10 magnet
- 22 schools made CMT/CAPT School Performance Index (SPI) gains between the baseline average (2010-2012) and 2013 with an average gain OF 4.0 SPI points (12 non-magnet and 10 magnet)
- 18 schools made CMT/CAPT SPI Science gains between the baseline average (2010-2012) and 2014 with an average gain of 8.9 SPI points (11 non-magnet and 7 magnet)

Additional recent indicators include:

- Continued improvement in the four-year cohort graduation rate, which reached 71.2% in 2013 and 71.5% in 2014
- Composite SAT scores for juniors increased 26 points since 2012. (Hartford has the largest number of students participating in SAT in the state after the CT Technical High Schools.) The percent of juniors meeting SAT college readiness benchmarks increased in math and reading with the largest gain in reading at 3.4%.

- Post-secondary enrollment increased from 51% in 2012 to 55% in 2013 and 2014

- By 2013, scores on statewide standardized tests showed that the achievement gap between Hartford Public Schools and the state had declined from 36.9% in 2007 to 27.3% in 2012 to 25.8% in 2013.

Additionally, seven of Hartford's magnet schools have been selected to receive Magnet Schools of Merit Awards, recognizing them as among the best schools of their kind in the United States, and in April 2015, Hartford's Breakthrough Magnet School was awarded the prestigious Dr. Ronald P. Simpson Distinguished Merit Award as the best magnet school in the United States. Also in April, Hartford's Academy of Engineering

and Green Technology was selected as a 2015 National Green Ribbon School for its accomplishments in raising student achievement through an effective environmental curriculum. Global Communications Academy was officially designated an International Baccalaureate World School in July 2013, joining one of the most challenging and rigorous programs in the world.

A central activity of Hartford's reform efforts involved identifying the lowest-performing schools and replacing them with higher-performing redesigned or newly created schools to provide college and career pathways. The district went from 39 schools to 49 schools with the goal of creating smaller, more personalized schools designed around the district values of Rigor, Relevance and Relationships. The process included closing down large, traditional high schools and establishing smaller, theme-based high schools to respond to student needs and interests. A school design process was established that included design teams to research and create new school models, community feedback, procedures for staffing the new schools, and systems for oversight and accountability. From 2007 to 2011, the district opened 26 new schools accessible through a district-wide lottery. These schools include 12 district-hosted magnet schools (aimed at reducing racial imbalance in Greater Hartford area schools as well as offering high-quality choices to Hartford students) and an array of themed schools, such as Engineering and Green Technology (9-12), a Global Communications Academy (PK-12), an Asian Studies Academy (K-8) and Expeditionary Learning Academies at Moylan (PreK-5) and McDonough (6-8). These schools have offered students and families a range of educational options, provided a pathway to school improvement through a carefully structured redesign process, and enlisted the participation of a number of community partners.

Among the strengths that have supported the reform initiative are:

- Our partnerships with local stakeholders, including Travelers, the United Way, the Hartford Insurance Group and the Hartford Foundation for Public Giving, among many others. These organizations have provided funding, thought partnership and direct involvement in many of our schools and initiatives.
- A structured design process for developing new schools and an audit process to measure their performance and identify areas of strength and weakness;
- Central Office supports around the facilitation of turnaround efforts; particularly the Portfolio Team structure for ongoing monitoring and support of our schools, with particular focus on low-performing schools;
- Our focus on developing and supporting school leadership, including the resident principal program, participation in CT Lead and our partnership with the University of Connecticut in the UCAPP program. HPS principals have capacity-building opportunities both within and outside the district, such as through Harvard's National Institute for Urban School Leaders and national conferences through the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. In addition, the district continues to focus on building its leadership pipeline by developing teacher/leader opportunities, such as our teacher-in-residence program that brings teachers to central office for a year to build capacity.

Some of the organizational areas where we face challenges in implementing effective turnaround include:

- School turnaround is our core work, but there are many competing priorities that make it difficult to align resources around this work;
- Time is an important challenge: there is a feeling of urgency around school turnaround which leads to the need to move fast to bring about change, and this sometimes leads to overly rushed processes;
- We are currently in a time of transition in our top leadership, which creates some uncertainties in our organization.

- Maintaining our talent capacity at every level.
- Finding viable partners who can work within the framework of our mission and vision.

- *Identify external partners supporting turnaround efforts, if applicable.*

Only in one Hartford school is there an external management partner, and that is Clark School, which is managed by the Capitol Region Education Council (CREC). Opportunity High also represents a close partnership between Hartford Public Schools and Our Piece of the Pie. Numerous other district schools have enrichment partners that enhance their themes or provide support for our students. For instance, our seven community schools partner with local community agencies to provide supports to students and families. Several of our schools are members of national educational networks that support an educational approach or theme, such as the Expeditionary Learning approach at McDonough. Others enjoy local partnerships that support and enrich the delivery of the school theme, such as Hartford Culinary Arts Academy, which is associated with the National Academy Foundation and enjoys a strong relationship with Capital Workforce Partners, the Blue Hills Civic Association, Heartbeat Ensemble and Supreme Athlete, Inc.

The district is also deeply involved in, and benefits from, collaborative efforts with Travelers, which has long been not only a funder but a valued thought partner; the United Way, Achieve Hartford, Hartford Public Library, and numerous other community stakeholders. We are currently working with Capitol Workforce Partners, the MetroHartford Alliance and CBIA to expand a ground-breaking internship program tied to academics, which began this year with more than 400 students. We are also involved in a partnership with the Nellie Mae Education Foundation that includes funding, training and a valuable partnership network through their New Approaches in Urban Districts program.

Section 2: Conditions for Success. The LEA must secure optimal conditions and create policies and practices that enable school reform and provide site-based flexibility.

- Describe how schools will receive additional autonomy in exchange for increased accountability. Describe additional flexibilities in the areas of staffing, scheduling/calendaring, budgeting, and programming.
- Explain how the district will modify its practices and policies, if necessary, to allow for full implementation of the interventions outlined in the school and/or district plans.
- Submit relevant labor-management documentation, such as memoranda of understanding and/or election to work agreements. Please note that such documentation is required.

- *Describe how schools will receive additional autonomy in exchange for increased accountability. Describe additional flexibilities in the areas of staffing, scheduling/calendaring, budgeting, and programming.*

The level of autonomy in Hartford's schools has been determined by the School Performance Index, which describes whether a school's placement is categorized as autonomous, under targeted supervision, or rated as an intervention school. Support and accountability are differentiated based on these categories.

The School Performance Index was most recently calculated in 2013 and uses methodology that calculates an index score across multiple data points to allow appropriate peer comparisons among schools for accountability purposes. Indicators of performance including SPI, SPI change, percent at Advanced level, graduation rate, subgroup performance and participation are than used to classify schools into five categories. In HPS, scores of 64-100 placed schools in the autonomous range; 41-63 placed them in the defined autonomy range, and 40 or below led to designation as an intervention school. This system is in transition as the district integrates its system with the state system of turnaround, focus and review schools and as the

state moves to a new system of assessments, the SBAC.

In an autonomous school, school leaders have considerable autonomy in structuring their leadership team, and they are expected to serve in district leadership roles and as executive principals or supervising principals. Staffing decisions are made by a school-based team, with support from the district's Office of Talent Management. Principals in these schools have "defined autonomy" regarding the use of instructional and professional learning time, restricted only by state and federal laws, collective bargaining agreements and district policies. In the area of curriculum, principals in autonomous schools are responsible for ensuring alignment with Common Core State Standards as well as other state requirements and district policies, but they may create unique courses and curriculum elements that prepare students for grade advancement and college. The principal is responsible for establishing and maintaining a positive school climate and for the scheduling and structuring of data teams or professional learning communities.

In middle tier schools under targeted supervision, school leaders have defined autonomy in structuring their leadership team. Leadership development is differentiated based on the needs of the leader and the school, and school leaders will participate in some required professional development based on school performance. School leaders of middle tier schools are supervised more frequently and receive feedback more frequently. Staffing decisions are made by the school-based team, with support from the Office of Talent Management. The district provides centralized professional development on the district curriculum, as well as training in mandated areas. The district has a relationship with Teach for America and encourages principals to select teachers from available TFA corps members. Teachers receive additional support from intervention specialists and instructional coaches who are supported by the intervention team. Schools receive direct supervision regarding the use of instructional and professional learning time. Schools implement the district curriculum and assessments which are aligned to the Common Core State Standards. They also may have additional theme-related courses that meet the approval of the Office of Research and Assessment. Principals are responsible for the scheduling and structuring of data teams or professional learning communities and for sustaining a data-rich culture. Principals and their supervisors work together to establish a schedule for data teams and to evaluate their effectiveness. Principals facilitate all data teams. School climate goals are a focus of School Accountability Plans. The principal is responsible for establishing and maintaining a positive school climate. Schools receive intervention support for improving school climate based on demonstrated need.

In intervention schools, which require the most significant level of support and oversight, school leaders have direct supervision in structuring their leadership team. Supervision is based on demonstrated needs of the school leader, and leadership development is differentiated based on the needs of the leader and the needs of the school. In addition, principals experience frequent professional learning both on site and off site targeted toward effective data use, improving instruction, and implementing curriculum and school climate. They also receive training through CT LEAD. Principals experience biweekly supervision and feedback. Staffing decisions are made by the school-based team, with support from the Office of Talent Management. Schools are responsible for the capacity of their staff to meet the educational needs and goals of their students. The district provides centralized professional development on the district curriculum, as well as training in mandated areas. Teachers receive additional support from intervention specialists and instructional coaches who are supported by the intervention team. Schools in the lowest tier, as part of their instructional support, experience more frequent school quality meetings where central office and district administrators analyze real-time data and support interventions. Schools receive direct supervision regarding the use of instructional and professional learning time. Supervisors of principals ensure that data teams are scheduled, meetings are productive, minutes are kept and reviewed. They also ensure that professional learning time is tightly aligned to the school improvement plan and district priorities. Schools implement the district curriculum, assessment and professional learning to support the curriculum, along with additional support to implement the curriculum. Schools receive direct supervision regarding the use of instructional and professional learning

time. Schools receive intervention support for improving school climate based on demonstrated need.

As noted in a previous section, this year a number of schools have been identified for participation in the district's acceleration agenda. These schools are viewed as having particularly serious needs, which are given the highest priority.

- *Explain how the district will modify its practices and policies, if necessary, to allow for full implementation of the interventions outlined in the school and/or district plans.*

Most of the interventions outlined in the school and/or district plans do not require any modification of practices and policies. The exception is that the school day for teachers will be extended to allow for additional professional learning in some of the school plans. In those cases, the budget includes funds to compensate teachers consistent with contractual agreements.

- *Submit relevant labor-management documentation, such as memoranda of understanding, election to work agreements, and/or thin contracts. Please note that such documentation is required.*

Please see response to the question above. Since there are no modifications to contractual agreements, there are no Flexible Work Rules attached.

Section 3: Accountability and Monitoring Strategy. The LEA must develop and implement tools and processes to create shared accountability for results at the school and district levels.

- Describe the district's systems, tools, and processes to monitor the fidelity of plan implementation, and leading and lagging performance indicators.
- Explain how the district and school will use data to drive ongoing decision-making and create a culture of shared accountability for results.
- Identify annual performance goals (subject to CSDE approval) for the school(s) by completing Appendix A.

The School Quality Process is the focal point for monitoring schools within the district, and the process centers on an ongoing review of performance data centered on student outcomes. As noted above, there are six Associate Superintendents for Instructional Leadership, each one heading a team that includes a Special Education Director, Intervention Specialist, Curriculum Director, Staffing Specialist, ELL Coach, and Budget Advisor. Each Associate Superintendent is assigned to 7 to 9 schools, representing a mix of schools at various performance levels, though low-performing schools are reviewed on a more frequent basis. This team constantly monitors data on school performance to determine the success of the School Accountability plan, and a School Quality Review process occurs on a regular basis. Through this monitoring process, areas of need are identified, and the team members apply their areas of expertise to develop a plan of action to address these needs, including supports and resources that the district can provide. Principals receive feedback from Associate Superintendents regularly (every one to two weeks for the most challenged schools), and the two work together to further develop a plan of action, with the principal accountable for action steps within the school, and the Associate Superintendent responsible for following through with district-level supports and resources. While all district schools are included in this process, low-performing schools are the primary focus and are reviewed more frequently in order to track whether activities and interventions are having the desired impact and to implement additional interventions and supports as necessary.

- *Explain how the district and school will use data to drive ongoing decision-making and create a culture of shared accountability for results.*

Hartford Public Schools is a system driven by data, with data teams in every school, School Accountability Plans based on school data, Central Office analysis and reporting that guides decision-making, and

accountability to the community based on achievement data related to district targets. The HPS Office of Research and Assessment gathers data to monitor progress on an ongoing basis, utilizing multiple indicators including: CMT or CAPT Science scores, common assessments, NWEA-MAP, Dibels, LAS Links, monthly attendance, truancy rates, on-time credit completion rate, reading levels, parent engagement indicators, English Language Learner rate and progress, special education rate, percent of children living in poverty, etc. HPS has implemented universal screening through the standards-based NWEA-MAP assessments, which are interactive, computer-based assessments administered thrice yearly that provide information on each student's learning that will help teachers address individual needs and strengths. As noted above, this data is monitored continuously by the Portfolio teams in order to evaluate progress and inform ongoing decisions regarding interventions and supports.

The district has defined accelerated learning targets for students who are below grade level. These targets are student-specific and designed to accelerated and remediate learning through strengthening Tier 1 instruction as well as designing Tier 2 and 3 instruction to meet individual needs.

Data teams at the school level also monitor data regarding student progress, and results on NWEA/MAP assessments and DRA2, among others, and these results are used to guide decision-making in the schools. School leaders review data regularly with their Portfolio teams as well in order to ensure ongoing progress.

As a matter of practice, we have implemented instructional rounds at the district and portfolio level to create norms around professional practice.

- *Identify annual performance goals (subject to CSDE approval) for the school(s) by completing Appendix A.*

Please see the Appendix A document attached.

Section 4: Budget and Budget Narrative. The LEA must commit to thoughtful and strategic resourcing, including investments in high-yield activities and efforts to promote sustainability beyond the SIG grant.

- Describe the major expenditures associated with the SIG application. Justify each cost with the likely return on investment and impact on student achievement.
- Provide evidence that the district is thinking proactively about how to sustain reform activities, including by braiding together multiple funding streams.
- Ensure that the low-performing school will continue to receive all State and local funds it would receive in the absence of SIG, and that those resources are aligned to the SIG reform plan.
- Complete the Excel budget workbook, submitting a three- to five-year SIG budget proposal. Funding requests must be at least $50,000 per year and should be proportional to the proposed activities. Funding must be used to supplement and not supplant local or other non-federal expenditures.

- *Describe the major expenditures associated with the SIG application. Justify each cost with the likely return on investment and impact on student achievement.*

The major expenditures included in the school plans from the six applicant schools from Hartford and their likely return on investment and impact on student achievement include:

- Professional development in areas such as the use of data and interventions, which will increase teacher effectiveness and capacity on best practices, which is likely to lead to improved student achievement and improved culture and climate in the schools;
- Investments in human capital to improve instruction (e.g., resource teachers, math coach), to positively impact culture and climate (e.g., psychologist), to provide increased support to struggling students (e.g., intervention specialist), and to enrich the school program/theme (e.g., music teacher,

field trips). The anticipated results include improved student performance, school safety, attendance and behavior;

- Stipends for curriculum planning, which will improve and align the school's academic program and increase student achievement;
- Purchase of instructional supplies to enhance areas of academics (e.g., reading and math programs) and culture and climate (e.g., PGIS incentives). The impact will be an increase in student achievement as new programs are implemented in the schools to increasingly target instruction to student needs and reduce absenteeism, suspensions and expulsions.
- Technology resources to enhance instruction and intervention systems.

All these provisions are aimed at increasing teacher capacity, student achievement as measured by student growth on MAP testing administered three times a year and other relevant assessments; and culture and climate in the schools.

- *Provide evidence that the district is thinking proactively about how to sustain reform activities, including by braiding together multiple funding streams.*

Hartford Public Schools has integrated numerous funding streams in order to sustain reform activities. All school funds support the priorities of the district's Alliance District and Priority School District Plan, and Schools' Accountability Plans, which are aligned with the SIG reform plans. In addition, the district is constantly seeking external sources of funding through government and private grants and partnership contributions. All additional funding is aligned with the district's Strategic Operating Plan and district priorities, which are based on the reform initiative.

- *Ensure that the low-performing school will continue to receive all State and local funds it would receive in the absence of SIG, and that those resources are aligned to the SIG reform plan.*

SIG funding makes it possible to provide resources that would not be available to these schools in the absence of SIG, and the applicant schools will continue to receive all State and local funds it would otherwise receive. All these resources are aligned to the SIG reform plan.

- *Complete Appendix B, submitting a three-year SIG budget proposal.*

Please see Appendix B, which is attached.

Part II: School Plan

Directions: Part II of the SIG application provides a template for the school reform plan. Complete Part II for each district school for which the LEA is submitting a SIG application. Provide a comprehensive, bold, and transformative plan to dramatically improve student achievement. Identify school needs and opportunities, and use this analysis to inform the selection of a reform model. Articulate strategies to advance school performance in the areas of talent, academics, culture and climate, and operations, while meeting all of the requirements under the selected reform model. Part II responses should not exceed 20 pages.

Section 1: Needs Analysis. The school must provide a thorough needs analysis informed by the school audit.

- Summarize the school's greatest strengths as identified through the audit process.
- Summarize and provide a root cause analysis for the school's most significant growth areas as identified in the audit. Provide specific data points to support the analysis.
- Reference Appendix F: School Turnaround Rubric when evaluating school systems and performance.

Strength:	Explanation and data to substantiate:
Instructional Model	The Expeditionary Learning (EL) model provides an effective, research-based model to guide instructional practices and align our curriculum to the CT Core Standards. The Workshop 2.0 lesson template requires students to grapple with complex text and develop critical thinking skills. The 5 Es lesson template provides a structure for inquiry in Science and Social Studies classrooms while maximizing literacy integration. EL expeditions allow opportunities for students to apply acquired skills and knowledge through interdisciplinary projects within their community and present to an authentic audience. Teachers at MELS have begun to design and implement Workshop 2.0 lessons, 5E lessons and expeditions. Support is needed to fully transition to the project-based/EL model.
Professional Development	MELS teachers participate in school-based Professional Development workshops every Wednesday from 1:00- 4:00pm. School Designers from Expeditionary Learning and MELS leadership staff work together to design cohesive and aligned workshops and present to staff. The format typically includes time for new learning based on identified needs (Learning Walk data) and then time for application of the new learning within grade level teams or content area departments. More work is needed to design and align PD cycles to ensure coherence from week to week. Teachers are also able to attend off-site seminars and workshops through Expeditionary Learning around specified areas for growth.
Instructional Leadership	Use of the Danielson rubric and teacher evaluation system has provided the school with a common understanding of what effective teaching looks like in the classroom. Coaches reinforce these expectations in their coaching cycles. Coaches meet biweekly with teachers to review lesson plans, unit plans, and share feedback from classroom visits. The coaching informs PD cycles to align the professional learning to teachers' needs. Work is still needed to establish consistency amongst different coaches in order to prioritize focus areas, collect data, and implement a consistent plan to see the impact of coaching on student learning.
Growth Area:	Explanation and data to substantiate:

Scientifically Research-Based Intervention (SRBI) *Alignment Indicators:* *1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.6, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 4.1, 4.3*	Because of high student need in academic, social, and emotional learning, adopting SRBI as a foundational philosophy along with its corresponding structures is imperative for MELS' progression and sustainability plan. Converging SRBI as the crux for school improvement, MELS will be able to address concerns ranging from academics to behaviors to scheduling through a singular lens, thus establishing a culture of change. This transformation is necessary. During the 2014-2015 academic year, the suspension rate was reduced by over 50% from the previous year. More work is needed for students who experience frequent suspensions as well as coaching strategies and restorative justice practices. MELS is piloting restorative justice practices in the spring of 2015 and planning for full implementation in 2015-2016.
Student reading proficiency *Alignment Indicators:* *1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6*	MELS serves a diverse student population with wide-ranging reading abilities. While progress has been made with the adoption and full implementation of the CCSS-based ELA Engage NY curriculum, MELS students still struggle with reading. **83% of MELS students scored below proficient on the NWEA Winter 2015 Reading MAP Assessment.**
Student mathematics proficiency *Alignment Indicators:* *1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6*	Just as students continue to struggle as readers, mathematics proficiency continues to be a large area of concern. MELS math department began implementation of a CCSS-based math curriculum in December 2014, however math continues to be a significant area for growth. **94.4% of MELS students scored below proficient on the NWEA Winter 2015 Math MAP Assessment.**
Annual chronic absenteeism *Alignment Indicators:* *3.2, 3.4, 3.5*	During the 2014-2015 academic year, 36.4% of MELS were classified as chronically absent. As of March 2015, 25.1% (Quarter 1) and 30.7% (Quarter 2) of MELS students have been classified as chronically absent. Although we have seen a reduction, more work is still needed in this area.
High Quality CCSS Aligned Curriculum *Alignment Indicators:* *1.4, 2.1, 2.4, 3.1, 4.1, 4.2*	MELS has begun the adoption and implementation of CCSS-aligned curriculum, but more work is needed with implementation, rigor, and designing high quality summative assessments. MELS teachers need continued support developing pacing guides, rigorous assessments, and engaging unit plans. In addition, significant work is needed to meet the needs of all learners when implementing on grade level curriculum. Furthermore, MELS teachers need support designing high quality expeditions in order to increase academic rigor, engage students, and increase student academic performance.

Section 2: Reform Model and Rationale. The school must pursue a reform model – turnaround, restart, early learning, whole-school reform, closure, or transformation – that best aligns to the needs of the school community. Schools must participate in SIG for up to five years, including three required implementation years, a pre-implementation year (optional), and up to two sustainment years (optional). Select a model:

☐ Turnaround	☐ Restart	☐ Closure
☐ Early Learning	☐ Whole-School Reform	☒ Transformation

Provide a strong rationale, referencing school needs. Explain why other models are not feasible/likely generating the desired impact.

McDonough Expeditionary Learning School is in its fourth year of redesign implemented by the district in 2011-2012 in response to exceedingly low academic performance of students. During the past year and a half, the MELS community has experienced significant gains due to the transformation model, district support, and new leadership. Academic achievement, absenteeism, and behavioral data have all improved because coherent systems have been established and implemented with fidelity. Most notable during the 2014-2015 academic year is the development of a positive school culture where opportunities for student voice and expression have increased. Students are more invested in the MELS community and have begun the process of being active and engaged learners. In addition, this is the first year since redesign that MELS has had a successful School Governance Council and PTO. Due to increased stability with leadership and staffing, the transformation model best supports continued growth. This model allows for ongoing professional development to retain and grow current staff members and further develop their capacity. In the early redesign years there was a high staff turnover rate including a change in leadership in October of 2013. A more stable environment has been established during the current school year and it is anticipated that at least 85% of the current staff, including the Principal, will return to MELS for the 2015-2016 academic year. The use of any of the other reform models such as turnaround, whole-school reform and school closure would disrupt students, families and the surrounding community and impede the progress that is currently underway.

As MELS works to fulfill its potential as a successful, high-performing, neighborhood middle school, the Transformation Model provides the best opportunity to continue progress already begun at MELS. With additional SIG funding, MELS will be able to escalate its intervention programming for high needs student populations including English Language Learners and students with chronic behavioral challenges. In addition, MELS will continue to utilize SIG funds to support the ongoing implementation of the intervention programming installed in year 2014-2015. MELS students' reading proficiency is at 13.35%; MELS students' math proficiency is at 4.40%. MELS leadership recognizes that this grade level proficiency data is low; however, according to the NWEA Winter 2014 MAP data, 73% of MELS students classified as three or more grade levels below proficient in reading met or exceeded 150% of their growth benchmarks (56% of MELS students classify three or more grade levels below in reading); according to the NWEA Winter 2014 MAP data, 42% of MELS students classified as one to two grade levels below proficient in reading met or exceeded 125% of their growth benchmarks (32% of MELS students classify three or more grade levels below in reading). According to NWEA Winter 2014 MAP data, 70% of students classified as three or more grade levels below in math met or exceeded 150% of their growth benchmarks (69% of MELS students fall into this category). According to NWEA Winter 2014 MAP data, 56% of students classified as one or more grade levels below met or exceeded 125% of their growth benchmarks (25% of MELS students fall into this category).

Utilizing key tenets of the Transformation Model as defined by the Connecticut State Department of Education, MELS teachers and leaders will participate in rigorous and consistent data analysis, centered around Expeditionary Learning Core Practices and utilizing both qualitative (Habits of Scholars) and quantitative (iReady, NWEA) data. Moreover, anchor texts will continue to provide a foundation for MELS differentiated, ongoing Professional Development. MELS teachers, therefore, will continue to enhance rigor, reflect and refine practice, and maximize student learning in their daily instruction.

With systems implemented around academic intervention to continue, MELS leadership will focus on the implementation of a contextualized Restorative Justice Response Center to fundamentally alter the approach to school-wide discipline. During the 2014-2015 school year, a team of MELS staff and leadership have attended training sessions around this approach and have begun to implement restorative practices such as conferencing. However, discipline data shows that 10% of MELS students have more than one incident of negative behavioral occurrences and are in need of Tier III behavior intervention support. With the development and implementation of a Restorative Justice Response Center model, MELS students who exhibit repetitive negative behaviors will have the opportunity to learn mechanisms around the change to behavior.

This should greatly reduce the number of repeat occurrences of negative behavior and result in an even greater shift to a positive learning environment. Another benefit to such a system is the direct correlation between repeat behavioral students and attendance. By building students' capacity around maintained behavioral expectations, attendance should also improve among this population of students. MELS will also continue to develop and refine existing community and family engagement mechanisms using the Expeditionary Learning Core Practices (Community Meetings, Student-Led Conferences, Learning Expeditions, and Celebrations of Learning). Using the transformation model affords MELS the ability to maintain its Memorandum of Understanding with Expeditionary Learning, thus continuing the Expeditionary Learning Core Practices aimed at furthering community and family connectedness.

Furthermore, the classification as a Transformation school allows for MELS students to continue to gain access to a rigorous, high-leveraged, vertically-aligned curriculum. Continued curricular use of Connecticut Core State Standards in both ELA and math as well as the transition to an improved, Next Generation Science Standards alignment in science classes will provide a benchmark for rigor. Social studies curricula will be modified to incorporate and align with the assessed, foundational standards in the ELA curriculum. Through the close analysis of current and future student data, curricular needs and purchases will be thoroughly researched and purchased based solely on student need.

Select between 3-5 years for planning, implementation, and/or sustainability.	Indicate the school year during with each phase will occur (e.g., 2015-16). Insert "N/A" for phases not selected by the school.
☐ Pre-implementation (optional)	
☒ Year 1 Implementation (required)	2015-2016
☒ Year 2 Implementation (required)	2016-2017
☒ Year 3 Implementation (required)	2017-2018
☒ Sustainability Year 1 (optional)	2018-2019
☒ Sustainability Year 2 (optional)	2019-2020

Section 3: Overarching SMART Goals. Successful and sustainable turnaround requires a focused approach on the school's most pressing needs and challenges. Please reflect upon school data and the audit to identify a manageable set of priorities to guide the school's turnaround efforts. Develop three SMART goals for the turnaround process that are **S**pecific, **M**easurable, **A**ttainable, **R**esults-oriented and **T**ime-bound. Ensure alignment to Appendix A performance targets.

Goal #1:

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
30% of grade 6-8 students will be categorized as proficient according to their NWEA MAP Reading scores in Spring 2016.	45% of grade 6-8 students will be categorized as proficient according to their NWEA MAP Reading scores in Spring 2017.	60% of grade 6-8 students will be categorized as proficient according to their NWEA MAP Reading scores in Spring 2018.

- ☐ Specific
- ☐ Measurable
- ☐ Attainable
- ☐ Results-oriented
- ☐ Time-bound

Goal #2:

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
20% of grade 6-8 students will be categorized as proficient according to their NWEA MAP Math scores in Spring 2016.	35% of grade 6-8 students will be categorized as proficient according to their NWEA MAP Math scores in Spring 2017.	50% of grade 6-8 students will be categorized as proficient according to their NWEA MAP Math scores in Spring 2018.

- ☐ Specific
- ☐ Measurable
- ☐ Attainable
- ☐ Results-oriented
- ☐ Time-bound

Goal #3:

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Annual chronic absenteeism will reduce to a rate below 18% by June 2016 according to Powerschool and state attendance data.	Annual chronic absenteeism will reduce to a rate below 10% by June 2017 according to Powerschool and state attendance data.	Annual chronic absenteeism will reduce to a rate below 5% by June 2018 according to Powerschool and state attendance data.

- ☐ Specific
- ☐ Measurable
- ☐ Attainable
- ☐ Results-oriented
- ☐ Time-bound

Section 4: Talent. The school must employ systems and strategies to recruit, hire, develop, evaluate, and retain excellent school leaders, teachers, and support staff.

- Explain how the district and school will cultivate a professional learning environment to attract, support, develop, and retain high-quality teachers.
- Explain how administrators will have the ability to staff the school based exclusively on student and programmatic needs.
- Describe how teachers will be evaluated on an annual basis to inform professional development offerings and staffing decisions.
- Describe the process to secure an exceptional school principal with a track record of success, preferably in school turnaround and/or an urban school environment.
- Explain how administrators will be evaluated on an annual basis to inform leadership staffing decisions.
- Describe ongoing supports and coaching opportunities for school leadership.

- *Explain how the district and school will cultivate a professional learning environment to attract, support, develop, and retain high-quality teachers.*

With the Memorandum of Understanding with Expeditionary Learning, school leaders, teachers, and support staff will attend various site seminars and professional workshops offered by Expeditionary Learning. The school principal, a team of coaches and staff will attend the Expeditionary Learning National Conference in October of 2015. These conferences deepen the relational trust and significantly increase the capacity of MELS teachers and leaders and correlate directly to retaining excellent teachers. Further, MELS offers weekly, school-based professional development workshops, aligned and differentiated direct coaching cycles to cultivate an environment of professional growth and support in order to retain the highest-quality teachers.

In order to further build MELS staff capacity, the utilization of anchor texts drive PLC work and PD cycles, specifically in areas of growth. This professional development must be purposeful, actionable, and related to indicators that result in positive student outcomes. Next year, MELS staff will participate in PD cycles and PLCs utilizing anchor texts to address differentiation and scaffolding for all learners including English Language Learners, data analysis, and pedagogical best practices that include effective technology integration.

PD CYCLE	ANCHOR TEXT(s)	STUDENT OUTCOME	School Turnaround Rubric ALIGNMENT
Using Data to Support Instruction	-Bambrick-Santoyo, P. (2010). Driven by data: A practical guide to improve instruction. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishing.	-Flexible Learning Groups in Tier I instruction -Meeting the needs of all academic learners -Placed in fluid, appropriate Tier II & Tier III interventions -Academic Perseverance & Endurance -Teacher utilization of student data	*1.1, 1.4, 2.5, 2.6, 4.3*
Differentiating Instruction for All Learners	-Sousa, D., & Tomlinson, C. (2011). Differentiation and the brain. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press. - Tomlinson, C., (2014). The differentiated classroom: responding to the needs of all learners. Alexandria, VA. ASCD. -Hill, J., & Miller, K. (2013). Classroom instruction that works with English language learners. Alexandria, VA. ASCD.	-Reduced negative in-class behaviors -Increased student engagement -Authentic assessments score improvement -Increased academic rigor -Progression through SRBI triangle	*1.1, 1.4, 1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 3.3, 3.4*
Pedagogical Best Practice	-Magana, S., & Marzano, R. (2014). The art and science of teaching with technology. Bloomington, IN. The Marzano Research Laboratory. -Graham, S., MacArthur C., & Fitzgerald J., (2013). Best practices in writing. New York, NY. Guilford Press.	-Increased student engagement -Improved pedagogical strategy implementation -Increased academic rigor	*1.1, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6*

- Professional development will center around increasing MELS staff abilities to successfully meet the needs of all MELS learners regardless of academic tier (Tier I – grade-level inclusion; Tier II – homogeneous group intervention; Tier III small homogeneous group intervention)
- New Teacher Recruitment, Growth, and Retention Plan: With over 80% of MELS staff non-tenured, MELS administration recognizes the extreme need to build staff capacity. Working in a low socio-economic neighborhood school requires a unique skill set. For the 2015-2016 school year non-tenured teachers will attend monthly, ninety-minute sessions to collaborate, clarify, and improve instructional capacity using focus areas from a variety of sources such as Lemov's *Teach Like a Champion* (2009). These PLCs will be run by a school-based coach. Moreover, an Expeditionary Learning Boot Camp will be implemented before the beginning of the 2015-2016 school year for MELS teachers. The work done in this professional learning will be built upon in the monthly workshops. MELS' new teachers will be engaged in learning around cultural competencies and engaging students from a multitude of backgrounds with a multitude of skill sets. By focusing on school-based consistencies, strategies, and language all MELS staff will feel comfortable and able in the school.
- Math & Literacy Data Analysis: All teachers will engage in data/inquiry teams to implement and assess tier 1 instruction and begin to develop Tier II instruction. Using explicit, quantitative data from the iReady

Intervention programming and MAP assessments, MELS staff will participate in purposeful PD cycles centered around achieving SIP SMART goals utilizing data reflection tools. MELS staff will be provided with adequate technology in order to participate in meaningful data analysis. PD will focus on critical moves for differentiation and scaffolding of instruction for all learners. Teachers will design lessons and units implementing high leverage differentiation strategies and scaffolding strategies to meet the learning needs of students.

Aligned Student Outcomes

Structure	Action Step	Evidence of Progress
Professional Development	• Whole staff PD Cycles aligned to student need • Expeditionary Learning Site Seminars and Workshops (differentiated per teacher)	-Students will be exposed to learning opportunities designed to leverage learning no matter ability or background -Students will receive differentiated support to achieve academic goals -Students will receive common language around expectations and EL Core Practices from all MELS teachers
One-on-One Coaching	• MELS Coaching Cycles • School-wide and Individual Goals • Learning Walks	-Students will improve embedded curricular assignment scores aligned to Connecticut Core State Standards -Students will receive consistent, differentiated instruction in each content classrooms
Literacy & Math Intervention Programming	• Lesson Planning • iReady curriculum training and implementation • Quantitative Data Analysis	-Students will improve their foundational literacy and numeracy data on MAP assessments -Students will receive targeted, effective math and literacy integration in a variety of content classrooms -Students will receive targeted Tier II and Tier III literacy and numeracy instruction
Anchor Texts	• Common Readings • Best practices evaluation and implementation • Learning Walks	-students will experience proven, scientifically-based best pedagogical practices -Students will drastically improve their ability to create work that is complex, authentic, and done with craftsmanship

- Ashiedu & Scott-Ladd (2012) found that active teacher retention rates are directly impacted by working conditions and workplace factors including growth opportunities and administrative support. Through reflective practices, retention can improve when teachers feel there is sufficient growth and there is continuous positive feedback. Further, Perry and Hayes (2011) determined that the key to retention is giving novice teachers a plethora of targeted, professional development using relational trust and data-driven action steps. When teachers feel overwhelming support they develop pride and confidence in their position to drive student learning

- *Explain how administrators will have the ability to staff the school based exclusively on student and programmatic needs.*

Staffing is mainly governed by district contracts and certification requirements. Some flexibility is provided in cases where internal candidates do not align well with the theme and an external candidate is available who does. If this situation can be substantially documented, the school can occasionally hire an external candidate over an internal candidate. McDonough Expeditionary Learning School (MELS) is supported by the Hartford

Public Schools its efforts to support, develop, and retain high quality teachers. At the conclusion of the 2013-2014 school year, MELS leadership designed and implemented a rigorous and thorough hiring process aimed at leveraging the most highly qualified candidates for open positions. With the support of the Associate Superintendent for Instructional Leadership and members of the Office of Talent Management, MELS will continue to utilize this contextualized hiring practice.

The Expeditionary Learning Model and school-wide data support the need for more student and staff support. MELS was able to hire a Culture and Climate Coach to support implementation fidelity to the school's Habits of Scholars behavioral system, an Expeditionary Learning Theme Coach to support teacher development around the Expeditionary Learning Core Practices and integration and creation of content curriculum.

- *Describe how teachers will be evaluated on an annual basis to inform professional development offerings and staffing decisions.*

The Danielson Framework for Teaching (FFT) is used throughout Harford Public Schools as the evaluation instrument, and all school administrators have been trained in its use. The Danielson FFT is a research-validated instrument for teacher evaluation and development that offers a combination of increased teacher accountability and increased support for teachers' professional growth. This system, provided on the TeachScape platform, includes highly developed rubrics for teacher performance that provide common standards for observations, along with digital resources (online articles, videos, and sample lesson plans) for professional learning designed to respond to specific areas where a need for improvement is indicated. The two activities are closely linked so that discussions between evaluators and teachers around evaluation results lead directly to recommendations of resources the teacher can consult to help improve his/her effectiveness in specific areas. All principals are required to pass a proficiency test in order to evaluate teachers. The evaluation rubric is currently in the third year of use across the system and the district continues to monitor its implementation and inform the district's professional learning for administrators and teachers. The school leadership can use this instrument to identify which domains are the most challenging amongst staff in order to plan professional development to strengthen those areas. Learning walks, coaching cycles, and classroom observations also inform professional development offerings. The Danielson FFT ratings are also utilized to inform staffing decisions, along with other factors, including student achievement.

- *Describe the process to secure an exceptional school principal with a track record of success, preferably in school turnaround and/or an urban school environment.*

MELS is currently benefiting from an effective and new administrative team, and a change in leadership would be detrimental to the school's progress. The current principal assumed her responsibilities in October 2013 as acting principal and was promoted to principal in July of 2014. She has worked in Hartford Public Schools for 15 years and was involved in the launching one of the district's highest performing magnet schools, Classical Magnet School. She came to McDonough Expeditionary Learning School as an instructional coach, participated in the redesign process for the school, and assisted in its implementation. All her professional experience has been in Hartford. As a lifelong resident of Hartford, she has established instructional visions and prioritized needs focused on leveraging student growth and teacher development. Furthermore, she has worked to establish a coherent leadership team, developed meaningful professional relationships, formulated a cohesive school-wide vision, and created a clear recruiting, hiring, and retention process of high-quality teachers.

- *Explain how administrators will be evaluated on an annual basis to inform leadership staffing decisions. Describe ongoing supports and coaching opportunities for school leadership.*

Besides training all principals in the use of the FFT teacher evaluation process, Hartford Public Schools has also developed and implemented an administrator evaluation process that applies a school leadership rubric in order to measure principal effectiveness. The Associate Superintendent for Instructional Leadership conducts four site visits as well as a mid-year and summative evaluation of the principal. The principal's ability to recruit,

support, evaluate, and maintain a highly-effective staff are part of the evaluation process.

Support and development of the school leadership will come from several sources. The LEAD Connecticut Turnaround Leader Intensive Planning Program provides principals in Turnaround schools the training and support to diagnose and begin a turnaround plan in chronically low-performing schools in Alliance districts. The MELS building principal is currently a member of this program and will continue to attend summer and monthly workshops aimed at leveraging highly effective leadership strategies. In addition, the principal will benefit from yearlong site-based coaching provided by the district. Participation in this program will continue to develop the skills and competencies of an excellent school leader, who can then develop, evaluate and retain excellent teachers and support staff.

The district's School Quality Process provides ongoing support to district administrators. Operating under the Chief of School Improvement, the School Quality Process includes six School Quality teams, each headed by an Associate Superintendent for Instructional Leadership and includes a special education director, intervention specialist, curriculum director, staffing specialist, ELL coach, and budget advisor. Each of these team is responsible for 7 to 10 schools, with the distribution for each team including schools at a range of performance levels. This team works directly with school principals and school data to identify areas of best practice and areas for improvement and develop strategies and activities to address issues.

The school principal will participate in district-wide professional learning opportunities. The portfolio design allows opportunities for professional growth within a cohort of schools looking at problems of practice and collaborating on ideas and solutions. The Associate Superintendent for Instructional Leadership designs workshops that further develop principals' leadership skills, aligned to the Connecticut State Department of Education's Leadership Evaluation Rubric.

* Ashiedu, J. A., & Scott-Ladd, B. D. (2012). Understanding Teacher Attraction and Retention Drivers: Addressing Teacher Shortages. *Australian Journal Of Teacher Education*, *37*(11),

* Perry, B., & Hayes, K. (2011). The Effect of a New Teacher Induction Program on New Teachers Reported Teacher Goals for Excellence, Mobility, and Retention Rates. *International Journal Of Educational Leadership Preparation*, *6*(1),

Section 5: Academics. The school must design and implement a rigorous, aligned, and engaging academic program that allows all students to achieve at high levels.

- Describe the school's academic program and instructional philosophy, including alignment to the Common Core and transition to next-generation assessments.
- Describe the school's early literacy strategy, including targeted interventions.
- Describe how staff will use data to inform lesson plans, differentiate instruction, and provide remedial support to meet the academic and development needs of all students.
- Describe ongoing professional development opportunities to build staff capacity around the collection, analysis, and use of data to drive and differentiate instruction.

- *Describe the school's academic program and instructional philosophy, including alignment to the Common Core and transition to next-generation assessments.*

MELS is the only public, neighborhood middle school in Hartford. It is part of the nationwide network of more than 150 Expeditionary Learning schools. Expeditionary Learning is a proven, school improvement model with core practices that challenges students to think critically and take active roles in their classrooms and communities, resulting in higher achievement and greater engagement in school. The model centers on learning expeditions, which involve students in original research, critical thinking, and problem-solving, and which build character along with academic skills.

The school has aligned and implemented the curricula in math and ELA to the CT Core State Standards and recognizes the need to deepen this work. Through additional funding from SIG, in the summer of 2015 and throughout the fall, curricular work was completed in Science, beginning the alignments to the Next Generation Science Standards, and Social Studies with the alignment to the ELA Engage New York Modules and integration of critical CCSS standards. MELS plans on continuing to host curriculum-writing workshops in June and August to further develop its implementation of a rigorous Common Core curriculum and to support instruction. More work still needs to be done to align curriculum across content areas to leverage highly engaging and highly rigorous learning expeditions. More professional development is needed for teachers on the implementation of a CCSS curriculum as well as its alignment in relation to the SBAC administration. Through the utilization and implementation of the NWEA MAP assessments, MELS leadership and staff are able to prioritize key needs and instructional next steps during and throughout the transition to the SBAC next-generation assessments. MELS leadership has identified this as a crucial next step to drive proficiency data upwards.

- *Describe the school's early literacy strategy, including targeted interventions.*

Current Literacy Data-

Winter 2015 NWEA MAP scores, 8th grade students' mean RIT was 210.1 up from 204.6 in 2014, 11.1 points below the norm grade level mean RIT, or equivalent to a mid-level fifth grader. Winter 2015 NWEA MAP scores, 7th grade students' mean RIT was 206.1 up from 200.1 in 2014, 12.2 points below the norm grade level mean RIT, or an equivalent of an advancing fourth grader. Winter 2015 NWEA MAP scores, 6th grade students' mean RIT was 198.4, 15.9 points below the norm grade level mean RIT, or an equivalent of an advancing third grader.

53.8% of 6th grade ELL students met NWEA MAP reading projections from Fall 2014 to Winter 2015; 70.6% of 7th grade ELL students met NWEA MAP reading projections from Fall 2014 to Winter 2015; 63.6% of 8th grade ELL students met NWEA MAP reading projections from Fall 2014 to Winter 2015. 68.0% of 6th grade SPED students met NWEA MAP reading projections from Fall 2014 to Winter 2015; 71.4% of 7th grade SPED students met NWEA MAP reading projections from Fall 2014 to Winter 2015; 61.5% of 8th grade SPED students met NWEA MAP reading projections from Fall 2014 to Winter 2015.

Percentage of Students Meeting Proficiency According to Winter 2015 MAP Reading Data (>50%)	
6th Grade (87 students)	**15.50%**
7th Grade (60 students)	**17.80%**
8th Grade (89 students)	**17.85%**
Weighted total average	**13.35%**

Current Math Data-

MELS students face even more significant gaps in mathematics. Winter 2015 NWEA MAP scores, 8th grade students' mean RIT was 210.0, 22.8 points below the norm grade level mean RIT, or equivalent to an end-of-year level fourth grader. Winter 2015 NWEA MAP scores, 7th grade students' mean RIT was 207.9, 20.3 points below the norm grade level mean RIT, or equivalent to a middle level fourth grader. Winter 2015 NWEA MAP scores, 6th grade students' mean RIT was 203.6, 19.2 points below the norm grade level mean RIT, or an equivalent of a beginning fourth grader.

82.8% of 6th grade ELL students met NWEA MAP math projections from Fall 2014 to Winter 2015; 68.2% of 7th grade ELL students met NWEA MAP math projections from Fall 2014 to Winter 2015; 58.6% of 8th grade ELL students met NWEA MAP math projections from Fall 2014 to Winter 2015. 65.0% of 6th grade SPED students met NWEA MAP math projections from Fall 2014 to Winter 2015; 78.6% of 7th grade SPED students met NWEA

MAP math projections from Fall 2014 to Winter 2015; 56.3% of 8th grade SPED students met NWEA MAP math projections from Fall 2014 to Winter 2015.

According to Winter 2015 MAP Math Data, 5.7% of the school's 87 6th graders, 6.15% of the school's 7th graders, and 4.3% of the 93 8th graders met proficiency (for a weighted total average of 4.4%).

Current Math & Literacy Strategy/Interventions-

- Created a mathematics and reading intervention Tiered II- Homogeneous math and reading classes offered 5 days per week for all students. Each intervention is sixty minutes. Students utilize the iReady intervention program, both online and in small groups. More needs to be done with the utilization of iReady intervention data to create fluidity and more effective direct instruction for Tier II instruction and the identification and implementation of Tier III homogeneous group instruction.

-Hired a mathematics and reading interventionist/coach – Using 1003A monies awarded for 2014-2015, a unique position was created that combined specialties of interventionists and coaches. These individuals analyze data and create intervention groups, provide coaching and support to teachers for the daily intervention class, provide intensive coaching to math and ELA teachers, and pull Tier III students for intensive reading and math intervention.

-Expeditionary Learning (EL) designed Engage New York (ENY) ELA curriculum: This school year, MELS has implemented this CT Core Standards-based curriculum for Tier I instruction. The transition to implement this curriculum has been ongoing and more is needed to meet students' needs and differentiate the curriculum.

-Realignment of CT Core Standards-aligned math curriculum: In December of 2014, MELS math interventionist/coach, Expeditionary Learning Theme Coach, and math teachers adopted and integrated a more relevant and rigorous curriculum than the Engage New York (ENY) Math curriculum. The new curriculum took effect in January of 2015 and teachers are implementing currently. More work will need to be done this summer to leverage student outcomes in alignment with SBAC domains.

-Math and Literacy Data Analysis: MELS staff complete triennial data analysis, assessing formative data to inform daily instruction. However, with a large number of novice staff, the impact on student outcomes using this data needs to be supported and developed through protocols and utilization.

Math & Literacy Strategies/Interventions to be continued-

- Mathematics and reading intervention Tiered II- Homogeneous math and reading classes offered 5 days per week for all students. Each intervention is sixty minutes. Students utilize the iReady intervention program, both online and in small groups for literacy and numeracy support. Teachers will be provided with development opportunities and training on the utilization of iReady intervention data to create fluidity and improved direct small group instruction.
- Teacher Professional Development around the successful utilization of iReady data to inform intervention instruction.
- Math and Reading interventionists/coaches: Using 1003A monies awarded for 2014-2015, a unique position was created that combined specialties of interventionists and coaches. These individuals analyze data and create intervention groups, provide coaching and support to teachers for the daily intervention class, provide intensive coaching to math and ELA teachers, and pull Tier III students for intensive reading and math intervention.

Next Steps for Math & Literacy Strategies/Interventions-

- Newcomer Support Room – Integration of English Language Learners (ELL) into the MELS community is essential to, and directly tied to, academic success and sustainability. With over 37% of the MELS student population classified as ELLs, and 32% of this population classified as New Arrivals (enrolled in a school in the United States for less than ten months) and the arrival of Level One ELLs throughout the year (17 since January 1, 2015), MELS leadership recognizes this area of need. The Newcomer Support Room is aimed at providing individualized Student Success Plans and academic support to students with large gaps in language. Moreover, since 31% of ELLs at MELS are classified as chronically absent, the staff overseeing the Newcomer Support Room will extend to families and parents as a resource and connection for engagement in the school. This direct link is aimed at providing meaningful and respectful enculturation to the MELS learning community. Given that 2014-2015 is the first year in three years that students have been exited from ELL services (12 students), the continued targeted academic support is necessary for this population of students. The Newcomer Support Room staff will also conduct professional development and support to build capacity amongst staff and sustain growth and support of ELL students at MELS.
    - Rubinstein-Avila (2003) concluded that the educational opportunity of low-income adolescent English language learners is atrocious and noted that "the common denominator across studies seems to indicate that [ELL] students' academic and emotional needs are consistently being either ignored or denied" (p. 133). The design and implementation of an effective Newcomer Support Center at MELS aims to greatly impact this negative trend in the proper education of English Language Learners. According to Custodio (2011), the U.S. Department of Education names newcomer programs as "separate, relatively self-contained interventions designed to meet the academic and transitional needs of newly arrived immigrants. Typically, students attend these programs before they enter more traditional interventions" (p. 1). The programming at MELS will establish an environment of rapport and success for English Language Learners.

- The purchase of licenses and materials for the scientifically validated ELL programs *Inside USA* (National Geographic) and *Language Central* (Pearson Education) to provide the foundational curriculum for this program to leverage student gains and fast-track students into content-rich, grade-level classrooms.

- Math Inquiry and Technology Class: In 2015-2016, MELS will offer all students a fourth Encore (specials class) that provides a rigorous, mathematics inquiry integration program. MELS currently offers CCSS grade-level aligned math classes and math intervention with explicit, remedial instruction. This course will offer MELS students College and Career Readiness aligned project-based and inquiry-based assignments that integrate multiple grade-level math standards to offer another level of math support. MELS leadership recognizes the importance of equipping students for 21st century careers and college courses and aims to provide its students with the same rigorous and unique learning opportunities as their suburban peers receive. Students will participate in coding and programming as well as theme-based expeditions that incorporate SBAC aligned mathematics skills.
    - Ainsworth and Christinson (2006) describe that balanced math programs in middle and high schools contain elements of enrichment and, in high achieving programs, successful and aligned math integration. Through the implementation of a successful math integration and technology course, students, potentially, could receive up to three hours of math instruction per day. Further, Balfanz, Iver, and Byrnes (2006) concluded that mathematics reforms and programming in high-poverty middle schools, cannot rely on only remedial skill building interventions but more unique integration is needed to really close the achievement gap.

- In order to support a rigorous and highly leveraging math integration and technology program, MELS will implement F.I.R.S.T. Lego League; Texas Instruments Ti-Inspire Software and curriculum; ALEKS from McGraw Hill to align to texts used in the math classrooms. Further, this class will partner with the ACE

Youth Project after school program in order to increase STEM achievement and interest at MELS.

- SRBI Tier III Academic Tutors: Tutors will provide remedial and enriching instructional support to increase and maintain student proficiency data. The Tier III support tutors will be supported by the ELA and Math Interventionist/Coach and help facilitate Tier III instruction. According to NWEA Winter MAP Data, 63% of MELS students would qualify for Tier III mathematics intervention; and, according to NWEA Winter MAP Data, 44% of MELS students would qualify for Tier III reading intervention, and a cohesive system needs to be created to respond efficiently to students' academic needs.
    - Sadoski and Wilson (2006) concluded that Title I schools within the study required a sustained, targeted reading intervention program to increase student reading proficiency. Further, the authors concluded that successful, large scale reading interventions were dependent on building staff capacity, the sustainability and commitment of leadership, and the hiring/retention of highly qualified implementers of the reading intervention programming. In another study conducted by Pyle and Vaughn (2012), the authors concluded that without an intensive, multi-tiered literacy intervention structure and program, struggling readers in middle school fall drastically behind progressing readers the same age. Moreover, the researchers discovered that the readers who needed tiered intervention in literacy were behind in all components of reading (word study, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary) and mandated that struggling, secondary student readers receive targeted, intensive literacy intervention as early as possible.
- Data Team Redesign and Implementation- MELS leadership recognizes the need to accurately and efficiently collate and disaggregate student data and, in turn, quickly provide teachers training and support to integrate data-driven decision-making into their pedagogical practice. This will enable MELS teachers to meet the needs of all learners in the Tier I instructional realm, identify and address needs in Tier II, and inform, with fluidity, which students need Tier III interventions. This will allow all MELS students access to the expeditionary learning model. In order to accomplish this, MELS will implement a School-wide Academic Data Team Initiative and training to better leverage the SRBI process.

POSSIBLE DATA TEAM RESTRUCTURE:

Data Team Level	Membership	Alignment of Student Outcomes
School-Wide Data Team	• Principal • Expeditionary Learning Theme Coach • English Language Learner Coach • Math Interventionist/Coach • ELA Interventionist/Coach • Grade Level Team Leaders • SPED Coordinator	-targeted alignment to student needs and implementation of Tier II and Tier III models of support -ensures fluidity amongst Tier II and Tier III supports and instruction -Tier I curricular needs addressed -students receive consistent intervention programming implemented with fidelity
Grade-Level Data Team	• Grade Level Team Leader • Math Interventionist/Coach • ELA Interventionist/Coach • Grade Level Content Teachers • Grade Level SPED Teacher	-students receive purposeful instruction in Tier I and Tier II groups -students progress through specific standards in order to equalize grade level expectations
Intervention Programming Data Team	• Math Interventionist/Coach • ELA Interventionist/Coach • SRBI Tier III Tutors • English Language Learner	-specific students receive meaningful, remediation or enriching instruction from expert tutors -each student receives same entry

	Coach • SPED Coordinator	and exit process to ensure sustainability and implementation fidelity

DATA TEAM FOCUS AREAS:

Student Data	Teacher Instructional Response	Tier Category	ALIGNMENT INDICATORS
Academic Qualitative (CCSS, cdontent-based lesson tasks)	-Flexible Learning Groups -applied differentiation techniques within content classes -rotating academic intervention focuses	-Tier I -Tier II	*1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 2.1, 2.3, 2.6*
Academic Quantitative (NWEA MAP assessments, CCSS aligned interim assessments)	-intervention groupings -Cooperative Learning Groups -applied differentiation techniques within content classes and intervention classes	-Tier I -Tier II -Tier III	*1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 2.1, 2.3, 2.6*
Behavioral Qualitative (Interim Student Surveys regarding culture and climate)	-whole school character development lessons (CREW) -Proactive incentive systems -Common staff and student language	-Tier I -Tier II	*1.4, 2.1, 2.3, 2.6, 3.1, 3.3*
Behavioral Quantitative (Individual Functional Behavioral Assessments, Behavior Intervention Plans)	-individual student success plan development -differentiated behavioral protocols per student -small group social improvement groupings	-Tier II -Tier III	*1.4, 2.1, 2.3, 2.6, 3.1, 3.3*

- Math & Literacy Intervention Programming: MELS school leadership, in conjunction with district leaders, will continue to provide adequate professional development, for intervention curricula , (iReady Math & iReady Reading) to support students' progress towards SMART Goal One and SMART Goal Two.
- CCSS Quality Alignment: Teachers will participate in school-based, district-supported Curriculum Planning Summer workshop as well as throughout the school year (approximately once per quarter). The workshops will focus on aligning CT Core Standards with current curriculum, effective pacing guides, assessment creation, and interdisciplinary learning expeditions.

Academic Proposals & Aligned Student Outcomes-

STRUCTURE	ACTION STEP	PROGRESS METRIC	School Turnaround Rubric Alignment
Newcomer Support Center and Staff	-Create Identification and needs process for Center (gates for entry and exit) -Provide Training and PD for staff in NSC -Purchase and provide training to staff on scientifically-validated curricular programming for Newcomers -Identify family engagement and	-Students will receive intensive language support in order to integrate faster in to mainstream academic courses and receive access to grade level curriculum in content areas -Students will be more	1.1, 1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2

	attendance support mechanisms -Provide language support to Newcomer students	engaged in the school community -Newcomer student truancy rates will improve -Students will improve specific literacy skills aligned to their needs based on MAP data and LAS Links Data.	
Math Inquiry and Technology Class and Staff	-Provide training and PD for staff -Align curriculum to math content area curricula and SBAC critical domains -Purchase necessary support materials for class -Implement effective Tier I math integration and technology skills	-Students will improve specific math skills aligned to their needs based on MAP data. -Students will interact with high leverage math inquiry problems and technology tools -Students will increase competencies in math and SBAC	1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2
SRBI Tier III Tutors	-identify students based on ability and need -create scheduling and intervention periods to address large number of students -determine access and exit gateways to keep interventions fluid and individualized	-students drastically increase math and ELA competencies on MAP and SBAC -students receive targeted instruction to support skills needed for grade-level instruction -normalize SRBI triangle	1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6
Restructured Data Teams	-Turn-key training of Expeditionary Learning Workshop -Schedule and appropriate funds and technology supports -integrate assessment data points to be utilized both qualitative and quantitative -determine performance metrics	-increased student proficiencies in math and ELA -increased student performance in math and ELA MAP assessments -consistent improvement of foundational skills in math and ELA	1.6, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 4.2
New Teacher Cohort	-increased student engagement -decreased student referrals -increased positive student-teacher interaction		*1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5*

- *Describe how staff will use data to inform lesson plans, differentiate instruction, and provide remedial support to meet the academic and development needs of all students.*

Math & Literacy Data Analysis: All teachers will engage in data/inquiry teams to implement and assess Tier 1 instruction and begin to develop Tier II instruction. Using explicit, quantitative data from the iReady Intervention programming and MAP assessments, MELS staff will participate in purposeful PD cycles centered around achieving SIP SMART goals utilizing data reflection tools. MELS staff will be provided with adequate technology in order to participate in meaningful data analysis. PD will focus on critical moves for differentiation

and scaffolding of instruction for all learners. Teachers will design lessons and units implementing high leverage differentiation strategies and scaffolding strategies to meet the learning needs of students.

Data-driven Instruction: The initial professional development cycle for all staff will be founded on an anchor text, differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all learners, and, correspondingly, the following cycle will focus on using data to drive those differentiation techniques. With the development of an effective SRBI process aligned Tier I instruction will be not only differentiated but informed by actual quantitative and qualitative student data. Further, through the development of a finalized SRBI process, teachers will keep detailed data on student achievement and adjust Tier I instruction with support from MELS leadership, interventionists and instructional coaches. This shift in focus will allow the development of the expeditionary model to be accessible by all learners.

* Sadoski, M., & Wilson, V. L. (2006). Effects of a theoretically based large-scale reading intervention in a multicultural urban school district. *American Educational Resource Journal, 43*(1), 137-154. Retrieved from: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3699405

* Pyle, N., & Vaughn, S. (2012). Remediating Reading Difficulties in a Response to Intervention Model with Secondary Students. Psychology In The Schools, 49(3), 273-284.

*Custodio, B., (2011). How to design and implement a newcomer program. *Pearson Education Inc.,* Boston, MA.

*Rubinstein-Avila, E. (2003). Facing reality: English language learners in middle school classes. *English Education,* 35(2), and 122-136.

*Ainsworth, L., & Christinson, J. (2006). Five easy steps to a balanced math program for secondary grades. *Lead & Learn Press.* Englewood, CO. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

*Balfanz, R., Iver, D., & Byrnes, V. (2006). The implementation and impact of evidence-based mathematics reforms in high-poverty middle schools: a multi-site, multi-year study. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education,* 37(1), 33-64.

Section 6: Culture and Climate. The school must foster a positive learning environment that supports high-quality teaching and learning, engages families and the community as partners in the educational process.

- *Describe the school's behavior management system and strategies to shape a positive school culture.*

Current School Year Data-

As of May 4, 2015, MELS staff have written 621 official office referrals; administrators have assigned a total of 131 days of outside suspension; 96 days of inside suspension; 26 students have received multiple incidents of suspension. MELS leadership and culture and climate team has worked diligently with staff and students this year on the effective management of behaviors. MELS leadership has also attended trainings for action planning and implementation of the Restorative Justice Model. MELS leadership recognizes the need for change-of-behavior mechanisms and support for students.

As of May 6, 2015, MELS chronic absenteeism rate (students classified as missing more than 18 days of school) is 19%. Last year, in 2013-2014, 37.7% of MELS students had 18 or more absences and were placed on the district's chronic absenteeism list. The average monthly attendance rate is 92.2% up from 88%.

Current Responsive/Proactive Systems-

- Student Behavior Logs: All Core and Encore Teams keep detailed student logs electronically or on paper. Teachers document phone calls, student interactions, communication with administration, and outcomes.
- Administrator Behavioral Tracking Systems: As of August 2014, school leadership has been utilizing a shared Excel database to collate disciplinary information in order to streamline efficiency. It is electronically shared back to the referring teacher; multiple data points can be collated easily such as times

and locations; and chronically disruptive students and common areas can receive targeted interventions based on the data. According to Excel Data Base thus far, there have been 300 written referrals for 6th grade; 189 for 7th grade; and 132 for 8th grade.

- Emotional Therapeutic Groups: Due to the high number of students at MELS with a variety of needs and a variety of emotional issues, students at MELS receive specialized group therapy bi-weekly from MyClinical Services licensed therapists (students with highest emotional needs receive weekly group therapy).
- Expeditionary Learning Grade Level Community Meetings: This year, MELS has implemented a weekly community meeting for the whole school. Designed and implemented by MELS Encore staff, the community meeting is completely student run. Community meetings typically last an hour and students display exemplary models of student work, receive Habits of Scholarship Awards, compete in fun challenges, and review important dates and announcements upcoming in the school.
- Habits of Scholarship (HOS) Rubric System: Redesigned in the summer of 2014, the current HOS Rubric provides both a school-wide narrative and foundation for behavior expectations. While the tenets are critical to creating a successful school culture, the fidelity of implementation and resultant follow through is still an area for growth. While the HOS system has provided a mechanism for identifying behavior, managing it, and celebrating great character, next steps will involve its use in the change-of-behavior mindset critical to future growth.
- CREW Curriculum: All MELS students partake in a CREW class each morning. CREW is designed as a small class, where teachers and students specifically work on goal setting, community engagement, and improving school culture. According to the 2013-2014 Student Connectedness Survey, 50% of students could identify at least five teachers whom they felt really cared about them. CREW units were created offering some autonomy to teachers but embedded social improvement strategies. However, certain teachers did not embed any of the specified units. This inconsistency creates misalignment in student behaviors and student involvement in school events.
- Truancy Team: This year the Culture and Climate Coach, the school social worker, the school counselor, and the Family Support Provider met weekly to assess chronic absenteeism, tardiness, and interventions. Although truancy has been steadily improving each month, more needs to be done to continue decreasing the number of chronically absent students. In 2014-2015 the MELS Truancy team has held SSTs on all students with ten or more absences and conducted home visits for all students with ten absences.

Responsive/Proactive Systems to be continued-

- Truancy Team: The Truancy Team will remain in place. The Truancy Team will meet, conduct scheduled home visits, file legal documentation, and solicit outside services if necessary.
- Student Behavior Logs: Teachers will continue to keep student behavior logs. However, in the 2015-2016 school year, Team Leaders will be responsible for collating and presenting this data at leadership meetings to improve communication between administration and improve intervention services to students requiring said services.
- Administrator Excel Database: administrators and the culture and climate team will continue to utilize and manage an Excel Database to easily spot trends and address issues of concern. In 2015-2016 MELS administration will use the SWIS record-keeping system to keep track of the behavioral interventions and systems.
- Reformatted Habits of Scholarship Rubric System: After creating a new, effective HOS Rubric for the 2014-2015 school year, MELS staff and students will be exposed to the new language of the rubric during CREW units. MELS staff will also use the rubric to grade students in each class on an electronic platform at the conclusion of each marking period for the 2014-2015 school year.
- Expeditionary Learning Whole School Community Meetings: MELS will continue to host whole school Community Meetings. All MELS students, staff, and community will participate in this singular event. The meetings will be run by members of the student government and the MELS Encore Team to continue

building strong school culture and climate, keeping students invested in the process of their learning.

- CREW Curriculum: In addition to maintaining the CREW curricular units, MELS staff will be specifically trained during professional development at the beginning of the year to specific implementation protocols for the CREW Curriculum. Furthermore, selected MELS staff will write CREW curriculum in the summer to align with the Habits of Scholarship.
- Extracurricular Programming: Currently, MELS does offer students a full athletic schedule. Furthermore, MELS, this year partnered with the Boys and Girls Club of Hartford which services 75 MELS students after school, the Youth United for Survival (Y-US) program which offers after school services for 25 MELS students, and ACE Youth Project, a targeted, intensive STEM after-school program that provides intensive academic intervention in math and science to minority students on Tuesday and Thursday after school. ACE Youth Project also partners with universities such as Massachusetts Institute of Technology and companies such as Pratt and Whitney to provide field excursions and content experts to motivate students to excel in STEM careers.

Next Steps for Responsive/Proactive Systems-

- Restorative Justice Response Center: Led by a Restorative Justice Coordinator (certified guidance counselor), the Restorative Justice Response Center is aimed at providing students with specific change-of-behavior strategies to students who continually show repeat negative behaviors. In 2014-2015 student behaviors were managed but rarely changed. MELS leadership aims to significantly decrease the 621 office referrals written in 2014-2015, but will require a change in paradigmatic perception around school culture. With 26 students receiving multiple incidences of suspension and increase in internal suspension days compared to 2013-2014, MELS leadership recognizes the need for a novel approach to school-wide support for change-of-behavior interventions. It is imperative that behaviors are systemically changed to ensure compliance within the MELS Habits of Scholars and to maximize in-class learning time. Discipline data requires MELS to take next steps in regards to Tier II and Tier III behavioral supports to maximize student-learning time and decrease redundant negative behaviors. Restorative Justice practices are scientifically-validated to decrease student behavior redundancy.
    - Multiple research indicators consider positive school culture imperative to sustain academic growth. According to researchers at the American Institutes for Research (Osher et al, 2009) positive changes in school climate are directly correlated to significant increases in achievement on state assessments. The authors also suggest that improving the social and emotional culture of a school is as imperative as any academic intervention. These supports can include academic and behavioral interventions, relational posits to discipline, and building the social and emotional skill set of students and staff. Further, the utilization of Restorative Justice initiatives, specifically, contextualized to a high needs, urban setting can help change the cultural shift in the school in response to self-image and behavior management systems (Varnham, 2005). Moreover, Varnham (2005) also concluded that the tension to keep schools safe requires adequate conflict resolution for students in school. Ashworth and Bockern (2007) describe Restorative Justice as a key methodology for re-engaging students back into the learning process and inhibiting gateways that continuously keep students from maximizing their learning potential.
- Intensive Truancy Team Protocols and student truancy response system: While much has been done to positively impact school attendance this year, more is needed, systemically, to induce a positive relationship between school and community to engage parents and families in the importance of school attendance.
    - Parker et. al (2011) directly associate school success in low socio-economic environments to sustained positive culture and climate. The authors state that in order to implement improved

academic environments, schools must also foster a sense of belonging and purpose for students to be truly invested in their learning. In relation to truancy, Balfanz and Byrnes (2012) discovered that middle grade attendance, especially in the sixth grade is linked to the number of students who graduate within one year of their four-year high school graduation date.

- Comprehensive CREW Curriculum: In order to truly improve and change school culture and climate, MELS will provide funding for teachers to plan strategic MELS CREW lessons for each grade aligned to the tenets of the Habits of Scholars rubric to increase student participation in learning and the school community.

Connectedness-

Current Connectedness Data-

According to the 2013-2014 *Connectedness Survey Results* provided by the district, MELS has increased its standing within the community, with students, and with staff. However, more is needed to parallel and surpass district averages. Overall, MELS moved from lower performances on the 2012-2013 survey to improved performances on the 2013-2014 survey, but growth in the aforementioned areas is still of concern.

MELS Student Survey Results Synopsis 2013-2014			
Tenet	**MELS Percentage**	**District Percentage**	**Response Plan**
Students here treat me with respect.	38	49	CREW Curriculum
At school, there is a teacher or some other adult who will miss me when I'm absent.	36	48	Truancy Team Protocols
I control myself when I am frustrated, angry, or disappointed.	39	55	CREW Curriculum; Restorative Justice program
I know how to disagree without starting a fight or an argument	48	63	CREW Curriculum; Restorative Justice program; Habits of Scholars Narrative

Staff had similar concerns regarding community perception and involvement. Further, staff also identified similarly to students in relation to a respectful climate; citing that change-of-behavior is an important next step. These lower scores indicate that staff still does not feel the school environment is as respectful as it should be, a key indicator in staff retention, and a key focus area for leadership to address.

MELS Teacher Survey Results Synopsis 2013-2014			
Tenet	**MELS Percentage**	**District Percentage**	**Response Plan**
Adults in the community support this school	35	63	Learning Expeditions
Lots of parents come to events at this school.	31	48	EL Core Practices (Community and Parent Engagement)
Adults in the community encourage youth to take school seriously	31	64	EL Core Practices (Community and Parent Engagement)
Students in this school treat each other with respect	23	48	HOS Narrative; Restorative Justice Program; CREW curriculum

Parent & Community Engagement-

- Over the course of the 2014-2015 school year, MELS has kept accurate data on parent and community engagement. According to sign-in sheets collated from the Spring Student Led Conferences in April of 2015, 63% of MELS parents accompanied their student in the Student Led Conferences. While MELS continues to actively engage its community, next steps will be designing and implementing successful

learning expeditions that incorporate vital partnerships and sustainable relationships with community members. Furthermore, with a large population of non-English speaking parents and families, the Newcomer Support Center will also function as a support center for parents and families, providing parent trainings, and a school-home connection to leverage student behavior, attendance, and academics. Youth United for Survival (Y-Us), Boys and Girls Club of Hartford, and the ACE Youth Project are also key partnerships that provide extended opportunities for families to support students in those programs. Each program hosts parent and family events at least three times per year.

Aligned Student Outcomes-

STRUCTURE	STUDENT OUTCOME	Turnaround Rubric ALIGNMENT
Comprehensive CREW Curriculum	-reduced student-student negative behavior; increased student accountability	*3.1, 3.4, 3.3*
Truancy Planning	-decreased student chronic absenteeism; decreased tardiness; increased wrap-around services	*3.1, 3.2, 3.5, 3.6*
Restorative Justice Response Center	-increased student engagement; decreased negative behaviors and redundant behaviors; increased student camaraderie -increased student self-management	*3.1, 3.2, 3.5, 3.6*
HOS Rubric System & Community Meetings	-increased student engagement; increased positive student-student interaction; increased positive student-community interaction	*3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 4.4*

*Ashworth, J., Van Bockern., et al (2007). The restorative justice center: an alternative to school detention. *Reclaiming Children and Youth.*

*Varnham, S., (2005). Seeing things differently: restorative justice and school discipline. Education and the Law, 17(3), 87-104.

* Osher, D., Spier, E., Kendziora, K., and Cai, C. (2009). Improving academic achievement through improving school climate and student connectedness. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

* Parker, D., Grenville, H., & Flessa, J. (2011). Case Studies of School Community and Climate: Success Narratives of Schools in Challenging Circumstances. School Community Journal, 21(1), 129-150.

* Balfanz, R., & Byrnes, V. (2012) Chronic Absenteeism: Summarizing What We Know From Nationally Available Data. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Center for Social Organization of Schools.

Section 7: Operations. The school must create systems and processes that promote organizational efficiency and effectiveness, including through the use of time and financial resources

- Propose the length of the school day and year for students, and describe how the proposed schedule will maximize instructional time on task.
- Propose the length of the school day and year for staff, including additional time before and during the school year for professional development and/or common planning time.

School Year- We currently follow the school calendar for Hartford Public Schools without any modifications. We would like to add 2 professional learning days in August for new hires in order to provide them with an overview of Expeditionary Learning at MELS, curriculum materials (course overview, unit plans, lesson plan templates) and introduce them to school-wide expectations regarding school culture.

Current School Schedule for Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays & Fridays-

6th Grade		7th Grade		8th Grade	
Crew	8:15-8:45	Crew	8:15-8:45	Crew	8:15-8:45
EL Flex	8:47-9:47	EL Flex	8:47-9:47	EL Flex	8:47-9:47
Core 1	9:49- 10:48	Core 1	9:49- 10:48	Encore	9:49- 10:48
Core 2	10:50- 11:49	Core 2	10:50- 11:49	Core 1	10:50- 11:49
Lunch	11:50-12:20	Lunch	11:50-12:20	Core 2	11:51- 1:22
Core 3	12:22-1:22	Core 3	12:22-1:22	Lunch	12:22-12:52
Core 4	1:24- 2:23	Encore	1:24- 2:23	Core 3	1:24- 2:23
Encore	2:25-3:25	Core 4	2:25-3:25	Core 4	2:25-3:25

Grade Level Teams have daily common planning time. During this time they co-plan with Special Education teachers, TESOL teachers, the EL Theme Coach, and Math and ELA Intervention teachers. In addition, they run data team meetings related to student behavior with the Culture & Climate Coach and Assistant Principal. During Wednesday PD from 1:00- 4:00, departments frequently meet with coaches to develop and review curriculum and provide feedback to colleagues on daily lesson plans. The focus of department times aligns with the PD cycle. In addition, departments work as a data teams to analyze student work samples.

This daily schedule has been effective in year one of implementation. Students are able to receive academic interventions during EL Flex, as well as have access to Art, Music, and Physical Education every quarter. Beginning each day with CREW provides staff and students with an opportunity to develop interpersonal connections and engage in discussions and activities related to our core values (respect, excellence, perseverance and community) and our daily Habits of Scholars.

Proposal- There is no time during the school day for enrichment activities and additional academic support for students. We are requesting additional funds to pay teachers to run enrichment programs with an academic component or academic support sessions for students.

Section 8: Stakeholder Engagement. Please describe stakeholder engagement throughout the turnaround planning process. Provide evidence that school and district personnel, School Governance Council members, parents, students and community members were engaged in the planning process and/or are aware the contents of this plan.

The School Governance Council has been involved in the SIG planning process, providing input and feedback. They met on March 17, 2014 to review and approve the School Improvement Plan and SIG application. Revisions and amendments were made accordingly. In addition, the building principal also met with the elected Student Government officials from each grade to review the School Improvement Plan and SIG application. Discussions focused on extending the school day by 30 minutes in order to provide Intervention classes and more opportunities for teachers to collaborate on curriculum and run data team meetings. They also discussed how summer institutes will further develop the EL theme and train teachers on designing curriculum aligned to the Common Core. Students were interested to learn about afternoon summer programs for students where they can engage in learning expeditions in their local communities. Associate Superintendent for Instructional Leadership and district personnel have been actively involved in the planning process.

Section 9: Implementation Timeline. Using Appendix C, summarize key strategies presented in this reform plan in the areas of talent, academics, culture and climate, and operations. Identify when each strategy will occur by year.

SIG 1003(g) BUDGET PROPOSAL WORKBOOK

School: McDonough Expeditionary Learning School District: Hartford, CT

SIG 1003(g) 3-5 Year Budget Proposal							
ED 114 Cost Categories		Planning Year (Optional)	Year 1 Implementation	Year 2 Implementation	Year 3 Implementation	Year 4 (Optional)	Year 5 (Optional)
100	Personnel Services - Salaries	$ -	$ 285,000.00	$ 275,000.00	$ 265,000.00	$ -	$ -
200	Personnel Services - Employee Benefits	$ -	$ 54,220.50	$ 54,075.50	$ 53,930.50	$ -	$ -
300	Purchased Professional and Technical Services	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
400	Purchased Property Services	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
500	Other Purchased Services	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
600	Supplies	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
700	Property	$ -	$ 60,000.00	$ 30,000.00	$ 15,000.00	$ -	$ -
800	Other Objects	$ -	$ 28,824.00	$ 10,000.00	$ 5,000.00	$ -	$ -
	Total SIG 1003(g) Proposal:	**$ -**	**$ 428,044.50**	**$ 369,075.50**	**$ 338,930.50**	**$ -**	**$ -**

Part II: FY 16 Low-Performing Schools Bond Request (Optional)	
Total Bond Request:	**$ -**

Planning Year Budget Proposal (Optional)

School Year (if applicable):

Cost:	Description:	1003(g) Proposal:	Other Funding Source(s):	Other Sources:
100: Personnel Services - Salaries				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	100: Personnel Services - Salaries Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
200: Personnel Services - Benefits				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	200: Personnel Services - Benefits Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
300: Purchased Professional and Technical Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	300: Purchased Professional and Technical Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
400: Purchased Property Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	400: Purchased Property Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
500: Other Purchased Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	500: Other Purchased Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
600: Supplies				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	600: Supplies Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
700: Property				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	700: Property Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
800: Other Objects				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	800: Other Objects Subtotal:	$ -		$ -

YR 1 Implementation Budget Proposal

School Year: 2015-2016

Cost:	Description:	1003(g) Proposal:	Other Funding Source(s):	Other Sources:
100: Personnel Services - Salaries				
TESOL/Bilingual Teacher	TESOL or Bilingual Teacher for Newcomer Center	$ 80,000.00		$ -
MIT Teacher	Math Inquiry & Technology (MIT) Teacher	$ 80,000.00		
School Counselor	Restorative Justice Coordinator (school counselor)	$ 80,000.00		$ -
Academic Tutors	Certified Tutors for Tier 3 Intervention	$ 25,000.00		
Extra Pay for Teachers	Paid worksops on curriculum development and PLCs for	$ 20,000.00		$ -
	100: Personnel Services - Salaries Subtotal:	**$ 285,000.00**		$ -
200: Personnel Services - Benefits				
TESOL/Bilingual Teacher- fringe	Fringe benefits for TESOL/Bilingual Teacher	$ 17,856.00		$ -
MIT Teacher- fringe	Fringe benefits for MIT Teacher	$ 17,856.00		
School Counselor- fringe	Fringe benefits for Restorative Justice Coordintaor	$ 17,856.00		$ -
Acadmic Tutors- fringe	Fringe for Academic Tutors (1.45%)	$ 362.50		
Extra Pay for Teachers-	Fringe benefits for extra pay for extra duty (training) (1.45%)	$ 290.00		$ -
	200: Personnel Services - Benefits Subtotal:	$ 54,220.50		$ -
300: Purchased Professional and Technical Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	300: Purchased Professional and Technical Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
400: Purchased Property Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	400: Purchased Property Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
500: Other Purchased Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	500: Other Purchased Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
600: Supplies				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	600: Supplies Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
700: Property				
Intervention & math Materials	Computer programs, materials for Intervention & MIT classes	$ 35,000.00		$ -
Computer	ELL materials	$ 25,000.00		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	700: Property Subtotal:	$ 60,000.00		$ -
800: Other Objects				
12 Laptops	Macbook Pros for Data Teams, Content Technology Integration	$ 13,824.00		$ -
18 Student computers	Student computers for web based intervention programs	$ 15,000.00		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	800: Other Objects Subtotal:	$ 28,824.00		$ -

YR 2 Implementation Budget Proposal

School Year:

Cost:	Description:	1003(g) Proposal:	Other Funding Source(s):	Other Sources:
100: Personnel Services - Salaries				
TESOL/Bilingual Teacher	TESOL or Bilingual Teacher for Newcomer Center	$ 80,000.00		$ -
MIT Teacher	Math Integration & Technology (MIT) Teacher	$ 80,000.00		$ -
School Counselor	Restorative Justice Coordinator (school counselor)	$ 80,000.00		
Extra Pay for Teachers	Paid worksops on curriculum development and PLCs for	$ 15,000.00		
Academic Tutors	Certified Tutors for Tier 3 Intervention	$ 20,000.00		$ -
	100: Personnel Services - Salaries Subtotal:	**$ 275,000.00**		**$ -**
200: Personnel Services - Benefits				
TESOL/Bilingual Teacher- fringe	Fringe benefits for TESOL/Bilingual Teacher	$ 17,856.00		$ -
MIT Teacher- fringe	Fringe benefits for MIT Teacher	$ 17,856.00		$ -
Extra Pay for Teachers-	Fringe benefits for extra pay for extra duty (training) (1.45%)	$ 217.50		
Acadmic Tutors- fringe	Fringe for Academic Tutors (1.45%)	$ 290.00		
School Counselor- fringe	Fringe benefits for Restorative Justice Coordintaor	$ 17,856.00		$ -
	200: Personnel Services - Benefits Subtotal:	$ 54,075.50		$ -
300: Purchased Professional and Technical Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	300: Purchased Professional and Technical Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
400: Purchased Property Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	400: Purchased Property Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
500: Other Purchased Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	500: Other Purchased Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
600: Supplies				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	600: Supplies Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
700: Property				
Intervention & math Materials	Computer programs, materials for Intervention & MIT classes	$ 20,000.00		$ -
Computer	ELL materials	$ 10,000.00		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	700: Property Subtotal:	$ 30,000.00		$ -
800: Other Objects				
10 Student computers	Student computers for web based intervention programs	$ 10,000.00		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	800: Other Objects Subtotal:	$ 10,000.00		$ -

YR 3 Implementation Budget Proposal

School Year:

Cost:	Description:	1003(g) Proposal:	Other Funding Source(s):	Other Sources:
100: Personnel Services - Salaries				
TESOL/Bilingual Teacher	TESOL/Bilingual Teacher	$ 80,000.00		$ -
MIT Teacher	Math Integration & Technology (MIT) Teacher	$ 80,000.00		$ -
Paid worksops on	Paid worksops on curriculum development and PLCs for	$ 10,000.00		
Academic Tutors	Certified Tutors for Tier 3 Intervention	$ 15,000.00		
School Counselor	Restorative Justice Coordinator (school counselor)	$ 80,000.00		$ -
	100: Personnel Services - Salaries Subtotal:	**$ 265,000.00**		**$ -**
200: Personnel Services - Benefits				
TESOL/Bilingual Teacher- fringe	Fringe benefits for TESOL/Bilingual Teacher	$ 17,856.00		$ -
MIT Teacher- fringe	Fringe benefits for MIT Teacher	$ 17,856.00		$ -
Extra Pay for Teachers-	Fringe benefits for extra pay for extra duty (training) (1.45%)	$ 145.00		
Acadmic Tutors- fringe	Fringe for Academic Tutors (1.45%)	$ 217.50		
School Counselor- fringe	Fringe benefits for Restorative Justice Coordintaor	$ 17,856.00		
		$ -		$ -
	200: Personnel Services - Benefits Subtotal:	$ 53,930.50		$ -
300: Purchased Professional and Technical Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	300: Purchased Professional and Technical Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
400: Purchased Property Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	400: Purchased Property Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
500: Other Purchased Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	500: Other Purchased Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
600: Supplies				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	600: Supplies Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
700: Property				
Intervention & math Materials	Computer programs, materials for Intervention & MIT classes	$ 10,000.00		$ -
Computer	ELL materials	$ 5,000.00		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	700: Property Subtotal:	$ 15,000.00		$ -
800: Other Objects				
5 Student computers	Student computers for web based intervention programs	$ 5,000.00		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	800: Other Objects Subtotal:	$ 5,000.00		$ -

YR 4 Implementation Budget Proposal (Optional)

School Year:

Cost:	Description:	1003(g) Proposal:	Other Funding Source(s):	Other Sources:
100: Personnel Services - Salaries				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	100: Personnel Services - Salaries Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
200: Personnel Services - Benefits				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	200: Personnel Services - Benefits Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
300: Purchased Professional and Technical Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	300: Purchased Professional and Technical Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
400: Purchased Property Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	400: Purchased Property Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
500: Other Purchased Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	500: Other Purchased Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
600: Supplies				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	600: Supplies Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
700: Property				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	700: Property Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
800: Other Objects				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	800: Other Objects Subtotal:	$ -		$ -

YR 5 Implementation Budget Proposal (Optional)

School Year:

Cost:	Description:	1003(g) Proposal:	Other Funding Source(s):	Other Sources:
100: Personnel Services - Salaries				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	100: Personnel Services - Salaries Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
200: Personnel Services - Benefits				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	200: Personnel Services - Benefits Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
300: Purchased Professional and Technical Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	300: Purchased Professional and Technical Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
400: Purchased Property Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	400: Purchased Property Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
500: Other Purchased Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	500: Other Purchased Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
600: Supplies				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	600: Supplies Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
700: Property				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	700: Property Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
800: Other Objects				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	800: Other Objects Subtotal:	$ -		$ -

FY 16 Bond Request (Optional)

Item #	Description	Amount
1		$0.00
2		$0.00
3		$0.00
4		$0.00
5		$0.00
6		$0.00
7		$0.00
8		$0.00
9		$0.00
10		$0.00
11		$0.00
12		$0.00
13		$0.00
14		$0.00
15		$0.00
	Total:	**$0.00**

Modifications and Annual Renewal

The CSDE must evaluate annually if the district is eligible to have their SIG application renewed. The Commissioner or his/her designee may, on the basis of such review, address with district and school leadership a lack of sufficient progress or other implementation issues at the school. If the school does not enact changes or the changes are unlikely to result in sufficient progress or adequately address implementation concerns, the Commissioner may take appropriate actions to ensure sufficient progress at the school, including, but not limited to, developing a revised SIG Plan and/or selecting an alternate reform model.

Additionally, the schools must demonstrate progress with regard to the following indicators:

- School performance index/Classification;
- Number of minutes within the school year;
- Discipline incidents;
- Truants;
- Dropout rate;
- Student attendance rate:
- Student chronic absenteeism rate;
- Progress on student assessments;
- Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes (high school only); and
- Teacher attendance rate.

APPENDIX A: ACCOUNTABILITY METRICS AND PERFORMANCE TARGETS

SIG school progress is measured against the leading and lagging indicators identified in the chart below. Under the "Baseline and Historic Data" columns, please enter school data for each of the past three years. Please note that "Performance Targets" are subject to approval by the CSDE.

Performance Indicators	Baseline and Historic Data			Performance Targets		
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15 YTD	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Student enrollment	385	291	252	255	275	295
Number of minutes in the school year						
Average daily attendance rate	97.2%	94.3%	94.4%	95%	95%	95%
Chronic absenteeism rate	52.5%	62.5%	35.7%	18%	10%	5%
Number of in-school suspensions	0	13	57	25	15	10
Number of out-of-school suspensions	237	263	35	25	15	10
Number of expulsions	11	3	0	0	0	0
Dropout rate	N/A	N/A	N/A			
School Performance Index (SPI)	36.4	N/A	N/A			
Number of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP, IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes (HS only)	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Teacher attendance rate	97.2%	94.1%	94.0%	96%	98%	98%
Percent of teachers rated "Exemplary" as a proportion of the total numbers of teachers employed at the school	7%	0%	N/A	20%	40%	60%
Percent of teachers rated "Proficient" as a proportion of the total numbers of teachers employed at the school	88%	64%	N/A	90%	95%	98%
Percent of teachers rated "Developing" as a proportion of the total numbers of teachers employed at the school	4%	14%	N/A	10%	5%	0%
Percent of teachers rated "Below Standard" as a proportion of the total numbers of teachers employed at the school	1%	0%	N/A	0%	0%	0%

APPENDIX B: SIG 1003(g) EXCEL BUDGET WORKBOOK DIRECTIONS

Directions: Using the Excel budget workbook provided, please create a budget proposal outlining new costs associated with the SIG School Plan and leveraging all available funding sources. The budget proposal and aligned budget narrative must indicate the amount of SIG 1003(g) funds requested by the district to:

- Implement the selected model (turnaround, restart, closure, early learning, whole-school reform or transformation) in each school the district commits to serve;
- Conduct district-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected reform models;
- Implement a full pre-implementation year during 2015-16 (optional); implement three full years of implementation; and/or implementation up to two full years of sustainment (optional).
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or district level, for schools the district commits to serve over the five-year period.

The budget request for each school must be of sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention over a period of up to five years. A district may request funds for district-level activities that will support the implementation of school intervention models. Include not less than $50,000 per year or more than $2 million per year for each school the district commits to serve. Schools selecting the closure model will only be funded for one year, not to exceed $50,000.

The CSDE may make a SIG award to an LEA for **up to five years** for a particular school. The LEA may apply for **one optional planning year** for pre-implementation activities; **at least three full years of implementation** for full implementation of the selected intervention; and **up to two years for sustainability activities** related to sustaining reforms following at least three years of full intervention implementation. The LEA budget should address the entire grant period. An LEA may not receive more than five years of SIG funding for a particular school, and budgets for sustainability years cannot exceed $50,000 per year.

SIG funds may not be used to supplant federal and non-federal funds, but only to supplement funding provided to SIG schools. In particular, a district must continue to provide all funds that would have been provided to the school in the absence of SIG funds. This requirement applies to all funding related to full implementation, including pre-implementation activities.

Excel Workbook Instructions:

- **Budget Cover Page:** Please enter the school and district name on the cover sheet. The remaining cells summarizing the entire budget workbook will be auto-generated as you complete the SIG budget proposal. Do not enter cost information on the cover page.

- **Planning Year Budget *(Optional);* Year 1-3 Budgets *(Required);* Year 4-5 Sustainability Budgets *(Optional)*:** Please insert information pertaining to the proposed SIG 1003(g) budget for the school for up to five years of fund (i.e., complete up to five tabs). The budget should reflect all new expenditures contained in the school plan and show the proposed funding source(s) for each new cost. Possible funding sources include, but are not limited to, the school's local operating budget, federal allocations such as Title I, Alliance District grant, Priority School District grant, and/or other grants. Please categorize proposed expenditures by Uniform Charts of Accounts (UCOA) codes (see the table on the next page). For each expenditure, provide the following information in the appropriate columns: (a) label the position/service/item; (b) provide cost information and/or a budget justification (e.g., summary of the

expense, # of units, cost per unit, etc.); (c) enter the total proposed SIG 1003(g) investment; (d) list alternate funding sources, if applicable; and (e) show the amount covered by alternate sources. The budget proposal will be evaluated for strategic alignment and anticipated impact.

- **Low-Performing Schools Bond Request:** Public Act 13-239 § 32(g)(3) authorizes "grants-in-aid to assist targeted local and regional school districts for alterations, repairs, improvements, technology and equipment in low-performing schools" to address physical barriers to maintaining and achieving quality facilities and 21st century school environments. Schools may complete the final tab, requesting up to $500,000 in bond funding. Low-performing schools bond funding may not be requested for projects eligible for the State School Construction Grant Program, including, but not limited to: new construction, portable classrooms, roof replacements, or projects with a primary purpose of ensuring code compliance. Proposed projects may not supplant standard operating expenses. The awarding of bond funding is contingent upon the availability of funds and approval by the CSDE and the State Bond Commission. Funding cannot replace previously and separately allocated, approved, and funded projects.

Please code all expenditures in accordance with the state's Uniform Charts of Accounts as summarized below.

CODE:	OBJECT:
100	**PERSONNEL SERVICES – SALARIES.** Amounts paid to both permanent and temporary grantee employees including personnel substituting for those in permanent positions. This includes gross salary for personnel services rendered while on the payroll of the grantees.
200	**PERSONNEL SERVICES – EMPLOYEE BENEFITS.** Amounts paid by the grantee on behalf of employees; these amounts are not included in the gross salary, but are in addition to that amount. Such payments are fringe benefit payments and, while not paid directly to employees, nevertheless are parts of the cost of personnel services.
300	**PURCHASED PROFESSIONAL AND TECHNICAL SERVICES.** Services, which by their nature can be performed only by persons or firms with specialized skills and knowledge. While a product may or may not result from the transaction, the primary reason for the purchase is the service provided. Included are the services of architects, engineers, auditors, dentists, medical doctors, lawyers, consultants, teachers, accountants, technical assistance support organizations, school management partners, etc.
400	**PURCHASED PROPERTY SERVICES.** Services purchased to operate, repair, maintain, and rent property owned or used by the grantee. Persons other than grantee employees perform these services. While a product may or may not result from the transaction, the primary reason for the purchase is the service provided.
500	**OTHER PURCHASED SERVICES.** Amounts paid for services rendered by organizations or personnel not on the payroll of the grantee (separate from Professional and Technical Services or Property Services). While a product may or may not result from the transaction, the primary reason for the purchase is the service provided.
600	**SUPPLIES.** Amounts paid for items that are consumed, worn out, or deteriorated through use; or items that lose their identity through fabrication or incorporation into different or more complex units or substances.
700	**PROPERTY.** Expenditures for acquiring fixed assets, including land or existing buildings, improvements of grounds, initial equipment, additional equipment, and replacement of equipment.
800	**OTHER OBJECTS.** (Miscellaneous Expenditures) Expenditures for goods or services not properly classified in one of the above objects. Included in the category could be expenditures for dues and fees, judgments against a grantee that are not covered by liability insurance, and interest payments on bonds and notes.

APPENDIX C: IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

Year 1 Implementation	
Strategies:	**Progress Metrics:**
1. Newcomer Support Center	By end of year 1, MELS leadership will hire and train the Newcomer Support Center coordinator; by end of year 1 the Newcomer Support Center will establish a protocol and curriculum for support.
2. Restorative Justice Response Center and Programming	By end of year 1, 100% of MELS staff will be trained on the implementation of the programming; by the end of year 1, MELS leadership will hire and train the Restorative Justice Response Center Coordinator and establish a protocol for change-of-behavior curricula. Student absenteeism will drop below 18%.
3. Data Team Process	By end of year 1, 100% of content teachers will be equipped with technology and trained on data analysis protocols. 100% of content teachers will participate in three data analysis protocols.
4. Non-Tenured Teacher Cohort	By end of year 1, 100% of non-tenured teachers will be a participant in a school-based Professional Learning Community.
5. Math Inquiry and Technology Class	By end of year 1, MELS will hire and train a certified math teacher for the MIT class; by the end of year 1, MIT class will have a tiered, 3-grade level curriculum; 100% of MELS students will participate in a Math Inquiry & Technology Class
6. SRBI Tier III Tutors	By end of year 1, 100% of tutors will be hired and trained on intervention processes and data utilization at MELS; by end of year 1, SRBI Academic Tutors will establish a cohesive student schedule and intervention cycle.

Year 2 Implementation	
Strategies:	**Progress Metrics:**
1. Newcomer Support Center	By end of year 2, the Newcomer Support Center will intake and academically support 100% of MELS ELL new arrivals; 100% of MELS new arrivals will be placed on an individualized learning plan; less than 3 ELL newcomers will be classified as chronically absent.
2. Restorative Justice Response Center and Programming	By end of year 2, 100% of MELS staff will implement the Restorative Justice program; student referrals will decrease by 60%; school suspensions will decrease by 50%. Student chronic absenteeism will drop below 10%
3. Data Team Process	By end of year 2, 100% of teachers will participate in horizontal and vertical data analysis protocols.
4. Non-Tenured Teacher Cohort	By end of year 2, 100% of non-tenured teachers participate

	in school-based professional learning communities.
5. Math Inquiry and Technology Class	By end of year 2, MELS will implement a tiered curriculum; by the end of year 2, MIT class will have a tiered, 3-grade level curriculum; 35% of MELS students will be categorized as proficient on NWEA math MAP assessment
6. SRBI Tier III Tutors	By end of year 2, 100% implement small group instruction; by end of year 2, 35% of MELS students will be categorized as proficient on NWEA math MAP assessment; 45% of MELS students will be categorized as proficient on NWEA reading MAP assessment.

Year 3 Implementation	
Strategies:	**Progress Metrics:**
1. Newcomer Support Center	By end of year 3, the Newcomer Support Center will intake and academically support 100% of MELS ELL new arrivals; 100% of MELS new arrivals will be placed on an individualized learning plan; no 3 ELL newcomers will be classified as chronically absent.
2. Restorative Justice Response Center and Programming	By end of year 3, 100% of MELS staff will implement the Restorative Justice program; student referrals will decrease by 80%; school suspensions will decrease by 75%. Student chronic absenteeism will drop below 5%.
3. Data Team Process	By end of year 3, 100% of teachers will participate in quarterly horizontal and vertical data analysis protocols.
4. Cut Non-Tenured Teacher Cohort	By end of year 3, the non-tenured teacher cohort will be dissipated and teacher growth will be completed through professional development, coaching cycles, and evaluation.
5. Math Inquiry and Technology Class	By end of year 3, MELS MIT class will implement grade-specific expedition integration; by the end of year 3, 50% of MELS students will be categorized as proficient on NWEA math MAP assessment
6. SRBI Tier III Tutors	By end of year 3, 100% implement small group instruction; by end of year 3, 50% of MELS students will be categorized as proficient on NWEA math MAP assessment; 60% of MELS students will be categorized as proficient on NWEA reading MAP assessment.

Sustainment Year 1 (Optional)	
Strategies:	**Progress Metrics:**
1. Newcomer Support Center	Newcomer Support Center Personnel and programming will be transitioned into the general budget; 100% of ELL newcomers will receive individualized programming.
2. ELA & Math Interventionists/Coaches	ELA and Math Interventionist/Coach position will be cut from school budget. 100% of students will still receive 60 minutes daily of reading and math intervention.

3. Restorative Justice Center and Programming	Restorative Justice Center Coordinator position will be cut; 100% of MELS staff and students will still use Restorative Justice programming;
4. SRBI Tier III Tutors	Two out of the three SRBI Tier III Academic Tutor positions will be eliminated; the remaining position will be transitioned into the general budget to provide tier III support to remaining students who require.
5. Math Inquiry and Technology Class	The Math Inquiry and Technology class certified math teacher will be transitioned into the general budget.

Sustainment Year 2 (Optional)	
Strategies:	**Progress Metrics:**
1. Instructional Coaches	The position of Expeditionary Learning Theme Coach and Culture and Climate Coach will be consolidated into one school-based instructional coach. The Instructional Coach position will be included in the general budget.
2. SRBI Tier III Tutors	The final Tier III tutor will be cut from the school general budget. Monies will go towards supporting and cultivating Teacher Leadership positions and stipends for after school/before school tutoring.
3.	

APPENDIX D: STATEMENT OF ASSURANCES

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STANDARD STATEMENT OF ASSURANCES | GRANT PROGRAMS

PROJECT TITLE: **School Improvement Grant (SIG) 1003(g)**

THE APPLICANT: **Hartford Public Schools** HEREBY ASSURES THAT:

Hartford Public Schools
(insert Agency/School/CBO Name)

A. The applicant has the necessary legal authority to apply for and receive the proposed grant;

B. The filing of this application has been authorized by the applicant's governing body, and the undersigned official has been duly authorized to file this application for and on behalf of said applicant, and otherwise to act as the authorized representative of the applicant in connection with this application;

C. The activities and services for which assistance is sought under this grant will be administered by or under the supervision and control of the applicant;

D. The project will be operated in compliance with all applicable state and federal laws and in compliance with regulations and other policies and administrative directives of the State Board of Education and the Connecticut State Department of Education;

E. Grant funds shall not be used to supplant funds normally budgeted by the agency;

F. Fiscal control and accounting procedures will be used to ensure proper disbursement of all funds awarded;

G. The applicant will submit a final project report (within 60 days of the project completion) and such other reports, as specified, to the Connecticut State Department of Education, including information relating to the project records and access thereto as the Connecticut State Department of Education may find necessary;

H. The Connecticut State Department of Education reserves the exclusive right to use and grant the right to use and/or publish any part or parts of any summary, abstract, reports, publications, records and materials resulting from this project and this grant;

I. If the project achieves the specified objectives, every reasonable effort will be made to continue the project and/or implement the results after the termination of state/federal funding;

J. The applicant will protect and save harmless the State Board of Education from financial loss and expense, including legal fees and costs, if any, arising out of any breach of the duties, in whole or part, described in the application for the grant;

K. At the conclusion of each grant period, the applicant will provide for an independent audit report acceptable to the grantor in accordance with Sections 7-394a and 7-396a of the Connecticut General Statutes, and the applicant shall return to the Connecticut State Department of Education any moneys not expended in accordance with the approved program/operation budget as determined by the audit;

L. REQUIRED LANGUAGE (NON-DISCRIMINATION)

References in this section to "contract" shall mean this grant agreement and to "contractor" shall mean the Grantee.

(a) For purposes of this Section, the following terms are defined as follows:

i. "Commission" means the Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities;
ii. "Contract" and "contract" include any extension or modification of the Contract or contract;
iii. "Contractor" and "contractor" include any successors or assigns of the Contractor or contractor;
iv. "Gender identity or expression" means a person's gender-related identity, appearance or behavior, whether or not that gender-related identity, appearance or behavior is different from that traditionally associated with the person's physiology or assigned sex at birth, which gender-related identity can be shown by providing evidence including, but not limited to, medical history, care or treatment of the gender-related identity, consistent and uniform assertion of the gender-related identity or any other evidence that the gender-related identity is sincerely held, part of a person's core identity or not being asserted for an improper purpose;
v. "good faith" means that degree of diligence which a reasonable person would exercise in the performance of legal duties and obligations;
vi. "good faith efforts" shall include, but not be limited to, those reasonable initial efforts necessary to comply with statutory or regulatory requirements and additional or substituted efforts when it is determined that such initial efforts will not be sufficient to comply with such requirements;
vii. "marital status" means being single, married as recognized by the state of Connecticut, widowed, separated or divorced;
viii. "mental disability" means one or more mental disorders, as defined in the most recent edition of the American Psychiatric Association's "Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders", or a record of or regarding a person as having one or more such disorders;
ix. "minority business enterprise" means any small contractor or supplier of materials fifty-one percent or more of the capital stock, if any, or assets of which is owned by a person or persons: (1) who are active in the daily affairs of the enterprise, (2) who have the power to direct the management and policies of the enterprise, and (3) who are members of a minority, as such term is defined in subsection (a) of Connecticut General Statutes § 32-9n; and
x. "public works contract" means any agreement between any individual, firm or corporation and the State or any political subdivision of the State other than a municipality for construction, rehabilitation, conversion, extension, demolition or repair of a public building, highway or other changes or improvements in real property, or which is financed in whole or in part by the State, including, but not limited to, matching expenditures, grants, loans, insurance or guarantees.

For purposes of this Section, the terms "Contract" and "contract" do not include a contract where each contractor is (1) a political subdivision of the state, including, but not limited to, a municipality, (2) a quasi-public agency, as defined in Conn. Gen. Stat. Section 1-120, (3) any other state, including but not limited to any federally recognized Indian tribal governments, as defined in Conn. Gen. Stat. Section 1-267, (4) the federal government, (5) a foreign government, or (6) an agency of a subdivision, agency, state or government described in the immediately preceding enumerated items (1), (2), (3), (4) or (5).

(b) (1) The Contractor agrees and warrants that in the performance of the Contract such Contractor will not discriminate or permit discrimination against any person or group of persons on the grounds of race, color, religious creed, age, marital status, national origin, ancestry, sex, gender identity or expression, mental retardation, mental disability or physical disability, including, but not limited to, blindness, unless it is shown by such Contractor that such disability prevents performance of the work involved, in any manner prohibited by the laws of the United States or of the State of Connecticut; and the Contractor further agrees to take affirmative action to insure that applicants with job-related qualifications are employed and that employees are treated when employed without regard to their race, color, religious creed, age, marital status, national origin, ancestry, sex, gender identity or expression, mental retardation, mental disability or physical disability, including, but not limited to, blindness, unless it is shown by the Contractor that such disability prevents performance of the work involved; (2) the Contractor agrees, in all solicitations or advertisements for employees placed by or on behalf of the Contractor, to state that it is an "affirmative action-equal opportunity employer" in accordance with regulations adopted by the Commission; (3) the Contractor agrees to provide each labor union or representative of workers with which the Contractor has a collective bargaining Agreement or other contract or understanding and each vendor with which the Contractor has a contract or understanding, a notice to be provided by the Commission, advising the labor union or workers' representative of the Contractor's commitments under this section and to post copies of the notice in conspicuous places available to employees and applicants for employment; (4) the Contractor agrees to comply with each provision of this Section and Connecticut General Statutes §§ 46a-68e and 46a-68f and with each regulation or relevant order issued by said Commission pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §§ 46a-56, 46a-68e and 46a-68f; and (5) the Contractor agrees to provide the Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities with such information requested by the Commission, and permit access to pertinent books, records and accounts, concerning the employment practices and procedures of the Contractor as relate to the provisions of this Section and Connecticut General Statutes § 46a-56. If the contract is a public works contract, the Contractor agrees and warrants that he will make good faith efforts to employ minority business enterprises as subcontractors and suppliers of materials on such public works projects.

(c) Determination of the Contractor's good faith efforts shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following factors: The Contractor's employment and subcontracting policies, patterns and practices; affirmative advertising, recruitment and training; technical assistance activities and such other reasonable activities or efforts as the Commission may prescribe that are designed to ensure the participation of minority business enterprises in public works projects.

(d) The Contractor shall develop and maintain adequate documentation, in a manner prescribed by the Commission, of its good faith efforts.

(e) The Contractor shall include the provisions of subsection (b) of this Section in every subcontract or purchase order entered into in order to fulfill any obligation of a contract with the State and such provisions shall be binding on a subcontractor, vendor or manufacturer unless exempted by regulations or orders of the Commission. The Contractor shall take such action with respect to any such subcontract or purchase order as the Commission may direct as a means of enforcing such provisions including sanctions for noncompliance in accordance with Connecticut General Statutes §46a-56; provided if such Contractor becomes involved in, or is threatened with, litigation with a subcontractor or vendor as a result of such direction by the Commission, the Contractor may request the State of Connecticut to enter into any such litigation or negotiation prior thereto to protect the interests of the State and the State may so enter.

(f) The Contractor agrees to comply with the regulations referred to in this Section as they exist on the date of this Contract and as they may be adopted or amended from time to time during the term of this Contract and any amendments thereto.

(g) (1) The Contractor agrees and warrants that in the performance of the Contract such Contractor will not discriminate or permit discrimination against any person or group of persons on the grounds of sexual orientation, in any manner prohibited by the laws of the United States or the State of Connecticut, and that employees are treated when employed without regard to their sexual orientation; (2) the Contractor agrees to provide each labor union or representative of workers with which such Contractor has a collective bargaining Agreement or other contract or understanding and each vendor with which such Contractor has a contract or understanding, a notice to be provided by the Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities advising the labor union or workers' representative of the Contractor's commitments under this section, and to post copies of the notice in conspicuous places available to employees and applicants for employment; (3) the Contractor agrees to comply with each provision of this section and with each regulation or relevant order issued by said Commission pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes § 46a-56; and (4) the Contractor agrees to provide the Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities with such information requested by the Commission, and permit access to pertinent books, records and accounts, concerning the employment practices and procedures of the Contractor which relate to the provisions of this Section and Connecticut General Statutes § 46a-56.

(h) The Contractor shall include the provisions of the foregoing paragraph in every subcontract or purchase order entered into in order to fulfill any obligation of a contract with the State and such provisions shall be binding on a subcontractor, vendor or manufacturer unless exempted by regulations or orders of the Commission. The Contractor shall take such action with respect to any such subcontract or purchase order as the Commission may direct as a means of enforcing such provisions including sanctions for noncompliance in accordance with Connecticut General Statutes § 46a-56; provided, if such Contractor becomes involved in, or is threatened with, litigation with a subcontractor or vendor as a result of such direction by the Commission, the Contractor may request the State of Connecticut to enter into any such litigation or negotiation prior thereto to protect the interests of the State and the State may so enter.

M. The grant award is subject to approval of the Connecticut State Department of Education and availability of state or federal funds.

N. The applicant agrees and warrants that Sections 4-190 to 4-197, inclusive, of the Connecticut General Statutes concerning the Personal Data Act and Sections 10-4-8 to 10-4-10, inclusive, of the

Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies promulgated there under are hereby incorporated by reference.

I, the undersigned authorized official; hereby certify that these assurances shall be fully implemented.

Superintendent Signature:

Name: *(typed)* Dr. Beth Schiavino-Narvaez

Title: *(typed)* Superintendent of Schools

Date: May 14, 2015

APPENDIX E: EVALUATION OF EXTERNAL PARTNERS

Part I: Partner Profile and Contact Information

Organization Legal Name:	**Organization Street Address:**
CEO/President Name:	**CEO/President Contact Information:**
Contact Person Name/Title:	**Contact Person Contact Information:**

Type of Provider:

- ☐ For-profit
- ☐ Non-profit
- ☐ Business (public or private)
- ☐ Sole Proprietorship
- ☐ Limited Liability Corporation
- ☐ General or Limited Partnership
- ☐ Community-Based Organization
- ☐ Regional Educational Service Center (RESC)
- ☐ Institution of Higher Education
- ☐ Other (specify): _____

Grade-Level Experience (Check all that apply):

- ☐ Elementary
- ☐ Middle/Junior High
- ☐ High

Expertise with Student Populations:

- ☐ English language learners
- ☐ Students with disabilities
- ☐ Over-aged, under-credited students
- ☐ Other (specify): _____

Financial/Legal Information:

1. Please include a copy of the organization's current certificate of commercial general liability insurance (Declaration page).

2. Please include a statement from the insurance carrier with dates of coverage on the insurance company's letterhead indicating that the entity has commercial general liability insurance coverage in the state of Connecticut.

3. Is the organization insured in Connecticut? ☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Please attach a copy of the document that formally acknowledges the entity's legal status to conduct business in Connecticut. Select one form of verification submitted by the organization:
   - ☐ Certificate of legal existence (Connecticut Secretary of the State's)
   - ☐ Certificate of Authority (out of state applicants)
   - ☐ 501C3 (non-profit organizations)

5. Please attach a copy of one of the following documents: Articles of Incorporation; Partnership Agreement; and/or Sole Proprietorship.

6. Criteria for approval: (1) positive net assets and (2) current assets exceed current liabilities.

Please include the organization's most current accrual balance sheet, such as audited financial statements or personal financial statements.

7. What total percentage of the organization's revenue would be derived from providing services for SIG? _____percent.

Part II: Partner Services

Description of Model and Approach

Please describe the partner's model and approach to school turnaround, including detailed descriptions of the services and capacity-building the organization provides to support schools in raising student performance and closing achievement gaps. Specifically, how would the organization operationalize and support work in each of the areas of talent, academics, culture and climate, and operations.

Experience in School Turnaround

Please describe and provide examples of the organization's experience serving as a turnaround operator and/or managing low-performing schools, including examples of how the organization has worked collaboratively with other partners to achieve desired outcomes in schools.

Please include:

- A list of schools and/or districts that the organization has supported and data that provide evidence of the effectiveness of the interventions; please reference student achievement data.
- Provide the name and contact information for two references in a school and/or district in which the organization has operated in a similar capacity.

Staffing Model

Please provide an overview of the organization's staffing model and a short narrative detailing the roles

of key staff involved in the proposed turnaround partnership.
Cost Information Please provide an overview of the costs associated with the model/partnership, including: • A detailed menu of services, including the intensity of services (e.g., duration and staffing) and associated costs for each service. Acceptable costs could include staffing, programs, supplies, subcontracts with vendors to provide supplemental services, operations, overhead, etc. • What is the cost structure (e.g., per pupil, per school)? Which costs are variable versus fixed?
Authority and Accountability Please describe the partner's decision-making authority, including around staffing, scheduling, programming, and budgets. Likewise, explain the accountability structure between the partner and the district. What are the partner's specific performance targets?

APPENDIX F: SCHOOL TURNAROUND RUBRIC/AUDIT TOOL

TALENT				
Indicator	**Below Standard**	**Developing**	**Proficient**	**Exemplary**
1.1. Instructional Practice	Teacher effectiveness is inconsistent and highly variable from classroom to classroom. There are significant concerns about instruction. Staffing decisions do not reflect teacher effectiveness and student needs.	Instructional quality is moderate; however, teacher effectiveness is variable from classroom to classroom. Staffing decisions do not always reflect teacher effectiveness and student needs.	Most classes are led by effective educators, and instructional quality is strong. There are some systems in place to promote and develop teacher effectiveness and make appropriate staffing decisions.	100% of classes are led by deeply passionate and highly effective educators. There are strong systems in place to promote staff efficacy and make staffing decisions driven exclusively by student needs.
1.2. Evaluation and Professional Culture	There are significant concerns about staff professionalism. Staff come to school unprepared, and there is little sense of personal responsibility. There is a culture of low expectations; individuals are not accountable for their work. Evaluations are infrequent, and few if any staff were formally evaluated 3 or more times. Instructional leaders do not provide regular feedback to staff.	There are some concerns about professionalism. Some staff come to school unprepared. Some teachers feel responsible for their work. Some teachers were formally evaluated at least 3 times, but most were not. Leaders communicate some expectations for and feedback on performance, but do not consistently follow-up to see whether or not the feedback is acted upon.	The school is a professional work environment. Most staff are prepared to start the school day on time with appropriate instructional materials ready to go. Most individuals feel responsible for their work. Most teachers were formally evaluated at least 3 times in alignment with SEED expectations. Leaders provide feedback and hold individuals accountable for effort and results.	100% of staff are prepared to start the school day on time with appropriate instructional materials ready to go. The vast majority of staff feel deep personal responsibility to do their best work. All teachers were formally evaluated at least 3 times. Leaders conduct frequent informal evaluations and provide meaningful feedback. Individuals are held accountable for their performance.
1.3. Recruitment and Retention Strategies	The school and/or district lack systems to recruit and attract top talent. Retention of high-quality staff is a significant concern. The school lacks systems and strategies to retain top teachers and leaders.	The school and/or district have components of a plan for recruitment and retention of quality educators (e.g., mentoring, induction). The plan is not fully developed or consistently implemented.	The school and/or district have systems for strategic recruitment and retention. Efforts are made to match the most effective educators to the students with the greatest needs. Retention of high-quality teachers is high.	The school and/or district effectively implement a long-term plan for recruitment and retention. Efforts are made to match the most effective educators to the students with the greatest needs. Deliberate, successful efforts are made to retain top talent.
1.4. Professional Development	Professional Development (PD) opportunities are infrequent and/or of inconsistent quality and relevance. PD does not align to staff's development areas and/or students' needs. As a result, teachers struggle to implement PD strategies. There is no clear process to support or hold teachers accountable for the implementation of PD strategies.	PD opportunities are provided; however, they are not always tightly aligned with student and adult learning needs. The quality of PD opportunities is inconsistent. Sometimes, teachers report that PD improves their instructional practices. Teachers are not generally held accountable for implementing skills learned through PD.	The school offers targeted, job-embedded PD throughout the school year. PD is generally connected to student needs and staff growth areas identified through observations. Most teachers feel PD opportunities help them improve their classroom practices. Most teachers are able to translate and incorporate PD strategies into their daily instruction.	The school consistently offers rich and meaningful PD opportunities that are aligned to student needs and staff growth areas identified through observations. Teachers effectively translate PD strategies into their daily instruction. The school has a process for monitoring and supporting the implementation of PD strategies.
1.5. Leadership Effectiveness	Leadership fails to convey a school mission or strategic direction. The school team is stuck in a fire-fighting or reactive mode, lacks school goals,	The mission and strategic direction are not well communicated. A school improvement plan does not consistently guide daily activities and	Leadership focuses on school mission and strategic direction with staff, students, and families. The school is implementing a solid improvement	Leadership focuses on school mission and strategic direction with staff, students, and families. The school has a manageable set of goals and a clear

TALENT				
Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
	and/or suffers from initiative fatigue. The school community questions whether the school can/will improve.	decision-making. The community generally understands the need for change, however actions are more often governed by the status quo.	plan and has a clear set of measurable goals. The plan may lack coherence and a strategy for sustainability. Leadership conveys urgency.	set of strategies to achieve those goals. The plan is being implemented and monitored with fidelity. Leadership conveys deep urgency.
1.6. Instructional Leadership	Few staff can articulate a common understanding of what excellent instruction looks like. School norms and expectations are not clear. Instructional leaders do not demonstrate a commitment to developing consistent and high-quality instructional practice school-wide.	Some staff can articulate a common understanding of what effective instruction looks like. School norms and expectations are enforced with limited consistency. Instructional leaders demonstrate some commitment to improving instructional practice school-wide.	Most staff articulates a common understanding of what effective instruction looks like. School norms and expectations are consistently enforced. Instructional leaders consistently demonstrate a commitment to improving instructional practice school-wide.	All staff articulates a common understanding of what effective instruction looks like. Educators relentlessly pursue excellent pedagogy. Instructional leaders have communicated and enforced high expectations school-wide.

ACADEMICS				
Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
2.1. Academic Rigor*[1]	Most observed lessons are teacher-led and whole group. Teachers rarely engage students in higher-order thinking. Most students demonstrate a surface-level understanding of concepts. Observed lessons are indicative of low expectations and little sense of urgency.	Some observed lessons are somewhat student-centered, challenging and engaging. Teachers engage students in some higher-order thinking. Many students demonstrate only a surface-level understanding of concepts. Teachers demonstrate moderate expectations and some urgency.	Observed lessons are appropriately accessible and challenging for most students. Teachers engage students in higher-order thinking, and students are pushed toward content mastery. Lessons begin to engage students as self-directed learners. Teachers communicate solid expectations.	All observed lessons are appropriately accessible and challenging. Teachers push students, promoting academic risk-taking. Students are developing the capacity to engage in complex content and pose higher-level questions to the teacher and peers. Teachers promote high expectations.
2.2. Student Engagement*	Few students are actively engaged and excited about their work. The majority of students are engaged in off-task behaviors and some are disruptive to their classmates. Observed lessons primarily appeal to one learning style. Few students are truly involved in the lessons.	Some students exhibit moderate engagement, but many are engaged in off-task behaviors. Some observed lessons appeal to multiple learning styles. Students are involved in the lessons, but participation is more passive than active. Students are easily distracted from assigned tasks.	Most students are engaged and exhibit on-task behaviors. The observed lessons appeal to multiple learning styles. Students are involved in the lesson, but participation is, at times, more passive than active. A handful of students are easily distracted from the task at hand.	All students are visibly engaged, ready to learn, and on task. Students are clearly focused on learning in all classrooms. The lessons appeal to and seem to support all learning styles. Students are actively engaged in the lessons and excited to participate in classroom dialogue and instruction.
2.3. Differentiation and Checking for Understanding*	Most teachers take a one-size-fits-all approach and struggle to differentiate their instruction to meet individual learning needs. There is no evidence around the use of data to inform instruction and minimal efforts to check for student understanding.	Some teachers are differentiating at least part of the observed lessons; however, the practice is not consistent or widespread. There is some evidence of the use of student data to adapt the learning process. Some teachers use strategies to monitor	Most teachers employ strategies to tier or differentiate instruction at various points in the lesson. Most teachers use data or checks for understanding to differentiate the learning process on the fly. Teachers take time to support students	Teachers consistently and seamlessly differentiate instruction. Teachers use data and formal/informal strategies to gauge understanding, and differentiate the learning process accordingly. Tight feedback loop between monitoring efforts and

[1] Ratings for the four sub-indicators marked with an asterisk (*) should be based largely on classroom observations.

ACADEMICS				
Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
		understanding.	struggling to engage with the content.	instruction.
2.4. Curriculum and Instruction Aligned to Common Core State Standards	The school lacks a rigorous, standards-based curriculum that is aligned to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and/or the curriculum is not being implemented with fidelity. As a result, pacing is inconsistent. The percentage of students at or above goal on state assessments is > 10 points below the state average.	The school has curricula for some grades and content areas, some of which are rigorous, standards-based. Curricula are implemented with some fidelity. Teachers struggle with consistent pacing. The percentage of students at or above goal on state assessments is 6-10 points below the state average.	Rigorous, standards-based curricula exist for almost all grade levels and content areas, and are being implemented consistently across classrooms. Teachers demonstrate consistent pacing. The percentage of students at or above goal on state assessments is within 5 percentage points of the state average.	Rigorous, standards-based curricula exist for all grade levels and content areas. Curricula are aligned with the CCSS and are being implemented with a high degree of fidelity throughout the school. The percentage of students at or above goal on state assessments meets or exceeds the state average.
2.5. Support for Special Populations	The school is inadequately meeting the needs of its high-needs students. IEP goals are not regularly met. Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) is not fully considered when making placements. The school lacks appropriate interventions and supports for ELLs. There are significant achievement gaps between subgroups and non-identified students as measured by state assessments, and no evidence of progress.	The school typically meets the needs of its high-needs students. Most special education students meet their IEP goals, but LRE is not always considered when making placement determinations. The school typically meets the needs of its ELLs, and attempts to track progress and set content and language mastery goals. There are significant gaps between subgroups and non-identified students as measured by state assessments and marginal progress over time.	The school consistently meets the needs of its high-needs students. Special education students regularly meet their IEP goals and LRE is a critical factor in placement determinations. The school meets the needs, tracks progress, and sets content and language mastery goals for all ELLs. There are small gaps between subgroups and non-identified students as measured by state assessments, and some signs of progress toward closing the gaps.	The school is successfully closing the achievement gap for its high-needs students. General and special education teachers work collaboratively to support students. The school tracks the effectiveness of language acquisition instructional strategies and adjusts programming accordingly. There is no achievement gap between subgroups and non-identified students as measured by state assessments.
2.6. Assessment Systems and Data Culture	The school lacks a comprehensive assessment system (including summative and benchmark assessments). Teachers rarely collect, analyze, and/or discuss data. The school lacks or fails to implement SRBI protocols linking data to interventions.	The school has some consistent assessments; however, there are major gaps in certain grades and content areas. There are some efforts to collect and use data. SRBI systems and processes are somewhat present.	The school implements a clear system of benchmark assessments. Some teachers are developing familiarity with regularly using formative assessments to differentiate instruction. The school has emerging processes in place to use the data to inform interventions.	Teachers consistently administer assessments throughout the year. Assessments are standards-based and provide real-time data. Teachers embed formative assessments in their daily lessons. The school has strong processes to collect, analyze, and use data to inform interventions.

CULTURE AND CLIMATE				
Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
3.1. School Environment	The school fails to create a welcoming and stimulating learning environment. Communal spaces and classrooms may be unkempt, rundown, unsafe, or sterile. Many classrooms are neither warm nor inviting and lack intellectual	The school struggles to provide a welcoming environment conducive to high-quality teaching and learning. Large sections of the school are not clean, bright, welcoming, or reflective of student work. Though the school	The school generally provides a welcoming learning environment. Most of the facility is in good repair and conducive to teaching and learning. Most classrooms and common spaces are bright and clean,	The school provides a welcoming and stimulating learning environment. Common spaces and classrooms are bright, clean, welcoming, and conducive to high-quality teaching and learning. Data and student work are

CULTURE AND CLIMATE				
Indicator	**Below Standard**	**Developing**	**Proficient**	**Exemplary**
	stimulation. Little to no student work or data is displayed to help convey a sense of pride and high expectations.	has some data and student work displayed, efforts to brand the school and convey high expectations are very minimal. Sections of the school need significant attention.	displaying data and student work; however, some sections lack visual stimulation. The school has made an effort to foster school identity through branding and consistent messaging in classrooms and communal spaces.	visible and present throughout the school, inspiring students and teachers to do their best work. There is clear branding and consistent messaging throughout the school, promoting school identity and pride.
3.2. Student Attendance	The school has few, if any, strategies to increase attendance. Average daily attendance is ≤ 88% and/or chronic absenteeism is > 20%.	The school has some strategies to increase attendance. Average daily attendance is between 89% and 93% and/or chronic absenteeism is between 16% and 20%.	The school has multiple, effective strategies to increase attendance. Average daily attendance is between 94% and 97% and/or chronic absenteeism is between 11% and 15%.	The school implements effective strategies to increase attendance and on-time arrival. Average daily attendance is > 97% and chronic absenteeism is ≤ 10%.
3.3. Student Behavior	A school-wide behavior management plan may exist, but there is little evidence of implementation. Student misbehavior is a significant challenge and creates regular distractions. Disciplinary approaches appear to be inconsistent; students and staff do not have a common understanding of behavioral expectations. Discipline is mostly punitive. The rate of suspensions/expulsions as a proportion of student enrollment is greater than 20% (total # yearly incidents/total enrollment).	A school-wide behavior management plan is in place, and there are some signs of implementation. Student misbehavior is a challenge and creates frequent disruptions. There may be confusion among students and staff regarding behavioral expectations. Discipline is primarily punitive, and there is inconsistent reinforcement of desired behaviors. The rate of suspensions/expulsions as a proportion of student enrollment is between 15% and 20%.	A school-wide behavior management plan is in place and effectively implemented most of the time. Student behavior is under control. Misbehavior is infrequent, with periodic distractions to instruction. Most students behave in a calm and respectful manner. Students and staff have a common understanding of the behavior policy. There is positive reinforcement of desired behaviors. The suspension/expulsion rate is between 10% and 14%.	A school-wide behavior management plan is consistently and effectively implemented. All students behave in a calm, orderly, and respectful manner throughout the school day. Classroom distractions are minimal, and immediately and appropriately addressed. Rewards and consequences are clear and appropriate, and are consistently applied across the school. The suspension/expulsion rate is < 10%.
3.4. Interpersonal Interactions	There is a weak sense of community. The quality and types of student, adult, and student/adult interactions raise concerns. There are signs of divisiveness or hostility among students and with staff. There are minimal signs of connections between students and staff; interactions are largely transactional or triggered when students are off task.	There is a moderate sense of community. Students are somewhat respectful toward one another and adults. There is some teasing and divisiveness; however, it does not define school culture. Communication between students and staff is somewhat positive. There are some connections between students and staff.	There is a good overall sense of community. Students are generally respectful toward one another and adults. Interactions are mostly positive. There is minimal teasing and divisiveness. Communication between students and staff is generally positive and respectful. There are signs of connections between students and staff. Most staff seem invested in their students.	There is a strong sense of community. Students are respectful and courteous of one another and adults. Student interactions are overwhelmingly positive and polite. The school has an inclusive and welcoming environment. Student/adult interactions are positive and respectful, demonstrating strong relationships. Staff seems invested in the well-being and development of students.
3.5. Family and Community Engagement	The school offers infrequent opportunities to involve parents in the school community. Family involvement is minimal. Teachers rarely reach out to families regarding	The school offers several family events throughout the year. Roughly half of families participate in school activities. More than half of all teachers reach out to families regarding their child's	The school offers periodic, meaningful opportunities for parents/families to engage in student's education. Most families participate in school activities. Most educators communicate	The school frequently engages parents/family as partners in student's education. Almost all families participate in school activities. Nearly all educators communicate with

CULTURE AND CLIMATE				
Indicator	**Below Standard**	**Developing**	**Proficient**	**Exemplary**
	their child's academic progress.	academic progress.	regularly with families.	families on a regular basis.
3.6. Community Partners and Wraparound Strategy	The school offers inadequate supports to address students' nonacademic needs. There are limited wraparound services. The school makes little or no effort to engage community partners to expand services offered through the school.	The school offers some support to address students' nonacademic needs through wraparound services. Community and partner engagement is spotty and event-specific.	The school offers a range of wraparound services to address students' nonacademic needs. The school has several sustained community partnerships.	The school has a clear process for evaluating students' needs and connecting students to appropriate wraparound services. The school has sustained community partnerships to help address student needs.

OPERATIONS				
Indicator	**Below Standard**	**Developing**	**Proficient**	**Exemplary**
4.1. Adequate Instructional Time	There is not enough time in the school schedule to appropriately meet students' academic needs. There is a significant amount of wasted time in the school calendar and daily schedule. The schedule includes ≤ 5 hours of instruction per day, and ≤ 60 minutes of ELA time.[2]	Students would benefit from increased instructional and/or intervention time. The school calendar and daily schedule could be improved to increase time on task. The schedule includes > 5 and ≤ 5.5 hours of instruction per day, and > 60 and ≤ 90 minutes of ELA time.	The school has taken steps to increase instructional time on task through extended learning opportunities. The school calendar and daily schedule are well constructed. The schedule includes > 5.5 and ≤ 6 hours of instruction per day, and > 90 and ≤ 120 minutes of ELA time.	The school has multiple extended learning opportunities available to students. The school implements a thoughtful and strategic school calendar and daily schedule. The schedule includes > 6 hours of instruction per day, and > 120 minutes of ELA time.
4.2. Use of Instructional Time*	Staff and students use time ineffectively. Misused instructional time results from misbehavior, poor scheduling, and inefficient transitions. There are missed opportunities to maximize time on task. Observed teachers struggle with pacing and fail to use class time in a constructive manner.	Staff and student use of time is somewhat effective. Some students are off task and there are missed opportunities to maximize instructional time. Lesson schedules are moderately well planned, paced, and executed. Teachers could be more skilled and/or methodical in the use of class time.	Most staff and students use time well. A handful of students require redirection; however, the majority of students transition quickly to academic work when prompted by the teacher. There is minimal downtime. Lessons are well planned, paced, and executed. Teachers are adept at managing and using class time.	Staff and students maximize their use of time. There is no downtime. Transitions are smooth and efficient. Students transition promptly to academic work with minimal cues and reminders from teachers. Teachers meticulously use every moment of class time to prioritize instructional time on task.
4.3. Use of Staff Time	Educators lack adequate and/or recurring professional development and/or common planning time. Common planning time is currently disorganized and the time is not used effectively. As a result, staff members are unable to develop and/or share practices on a regular basis.	Most academic teams have common planning periods (less than 1 hour/week); however, the school has failed to secure vertical and horizontal planning. Collaborative planning time is used at a basic level (e.g., organization of resources or topics not directly related to classroom	All academic teams have common planning periods (1-2 hours/week) and they are seldom interrupted by non-instructional tasks. Staff members use this time to discuss instructional strategies, discuss student work, develop curricular resources, and use data to adjust instruction.	All educators have weekly common planning time for vertical and horizontal planning (more than 2 hours/week). Common planning periods are tightly protected and only interrupted by emergencies. The school has established tight protocols to ensure that common planning time

[2] The total amount of ELA instructional time per day at the secondary level can include reading- and/or writing-intensive coursework.

Note: The rubrics draw from the CSDE's School Quality Review and Network Walkthrough Tool, and Mass Insight Education's School Readiness Assessment.

OPERATIONS				
Indicator	**Below Standard**	**Developing**	**Proficient**	**Exemplary**
		instruction).		is used effectively.
4.4. Routines and Transitions	The school is chaotic and disorderly. The safety of students and staff is a concern. The school lacks critical systems and routines. Movement of students is chaotic and noisy with little adult intervention. Adults are not present during transitions; therefore, there is very little re-direction.	The school is somewhat chaotic and/or disorderly, particularly in certain locations and during certain times of day. Some staff make an effort to maintain procedures and routines; however, staff presence is minimal and redirection of misbehavior is lacking.	The school environment is calm and orderly in most locations and during most of the day. Rules and procedures are fairly clear, consistent, and evident. Routines seem somewhat apparent and institutionalized. Adults are present to reinforce norms.	The school environment is calm and orderly. Rules and procedures are clear, specific, consistent, and evident. Routines are largely unspoken and institutionalized. Adults are consistently present to reinforce norms.
4.5. Financial Management	The school and/or district do not make sound budgetary decisions based on student need and projected impact. Budget decisions are largely governed by past practice and do not account for sustainability. There is little to no evidence around school and/or district leaders successfully advocating for school resource needs.	Budget decisions are sometimes focused on factors unrelated to student needs and school goals. A number of expenditures and initiatives lack a plan for sustainability beyond the current school year. School and/or district leaders do not effectively advocate for school needs or pursue additional resources.	The school and/or district have emerging strategic budgeting practices. The school and/or district have begun to repurpose funds to align expenditures more closely with school goals and student needs. Sustainability may pose a concern. School/district leaders effectively advocate for school needs and pursue additional resources.	The school and district engage in strategic budgeting. The school and district invest in high-yield, research-based initiatives aligned to student needs and school goals. There is a clear sustainability plan for all major expenditures. School/district leaders effectively advocate for school needs, and build strategic relationships to pursue needed resources.

SIG 1003(g) BUDGET PROPOSAL WORKBOOK

School: Martin Luther King Jr. District: Hartford

SIG 1003(g) 3-5 Year Budget Proposal							
ED 114 Cost Categories		Planning Year (Optional)	Year 1 Implementation	Year 2 Implementation	Year 3 Implementation	Year 4 (Optional)	Year 5 (Optional)
100	Personnel Services - Salaries	$ -	$ 204,000.00	$ 204,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -
200	Personnel Services - Employee Benefits	$ -	$ 18,000.00	$ 18,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -
300	Purchased Professional and Technical Services	$ -	$ 83,631.00	$ 7,290.00	$ 7,500.00	$ -	$ -
400	Purchased Property Services	$ -	$ 82,020.00	$ 8,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -
500	Other Purchased Services	$ -	$ 23,000.00	$ -	$ 8,000.00	$ -	$ -
600	Supplies	$ -	$ 58,000.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
700	Property	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
800	Other Objects	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
	Total SIG 1003(g) Proposal:	**$ -**	**$ 468,651.00**	**$ 237,290.00**	**$ 15,500.00**	**$ -**	**$ -**

Part II: FY 16 Low-Performing Schools Bond Request (Optional)	
Total Bond Request:	**$ -**

Planning Year Budget Proposal (Optional)

School Year (if applicable):

Cost:	Description:	1003(g) Proposal:	Other Funding Source(s):	Other Sources:
100: Personnel Services - Salaries				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	100: Personnel Services - Salaries Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
200: Personnel Services - Benefits				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	200: Personnel Services - Benefits Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
300: Purchased Professional and Technical Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	300: Purchased Professional and Technical Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
400: Purchased Property Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	400: Purchased Property Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
500: Other Purchased Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	500: Other Purchased Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
600: Supplies				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	600: Supplies Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
700: Property				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	700: Property Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
800: Other Objects				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	800: Other Objects Subtotal:	$ -		$ -

YR 4 Implementation Budget Proposal (Optional)

School Year:

Cost:	Description:	1003(g) Proposal:	Other Funding Source(s):	Other Sources:
100: Personnel Services - Salaries				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	100: Personnel Services - Salaries Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
200: Personnel Services - Benefits				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	200: Personnel Services - Benefits Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
300: Purchased Professional and Technical Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	300: Purchased Professional and Technical Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
400: Purchased Property Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	400: Purchased Property Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
500: Other Purchased Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	500: Other Purchased Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
600: Supplies				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	600: Supplies Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
700: Property				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	700: Property Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
800: Other Objects				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	800: Other Objects Subtotal:	$ -		$ -

YR 5 Implementation Budget Proposal (Optional)

School Year:

Cost:	Description:	1003(g) Proposal:	Other Funding Source(s):	Other Sources:
100: Personnel Services - Salaries				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	100: Personnel Services - Salaries Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
200: Personnel Services - Benefits				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	200: Personnel Services - Benefits Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
300: Purchased Professional and Technical Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	300: Purchased Professional and Technical Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
400: Purchased Property Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	400: Purchased Property Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
500: Other Purchased Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	500: Other Purchased Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
600: Supplies				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	600: Supplies Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
700: Property				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	700: Property Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
800: Other Objects				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	800: Other Objects Subtotal:	$ -		$ -

FY 16 Bond Request (Optional)

Item #	Description	Amount
1		$0.00
2		$0.00
3		$0.00
4		$0.00
5		$0.00
6		$0.00
7		$0.00
8		$0.00
9		$0.00
10		$0.00
11		$0.00
12		$0.00
13		$0.00
14		$0.00
15		$0.00
	Total:	**$0.00**

YR 5 Implementation Budget Proposal (Optional)

School Year:

Cost:	Description:	1003(g) Proposal:	Other Funding Source(s):	Other Sources:
100: Personnel Services - Salaries				
$32 per hour	Staff Professional Development	$ 30,000.00		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	100: Personnel Services - Salaries Subtotal:	**$ 30,000.00**		**$ -**
200: Personnel Services - Benefits				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	200: Personnel Services - Benefits Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
300: Purchased Professional and Technical Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	300: Purchased Professional and Technical Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
400: Purchased Property Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	400: Purchased Property Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
500: Other Purchased Services				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	500: Other Purchased Services Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
600: Supplies				
	Intervention Consumables/Contracts	$ 20,000.00		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	600: Supplies Subtotal:	$ 20,000.00		$ -
700: Property				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	700: Property Subtotal:	$ -		$ -
800: Other Objects				
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
		$ -		$ -
	800: Other Objects Subtotal:	$ -		$ -

FY 16 Bond Request (Optional)

Item #	Description	Amount
1	Technology	$60,000.00
2		$0.00
3		$0.00
4		$0.00
5		$0.00
6		$0.00
7		$0.00
8		$0.00
9		$0.00
10		$0.00
11		$0.00
12		$0.00
13		$0.00
14		$0.00
15		$0.00
	Total:	**$60,000.00**