



Level 3 Schools: Turnaround Plan Template ***(for Schools Not Eligible for Level 3 Turnaround Grants)***

Turnaround Plan Cover Sheet.....	2
Section I: Executive Summary.....	3
Section II: Turnaround Practices for School and District.....	4
Section III: Stakeholder Input.....	8

Turnaround Plan Cover Sheet

**Chicopee Public Schools
Chicopee High School
Level 3 School Turnaround Plan Template**

Superintendent's Signature: _____

Date of Completion: _____

SECTION I: Executive Summary

Theory of Action

For the 2017-2018 school year, Chicopee High School (CHS) is working to establish a culture of data driven decision making on all levels, promote reflective practices, improve instruction, communicate expectations of student behavior and response systems, and provide consistent and specific feedback to educators.

CHS's Turnaround Plan is designed to urgently and systematically accelerate academic and non-academic achievement.

CHS is a 9-12 high school situated on the south-west side of Chicopee in Hampden County Massachusetts. The present facility opened in the fall of 2005, and the student population has dropped from a high of 1,258 students to a current enrollment of 947. The current population subgroups are as follows:

- 47.4% economically disadvantaged
- 56.4% high needs
- 20.1% students with disabilities
- 3.9% English language learners
- 16.8% first language not English

CHS is a diverse community of learners as evidenced by the current demographic breakdown below:

- 4.6% African American
- 2% Asian
- 37.4% Hispanic
- 54.5% White
- 1.5% Other

CHS has been a level three school since 2010, with its ranking among that subgroup falling to the fifth percentile in 2016. CHS was afforded the opportunity to participate in the TSV process in the 2016-17 school year, culminating with a site visit from SchoolWorks on the first and second of May, 2017. The TSV included classroom observations, staff and faculty interviews and focus groups and a concluding prioritization meeting with the CHS Turnaround Team. Furthermore, the principal held additional prioritization meetings with selected administrative stakeholders and Principal Advisory Council (PAC). The TSV Turnaround Planning Team met in June and July 2017 to prepare this plan.

CHS has been actively participating in planning for the 2017-2018 Turnaround process since January of 2017 by forming an active Turnaround Team at the school. This team included a number of teachers, the principal and one assistant principal; this consistent team of administrators and teachers participated in the DSAC Turnaround Network during the spring of 2017, learning about the research on Turnaround Practices and

doing initial work to plan for analysis of their TSV report. The CHS principal, James Blain, began on January 30, 2017, and two new assistant principals, Ms. Andrea Williams and Mr. David Lemke, were hired in June 2017 to replace two retiring administrators. Mr. Blain was an assistant principal for four years and was instrumental in turning around a chronically underperforming school. He then became the Chicopee district athletic director and worked in this capacity for eight years before taking on the principal role at CHS. Carol Kruser brings five years of administration experience at the school and has lead the Turnaround Team process since January 2017. Ms. Andrea Williams has extensive experience in instructional leadership, including experience in a Level 4 and 5 district. Mr. Lemke was promoted from the math supervisor position. Mr. Lemke was part of the planning from the beginning, attended all Turnaround Network meetings, and understands the full scope of the Turnaround Plan.

The Administrative Team has been restructured to place an emphasis on clear expectations for improved instructional practices as well as professional development that fully supports all aspects of the turnaround plan. The Instructional Leadership Team has also been reconfigured to give members the opportunity to train fellow staff members on the key components of the turnaround plan. An increase in the number of teacher-led walkthroughs and opportunities for peer observations will help monitor CHS's implementation in four intentional focus areas: (1) effective questioning, (2) higher order thinking, (3) inclusive practice, and (4) formative assessment.

The emphasis of this turnaround is the belief that the plan will lead to improved instruction, student learning, and performance. The data from the TSV, DESE audit in December 2016, observations by the principal, assistant principals, and supervisors, and several learning walks led by our ILT all align to the turnarounds team's decision to focus on turnaround practices two and three. The goal of the plan is to create school-wide reform when it comes to articulated intentional practices for student instruction as well as for providing student-specific supports and instruction to all students. Additionally, all special needs inclusion students, and college preparatory classes in math, English, and science will be co-taught beginning in the 2017-18 school year.

This plan places less emphasis on Turnaround Practices one and four, because the Schoolworks visit listed those as emerging areas of strength. Administration as well as the ILT will continue to progress monitor, reflect, and improve practices that support one and four. In the future, our focus on turnaround practice four will include improving cultural proficiency through research and consultation with the district, DSAC, and DESE. However, as a result of Schoolworks' findings, the intentional focus will be on Turnaround Practices two and three.

SECTION II: Turnaround Practices for the School and District

Turnaround Practice #1:

Leadership, shared responsibility and professional collaboration

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

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

For the 2017-2018 school year, CHS will establish a culture of data driven decision making on all levels, promote reflective practices, improve instruction, communicate expectations of student behavior and response systems, and provide consistent and specific feedback to educators.

CHS's turnaround plan seeks to urgently and systematically accelerate academic and non-academic achievement.

The school has established several leadership and collaboration teams to promote shared responsibilities and teacher collaboration.

The new principal has increased visibility and accessibility within the school. He has increased communication between administration and staff which has improved the school climate. Teachers are now taking a more active role in school-wide initiatives. Administrative roles are being redefined and responsibilities of each administrator will be shared in order to provide clarity and transparency for all staff.

The school's ILT (Instructional Leadership Team), consisting of teachers and led by an assistant principal, will meet bi-monthly. They will lead the job embedded PD for the entire staff. The data team members will increase their focus and analysis on MCAS results and better use data to meet the needs of all students. The assistant principal overseeing the data team will meet with 9th and 10th grade teams on a regular basis to analyze weekly student grades on assessments and use specific and targeted documents to keep team members focused while identifying strengths and areas of concern. The PAC is made up of teachers who provide a voice for the staff to communicate in an open forum with the principal. This volunteer group of teachers meets once a month after school. The principal begins the meeting with an agenda to inform the teachers about school related issues. Each meeting provides time for teachers to bring concerns, suggestions, and teacher feedback to the principal. The All Hazards team includes administrators, guidance counselors, custodians, a school nurse, and the school's SRO (School Resource Officer) to plan crisis interventions and work to ensure the safety of everyone in the building. The attendance team, consisting of the principal, assistant principals, guidance counselors, and attendance clerk, meets once a month. This group analyzes data to recognize attendance trends that identify at risk students. These results inform decisions about possible interventions that increase student school attendance.

Grade 9 teams continue to meet in interdisciplinary common planning team time as well as in content areas. Teams will continually focus on improving instruction, assessing students' needs and aligning curriculum. In addition, the co-teaching model for instruction will begin in the fall focusing on grades 9 and 10 teams for the college preparatory, special education, and ELL students.

PD for the fall will be planned and facilitated by CHS staff, including members of the ILT and DSAC. This professional collaboration will include effective questioning strategies, higher order thinking skills, growth mindset, co-teaching practices, and effective routines/procedures. The TSV and school administrators reviewed findings from Schoolworks to make these informed decisions to prioritize the topics of this PD. The plan is to provide continued support for all staff throughout the year as needed through coaching and observations of effective teaching practices.

The ILT and the administration team will have clearly defined roles for coaching, modeling, and supporting teachers to develop and improve instructional strategies. These roles will include: classroom observations with feedback for the teachers from colleagues, administrators, and/or DSAC. Peer observations will also take place. The school will continue to support the co-teachers through job embedded PD, visits from Dr. Lisa Dieker, and resources to promote success.

Process Dates

1. By August 28, 2017, administrative roles will have been redefined and responsibilities of each administrator will have been shared to all.
2. By August 28, 2017, specific and targeted documents will be created for use during team common planning time.
3. By August 24, 2017 all members of the 2017-2018 ILT will have met, reviewed the findings of the TSV, and finalized plans for PD throughout the year.
4. By August 28, 2017, all grade 9 and 10 team teachers and co-teachers will be scheduled to have common planning time for teams and content areas.
5. By August 30, 2017, the initial PD in effective questioning strategies, growth mindset, co-teaching practices, and effective routines/procedures will have been delivered,
6. By November 1, 2017 every teacher in the co-teaching classrooms will have been observed and provided informal feedback and support on the execution of a co-taught lesson.
7. By December 1, 2017, all teachers will have visited a classroom to see a lesson in a peer observation.



Benchmarking Progress:
Leadership, shared responsibility and professional collaboration

	What will be different in classrooms if this plan is successful?
Interim Benchmarks for Teachers/Practitioners	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Administration will monitor consistency and effectiveness of instructional strategies with specific quarterly feedback.2. Beginning in September, teachers will efficiently utilize common planning time as evidenced by a variety of completed school-wide tracking documents for curriculum planning, student support for turnaround practice goals.
Interim Benchmarks for Students	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. By October 1, All students will be observed following the universal behavioral expectations.2. By November (end of term one), students will be exposed to and actively participate in on going effective questioning.3. Please refer to turnaround practice 2 student benchmark 2.

Turnaround Practice #2: Intentional practices for improving instruction

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

For the 2017-2018 school year, CHS will establish a culture of data driven decision making on all levels, promote reflective practices, improve instruction, communicate expectations of student behavior and response systems, and provide consistent and specific feedback to educators.

CHS's turnaround plan is designed to urgently and systematically accelerate academic and non-academic achievement.

FOCUS AREA:

CHS for the 2017-2018 school year will align instructional strategies and routines to improve academic performance through the use of ongoing data analysis and reflective practice.

1. Data Driven (improve instruction, drive decision making)
 - Utilizing regular, formative assessment and data analysis (ILT, Department, Teams)
 - Creating common assessments
2. Reflective Practice
 - Foster a reflective collegial environment
 - Incorporating the Growth Mindset philosophy into classroom policies, practices, and process-based praise (Dweck)
3. Improve Instructional Practice/Rigor
 - Utilizing engaging instructional strategies and activities to improve student learning (Jensen)
 - Providing model classrooms and clearly defined routines
 - Implementing a co-teaching model (Dieker)
 - Promoting Questioning Practices to increase rigor (DSAC/Ribas/Effective Questioning)
4. High Quality Feedback/Effective Evaluation
 - Restructuring Assistant Principal and Supervisor responsibilities with a focus on constructive teacher-specific feedback.
5. Communicate expectations of student behavior and response systems
 - Implementing a restorative justice model
 - Calibrating expectations for student behavior in the classroom

In order to execute effectively a purposeful plan to align instructional strategies, routines, reflective practice, and data analysis, teachers and administrators will be placed in ILT lead groups to provide professional development and regular opportunities to collaborate. These groups will learn instructional strategies and inclusive practices to improve instruction in their classrooms.

Data Analysis/Rationale:

The rationale for the focus area described above is rooted in the following data sets: the SchoolWorks Monitoring Site Visit feedback, MCAS Data, ILT Learning Walk Evidence, Massachusetts District Wide Audit, and administrator/teacher feedback. The data below demonstrates the imperative need for improving instruction at CHS. As shown in the SchoolWorks Site Visit feedback, instruction at CHS is inconsistent, not aligned with data, and reflective practice has not been cultivated as shown in the above turnaround practices. Leadership has not: articulated engaging instructional practices, defined a walk through protocol, embedded ongoing coaching on a regular basis. The frequency and type of feedback from administration is variable and does not always provide specific paths for improvement. The use of common assessments by grade and content vary, but staff did not indicate that this data is analyzed. Teachers provide limited feedback to all students and are not provided with protocols to work with data to analyze student needs. Classroom observations revealed student engagement was uneven and low in rigor and that teachers do not systematically check that all students understand.

Findings:

Finding #1: School leadership has not yet articulated clear, school-wide expectations for effective instructional practices.

School leaders reported that the school is focusing on increasing student engagement; teachers indicated that they are clear on this focus. However, the focus on engagement is at this point more of a general strategy and not articulated in relation to instructional practices that will lead to greater engagement. Classroom observations conducted during the site visit revealed that student engagement is uneven and that instructional rigor is more commonly low. Supervisors reported that the ILT has identified 10-to-12 behaviors that indicate student engagement and hope that administrators and supervisors are using this list to guide classroom observations. However, there is no walkthrough protocol to guide the use of consistent “look-fors” or to articulate to teachers what strategies they should be using to increase engagement. Formal professional development and ongoing job-embedded coaching on instructional practices to increase student engagement have not yet been put

into place. Professional development days were front-loaded at the beginning of the year and centered on the book, *Engaging Students with Poverty in Mind*. Administrators reported that staff and department meetings during the school year are often focused on more housekeeping tasks. The new principal is interested in shifting these meetings to focus more on instruction.

Finding #2: The responsibility for providing instructional feedback is shared among administrators and department supervisors, but the frequency and quality of feedback varies.

CHS has identified department supervisors who provide instructional, evaluative feedback to teachers in their department, and fulfill a department chair-type of role. Supervisors teach three periods a day, enabling them to model instruction they expect to see in the classroom. Supervisors indicated that in addition to observing teachers in their own departments, they conduct some observations of teachers in other departments to gain and provide an additional perspective. Building from a peer observation pilot started last year, teachers and supervisors reported that teachers are being encouraged to observe other teachers.

The supervisor structure allows for all teachers to be evaluated by someone in their content area and to receive significantly more feedback than the minimum two formal observations a year. The frequency and type of feedback is variable. Supervisors reported that observations are typically followed by a conversation with the teacher. Some observations are documented in TeachPoint as part of a formal observation, whereas others are followed with more informal verbal feedback. Some supervisors reported that they observe teachers in their department twice a month or more, but the frequency of feedback varies by department and by teacher (with newer teachers being observed more often). Supervisors indicated that the format for how feedback is provided is not consistent across the school. Some teachers noted that while the feedback they receive is generally accurate, it does not always include specific suggestions for improvement. Other teachers indicated that the supervisor's feedback is useful.

Finding #3: The school is not currently using data to drive instructional improvement.

While assessments are used by some teachers to drive instruction, currently, there are no protocols or structures to consistently guide teachers in working with data to analyze student needs and identify changes in instruction. Departments have common midterms and finals across classes offering the same course, but the extent to which student performance on these assessments is analyzed to inform instruction and identify trends in student needs is unclear. Additionally, the extent to which teachers in the same grade and content area work

on and administer common assessments varies by department. For instance, English language arts (ELA) teachers administer Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS)-type open response benchmark assessments periodically for grades 9 and 10 students and grade-level teams review them. However, teachers in other departments indicated that looking at student work is not a common practice. Even when common questions or assessments are used, consistent protocols do not guide the use of assessment data to evaluate student needs and inform instructional approaches. Classroom observations conducted during the site visit revealed that teachers tend to check for understanding with one student at a time, rather than systematically for all students. In some cases, no checks for understanding were observed. Finally, teachers provided limited feedback to students related to lesson content, with feedback often provided to only those students who ask questions.

Finding #4: The school uses data to drive some course placements and to identify students who need additional MCAS support; however, it does not have a comprehensive system to identify and support all students.

CHS is collecting and analyzing data from multiple sources to determine whether students are on track to score proficient on State MCAS exams by the second half of their sophomore year. As part of the work of a newly formed data team, the principal reported that staff pulled together a datasheet on current grade 9 students that includes MCAS/PARCC (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers) assessment scores from grades 7 and 8 and their performance on a grade 9 mock MCAS assessment. The test performance data are being reviewed to inform class placements for grade 10 and to identify students in need of additional support for MCAS. Beyond analyzing MCAS results, the school does not have a comprehensive assessment system to assess student needs. There are no interim or benchmark assessment tools used to identify student needs across the grade levels, and there are no school-wide structures for every content and grade-level team to routinely review student progress. Teachers administer some district-determined assessments (DDMs) twice a year, but staff did not indicate that these data are analyzed to evaluate student progress and identify students in need of more support. The grade 9 team works the most with data. The team routinely monitors students' attendance and classroom performance and uses this information to reach out to students and families when students are identified as struggling. Grade 9 ELA teachers also administer the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) three times a year to assess students' overall reading Lexile level.

Recommendations:

1. Foster a reflective collegial environment
2. Incorporating the Growth Mindset into classroom policies, practices, and process-based praise (Dweck)
3. Providing model classrooms and clearly defined routines
4. Utilizing engaging instructional strategies and activities to improve student learning (Jensen)
5. Implementing a co-teaching model (Dieker)
6. Promoting Questioning Practices/Higher Order Thinking (Ribas/Effective Questioning)
7. Regular formative assessment and data analysis (ILT, Department, Teams)
8. Restructuring AP and Supervisor responsibilities with a focus on consistent, constructive teacher-specific feedback.
9. Creating common assessments
10. Defining the expectations of open response protocol and Math Across the Curriculum
11. Implementing a restorative justice model
12. Calibrating expectations for student behavior in the classroom

Professional Development:

- Co-teaching training provided June 23/26/27/28
- ILT will be trained on methods to cultivate reflective collegial practices; in turn, the ILT will facilitate small-group coaching sessions that are embedded throughout the entire year. This will create a fractal leadership model within the school where the expectations for the classroom are modelled in faculty and leadership meetings.
- Growth Mindset discussion based PD will be facilitated throughout August and September utilizing a variety of engaging instructional strategies selected by the TSV and ILT
- Questioning Practice/Higher Order Thinking: professional development presented by DSAC
- Administration will share model classrooms, routines, and expectations at the beginning and duration of the year.

Strategies:

- Reflective practices cultivated in professional development, meetings, and expectations. Implementation to begin with the Growth Mindset Coaching Session.
- Regular facilitated co-teaching meetings

- ILT/Data Team facilitated discussions with groups of teachers to examine student work, formative assessment data, engaging instructional strategies and lesson studies.
- Meetings with ongoing professional development centered on staff needs will occur quarterly to debrief and/or problem solve.
- Common planning time provided for the creation of common assessments by department and grade.
- First term, leadership will present expectations of the Open Response Protocol and Math Across the Curriculum at a faculty meeting; a debrief faculty meeting will occur in the 4th term to share data findings.
- Leadership will present expectations for student behavior in the classroom. A flowchart delineating who teachers need to contact and during what periods to ensure students' needs are met. A debrief faculty meeting in the second term to problem solve issues that develop.
- Leadership will define model classroom expectations and clearly define routines. Including the use but not limited to: student use of binders/hanging folders as an organizational aid, note-taking/annotation strategies, makeup workstations, digital ELA portfolio; and the locations of: agenda, objectives, homework, essential questions.
- Leadership will layout a coordinated calendar amongst themselves to distribute evaluation and observation equitably throughout the school.
- Restorative Justice model to be determined after professional development training and approval from central office.

Process Dates

1.Co-Teaching

- By June 28, 2017, staff working in the co-teaching model will have been trained in the co-teaching and inclusive practices training.
- By September 1, 2017, all teachers will be exposed to the co-teaching model to improve instructional practices.
- By December 1, 2017, all co-teaching staff will have at least one observation with quality feedback.
- Regular facilitated co-teaching meetings with ongoing professional development centered on staff needs will occur quarterly to debrief and/or problem solve throughout the year.

2. ILT Coaching

- By October 30, 2017, the ILT will participate in professional development to discuss issues related to small group coaching sessions to improve classroom instruction.
- By September 2017, the ILT will begin to facilitate small-group coaching sessions that are embedded throughout the entire year.

- By February 2018, teachers will implement two new strategies that they learned with the ILT small group coaching into their classroom.
- By June 1, 2018, all stakeholders understand a fractal leadership model within the school where the expectations for the classroom are modeled in faculty and leadership meetings. SV and ILT in response to analysis of CHS data

3. Growth Mindset discussion based PD will be facilitated throughout August and September, utilizing a variety of engaging instructional strategies chosen by the T

- By August 29, 2017, the ILT will have facilitated Growth Mindset PD
- By November 7, 2017, afternoon PD will include a session on Growth Mindset.
- By December 2017, the ILT Coaching Team will have developed a list of classroom “look-fors” and then by June of 2018 will track implementation progress

4. Questioning Practice/Higher Order Thinking: professional development presented by DSAC on 08/30

- By October 1, 2017, the ILT will finalize a learning walk rubric that focuses on higher order thinking questions.
- By January 1, 2018 ILT and/or Administration with the assistance of DSAC will conduct learning walks together to gather information on higher order thinking in the classroom.
- By February 1, 2018, the ILT learning walk results will be analyzed to determine the effectiveness and offer support where needed.
- By May 1, 2018, educators will utilize protocols to reflect on data findings that inform instruction. In the spring, the teams will conduct a follow up learning walk to gather information to analyze the effectiveness and the progress of higher order thinking/questioning.
- By June 1, 2018, the Data Team will analyze the ILT’s second learning walk results to evaluate effectiveness and offer support where needed.
- By April 2018, all faculty will participate in a lesson study and by June will meet again to evaluate the results.
- By February 2018, 100% of faculty will be incorporating effective higher order thinking tasks in lesson plans.
- By January 2018, teachers will receive formal and informal feedback regarding higher order thinking

5. Administration will provide:

- By August 28, 2018, universal expectations for model classroom will be communicated by administration.

- By August 28, 2018 universal routines will be communicated. Including the use of but not limited to: student use of binders/hanging folders as an organizational aid, note-taking/annotation strategies, makeup workstations, digital ELA portfolio; and the locations of: agenda, objectives, homework, essential questions.
- By August 28, 2018, expectations for student behavior in the classroom. A flowchart delineating who teachers need to contact to ensure students' needs are met.
- By June 1, 2018, the results of a needs assessment to determine the state of common assessments by department and grade.

Benchmarking Progress:
Intentional practices for improving instruction

	What will be different in classrooms if this plan is successful?
Interim Benchmarks for Teachers/Practitioners	1. By June, 2018, through the use of ongoing data analysis and reflective practice, Chicopee High School will have aligned instructional strategies and routines to improve academic performance as measured by feedback on classroom observations.
Interim Benchmarks for Students	1. In the fall, we will conduct a student perception survey regarding growth mindset to collect baseline data. This survey will be replicated in the 2018 -2019 school year to track internalization of the philosophy.

	<p>2. By May 1, 2018, the learning walk rubric will show that 50 percent of students/classes show an effective level of higher order thinking skills (for example by creating, analyzing, and/or synthesizing information provided).</p>
--	--

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

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

Turnaround Practice #3: Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to all Students

For the 2017-2018 school year, CHS will establish a culture of data driven decision making on all levels, promote reflective practices, improve instruction, communicate expectations of student behavior and response systems, and provide consistent and specific feedback to educators.

CHS's turnaround plan is designed to urgently and systematically accelerate academic and non-academic achievement.

Focus Area:

Beginning in the 2017—2018 school year, CHS will develop a comprehensive system to improve student outcomes and utilize data in order to identify student-specific academic and non-academic needs and then provide targeted interventions and supports to students and monitor those supports for effectiveness by:

1. Data Driven (improve instruction, drive decision making)
 - Defining what Data is at CHS
 - Creating a school-wide culture of data analysis that embraces the cycle of inquiry with a distinct focus on discerning which interventions and practices improve student outcomes
 - Developing common classroom and benchmark assessments
 - Implementing school-wide formative assessment strategies
 - Embedding into the co-teaching practices consistent use of data to drive small and whole-group instruction
2. Reflective Practice
3. Improve Instructional Practice/Rigor
4. High Quality Feedback/Effective Evaluation
5. Communicate expectations of student behavior and response systems
 - Mapping systems for non-academic student support

Data Analysis/Rationale:

The school is not using data to drive instructional improvement (see finding #3). Because there is not a school wide culture of data use, decisions about student services and instructional improvement have not historically been based on data. According to the District Accountability Review, “use of data to improve practice and inform decision-making is limited at the high schools. The high schools have insufficient data sources to monitor student progress or plan for improvement. Teachers at this level do not have sufficient focused support in understanding and using data to improve classroom teaching/learning” (see Chicopee Public Schools Comprehensive District Review Report).

Therefore, a shift toward using data on several levels is a main focus of CHS’s turnaround plan: using data to drive instructional improvement and using data to identify and support all students (including interventions and supports for students who are struggling academically).

Increased data use and analysis will include:

- Using a variety of valid assessments that measure academic performance and growth
- A set of expected protocols, practices, and systems to support frequent assessments and the use of assessment data to inform instructional improvements
- A deliberate system of review for student assessments
- Targeted interventions
- Monitoring of interventions

Findings:

The school provides student-specific supports and interventions informed by data and the identification of student-specific needs.

Finding #4: The school uses data to drive some course placements and to identify students who need additional MCAS support; however, it does not have a comprehensive system to identify and support all students.

CHS is collecting and analyzing data from multiple sources to determine whether students are on track to score proficient on State MCAS exams by the second half of their sophomore year. As part of the work of a newly formed data team, the principal reported that staff pulled together a datasheet on current grade 9 students that includes MCAS/PARCC (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers) assessment scores from grades 7 and 8 and their performance on a grade 9 mock MCAS assessment. The test performance data are being reviewed to inform class placements for grade 10 and to identify students in need of additional support for MCAS. Beyond analyzing MCAS results, the school does not have a comprehensive assessment system to assess student needs. There are no interim or

benchmark assessment tools used to identify student needs across the grade levels, and there are no school-wide structures for every content and grade-level team to routinely review student progress. Teachers administer some district-determined assessments (DDMs) twice a year, but staff did not indicate that these data are analyzed to evaluate student progress and identify students in need of more support. The grade 9 team works the most with data. The team routinely monitors students' attendance and classroom performance, and uses this information to reach out to students and families when students are identified as struggling. Grade 9 ELA teachers also administer the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) three times a year to assess students' overall reading Lexile level.

Key Evidence

- Prior MCAS data from grades 7 and 8, along with mock MCAS data from grade 9, are being collected and reviewed by staff to identify students in need of more academic support to prepare for the MCAS in grade 10. This information is also being used to guide course placement for rising 10th grade students. The school now plans to use grade 8 math MCAS data to inform grade 9 math course placements.
- Beyond the review of MCAS-related data for grade 9 and 10 students, the school does not have a comprehensive assessment system to assess student needs. There are no interim or benchmark assessment tools used to assess student needs across the grade levels, and there are no structures school-wide for every content team or grade level team to routinely review student progress.

Finding #5: The school provides limited interventions and supports for students who struggle academically.

Current support for students who struggle academically is provided through MCAS preparatory support, peer tutoring, and after-school help. Teachers reported that relatively few students participate in after-school support, despite the availability of a late bus to take students home. The school offered vacation week and Saturday "boot camps" this year for students for MCAS preparation. Further, there is little formalized support for students during the school day outside of a learning block for younger students. Approximately 70 grade 9 students and a smaller group of grade 10 students participate in a directed study learning block, which is primarily a study skills class. Participating students are identified based on prior year's grades, prior MCAS performance, and attendance. Additionally, the school does not offer remedial classes for developing math or writing skills that students might take in addition to a regular grade-level course in the same subject. Students who fail a course can go to summer school to retake the course. The school is starting to use Ingenuity to provide an online option for credit recovery during the summer, and some students are starting to use it during the school year. Students who fail a required course and do not go to summer

school can go on to the next grade-level course in that subject. However, students must repeat failed required courses prior to graduation.

Key Evidence:

- There is little formalized support for struggling students during the school day. A study-skills-oriented learning block class is offered to approximately 70 grade 9 students and a small group of grade 10 students who are identified as needing additional support based on course grades, attendance, and MCAS performance in prior grades.
- Peer tutoring is provided by the National Honor Society and teachers have office hours after school to provide additional help and support. Teachers report that relatively few students take advantage of these opportunities for help.
- Students who fail a course can pay to attend summer school (\$200 per course) or may be able to work toward credit recovery online through the Ingenuity program, which the school is starting to use as an option during the school year and in the summer.

Professional Development:

- Consistently providing embedded data analysis in professional development and time for educators to self reflect and participate in the cycle of inquiry
- Providing teachers with training and time to build, administer and utilize the results from common classroom and benchmark assessments

Strategies: Providing Targeted Interventions and Supports to Students and Monitoring for Effectiveness

- Create a flowchart of nonacademic student supports/contacts so that all members of the school community know who to contact and what services are available for specific non-academic needs and situations
- Utilize this flowchart to identify gaps in service
- Please see turnaround practice #4

Strategies: Using Data to Identify Student-Specific Academic and Non-Academic Needs

- Establish a robust data team
- Build data analysis training and time into Common Planning Time
- Build a data component into each initiative and intervention
- Use middle school Discovery assessment data to schedule ninth grade students

- Utilize NWEA (MAP) data to drive instruction and student grouping (3x each year in reading and math, grades 9 and 10 and upperclassmen who have not yet met proficiency)
- Utilize attendance, discipline, and prior academic achievement to evaluate the needs of the students.
- Utilize ACCESS data (“Can Do Descriptors”) for English Learners across all classrooms and all grades in order to target instruction and interventions to meet their individual strengths and weaknesses
- Implement Edgenuity’s MyPATH intervention with fidelity (9 & 10)
- Use DIBELS benchmark data to inform instruction and identify students for placement in the Read Naturally intervention
- Utilize Khan Academy as digital intervention/station in Science classrooms

Process Dates

1. By July 30, 2017, all grade 9 students will be scheduled heterogeneously (balance of achievement levels in each section) into classes based on 8th grade Discovery assessment and DIBELS data.
2. By September 15, 2017, establish a new school-wide data team.
3. By September 15, 2017, train all ELA and math teachers to administer NWEA/MAP testing.
4. By September 30, January 15, and June 15, NWEA assessments will be completed.
5. By October 10, 2017, the language acquisition team will distribute ACCESS data/ “Can Do Descriptors” to all teachers who have English Language Learners in their classrooms.
6. By November 1, 2017, all faculty will be using data in meetings and to drive instruction in the classroom.
7. By October 15, 2017, train all ELA and math teachers to implement the MyPATH intervention.
8. By October 31, 2017, all ELA, math and science teachers will have implemented respective digital interventions in their classrooms (MyPATH and Khan Academy).
9. By November 1, 2017, ELA and Special Education teachers will be trained in DIBELS and Read Naturally.
10. By November 1, 2017, all targeted grade 9 and 10 students will be using the MyPATH intervention.
11. By December 1, 2017, all targeted students will be receiving Read Naturally services.
12. By January 2018, the Data Team will develop a data reflection protocol.

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

	What will be different in classrooms if this plan is successful?
Interim Benchmarks for Teachers/Practitioners	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By February, 2018, teachers will use the data reflection protocol to improve a lesson plan as part of ongoing embedded professional development. 2. By October 1, 2017 a flowchart of nonacademic student supports/contacts so that all members of the school community know who to contact and what services are available for specific non-academic needs and situations. 3. By February 2018, all teachers and staff will incorporate a data component into meetings evidenced by agendas and minutes.
Interim Benchmarks for Students	Students report their instructional interventions allow them to enhance their education as evidenced by a survey at their entrance date and exit date.

Turnaround Practice #4: **School Culture and Climate**

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

Turnaround Practice #4 - School Climate and Culture

For the 2017-2018 school year, CHS will establish a culture of data driven decision making on all levels, promote reflective practices, improve instruction, communicate expectations of student behavior and response systems, and provide consistent and specific feedback to educators.

CHS's turnaround plan is designed to urgently and systematically accelerate academic and non-academic achievement.

1. Data Driven (improve instruction, drive decision making)
 - a. Behavioral data will be analyzed to determine the effectiveness of restorative justice techniques.
2. Reflective Practice
 - a. Professional Development on *Growth Mindset* and *Teaching with Poverty in Mind*.
 - b. Positive behavior practices to replace punitive behavioral practices.
3. Improve Instructional Practice/Rigor
 - a. Increased presence of administration in the classrooms will support teachers behaviorally which in turn will help improve Instruction.
4. High Quality Feedback/Effective Evaluation
 - a. Restructure faculty meetings for more open communication between faculty and administration.
 - b. Increased emails from the principal to increase transparency.
 - c. ILT will establish a peer observation schedule to facilitate effective feedback.
5. Communicate expectations of student behavior and responsive systems.
 - a. Administration will articulate clear universal behavioral expectations.
 - b. Restorative practice protocols will be researched and implemented.
 - c. High school level PBIS-like strategies will be implemented.

Finding 7 - Most students behave according to teachers' expectations; the school is exploring positive and culturally responsive approaches to managing student behavior.

This summer, (2017), four key members of the staff went to a restorative justice professional development conference and will present this information to the entire staff. We plan to implement restorative justice components to our behavioral management

system. Our internal suspension room will be run by a trained restorative justice staff member that will work to decrease negative student behavior and maximize student engagement in the classroom.

Positive reinforcement practices have been initiated within our freshmen team structures. These practices will continue and will be expanded to other grades. The administration team and the ILT will be researching PBIS strategies to enhance the ongoing positive reinforcement techniques.

The administration will articulate clear behavioral expectations and will support teachers in the implementation of these expectations. An increased presence and interaction in the hallways and in the classrooms by administration as well as continued outreach to parents will also assist in managing student behavior.

Finding 8 - School staff have recognized that the school's student population has changed, and are working to increase their cultural proficiency and the school's social emotional supports in response to that change.

Professional development has been given to the entire staff based on the books, Teaching with Poverty in Mind and Engaging with Poverty in Mind by Eric Jensen throughout the 2016-2017 year. We will continue to incorporate these practices into our classrooms and overall school climate. All teachers were also given Carol Dweck's, Growth Mindset in order to prepare for the 2017-2018 professional development. The instructional leadership team will facilitate multiple professional development sessions throughout the year addressing the growth mindset concepts and how to implement this philosophy to improve and enhance the overall climate of CHS.

The school continues to provide various social-emotional programs and approaches. A full time psychologist will provide resources and counseling services to students. A culturally proficiency professional development will be offered during the year to complement previous offerings. To increase parent involvement a faculty member is designing and promoting community outreach to expand our PTO and hold monthly meetings.

Finding 9- School leaders are developing a, respectful, and trusting professional climate.

There is an increase in communication from administration and faculty through daily and weekly emails. The new assistant principals will be asked to increase the positive, trusting environment by interacting and supporting teachers on a daily basis. There is a restructuring of faculty meetings to include teacher led professional development and to

encourage more open communication among teachers and administration. There is an increase in transparency among administrators and faculty through emails, PAC meetings, faculty meetings and The I.L.T. facilitates a coaching system, that helps to create trusting and collegial environments, utilizing norms, agendas, and protocols.

Process Dates

1. By October 2017, All teachers are enforcing the universal behavioral expectations as evidenced during classroom observations.
2. By December 2017, at least 25% of teachers will receive informal feedback through the ILT coaching system.
3. . By January 2018, 80% of students will report an increase in positive student teacher interactions.
4. By January 2018, 80% of students will report that teachers are culturally sensitive to the diverse population.
5. By January 2018, 80% of students will report that increased administration interaction, in the classroom, results in a increased student engagement.
6. By January 2018, classroom disruptions will decrease as evidenced by a decrease in behavioral referrals.
8. By June 2018, at least four PTO meetings will have occurred

Benchmarking Progress:
School Culture and Climate

	What will be different in classrooms if this plan is successful?
Interim Benchmarks for Teachers/Practitioners	By October 2017, all teachers will be enforcing the universal behavioral expectations as evidenced during classroom observations.
Interim Benchmarks for Students	By June 2018, student disruptions will decrease as evidenced by data analysis in quarterly reports shared with the faculty and staff.

SECTION III: Stakeholder Input and Recommendations

Administrators were conscientious about having full transparency during the turnaround planning process. Feedback and other data gathered from stakeholders was considered throughout the planning process. Teachers from several departments participated in the DSAC Turnaround Network, offering perspective from their areas of expertise. Students were given a student perception survey at the beginning of the 2016 school year, and a similar one will be given again at the end of the 2018 school year. Administration has an open door policy for students and staff who have concerns and suggestions for the school. We have a Student Advisory Council that advocates for school changes. They meet with the assistant principal once a month and they meet with the school committee four times a year. They were also given the results of the turnaround site visit and asked to share their perspectives. Parents have also been invited into the school for their continued feedback. Parents attended two ILT meetings to give their thoughts on the school and the changes that they believe are needed to reach our goals. We also held an information night for incoming freshmen and their parents. At this event, our administrative intern collected information and data from the parents. This will be used to develop a strong diverse PTO for the upcoming year that will also be used to collect data on our progress. Students and parents are also given support by our guidance counselors and assistant principals when they leave Chicopee High School. Exit interviews are used to assess when and why students are leaving the school and what their future plans entail. Faculty are also continually asked for suggestions and feedback. Specially, the results of the turnaround site visit were shared at a faculty meeting and then data was collected on the faculty's understanding and support of the findings. We had additional meetings with our Principal Advisory Council team and our administration team to debrief these vital stakeholders on the TSV results. These results were also shared extensively with the school committee. Previously, they had been informed about the entire process and agenda for the future. They will also be given a copy of this report for their feedback. Moving forward we plan to be transparent to all stakeholders and we will give a one page synopsis of this report to all interested parties.