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Introduction

Teachers traditionally work in isolation—without developing professional relationships with other teachers and parents and with minimal meaningful interaction with school leaders. In Springfield, intentional collaboration between the teachers’ union and school administration has led to the conclusion that this isolation contributes significantly to the multiple achievement gaps in this district. The Springfield Collaboration for Change (SCC) seeks to change the means and types of relationships that teachers, administrators, parents, and the school community create in order to develop and implement more holistic strategies that serve the students in Springfield.

Theory of Action

If teachers have the opportunity to work collaboratively with other teachers, administrators, parents and community members, then new ideas and approaches to closing the achievement gaps can be generated, tested, and shared throughout the Springfield community. Specific opportunities to work collaboratively include the District Leadership Team, Parent-teacher home visit project and the augmented Instructional Leadership Teams, which include teacher elected members and administrative and teaching coaches.

During year 2, collaboration efforts focused on three levels of intervention: first, at the district level with continuation of the District Leadership Team (DLT); second, to the instruction and communities through two school level initiatives, the Parent-Teacher Home Visit Project (PTHVP) and the Instructional Leadership Teams (ILTs); and third, through the use of Interest Based Bargaining (IBB) in the contract negotiation process. The evaluation sought to describe and analyze the efforts in these areas.

Scope of Evaluation Work

As evaluators, CEP collected data to address the following questions:

1. Where does collaboration occur and what does it look like? Who is involved, what resources are being contributed, and how does the collaboration manifest itself?

2. What strategies and initiatives emerge from this collaboration? What strategies and initiatives does the collaborating team choose for the school, how are the strategies chosen, and how do they align with other Springfield initiatives?

3. How are the chosen strategies and initiatives being implemented in the schools? Are teachers implementing the strategies and initiatives? What do we see at the classroom and school levels?

4. In what ways are parents and community organizations participating? What are parent, community organization, and staff roles in this collaboration, which parents and organizations are participating, and how extensive is this participation?
To answer these questions, CEP documented and assessed the following:

- The ILT processes (labor-management relationships at the school level),
- The implementation of the parent home visit project in the schools (parent relationships with the schools),
- Operation of the DLT (management, labor, and community)
- Student learning and Closing of Achievement Gap (within Springfield Schools and in comparison with the Commonwealth)
- Alignment of Initiative efforts with others in the Springfield school system.

Data collection methods include interviews, focus groups, site visits, and online surveys with school teams, coaches, and community partners, as well as baseline datasets provided to Center for Educational Policy (CEP) by Springfield Education Association (SEA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Data Collected or Tool Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September-October</td>
<td>• Met with various stakeholders to create evaluation plan</td>
<td>• Logic Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>• Revised logic models and theories of action</td>
<td>• Evaluation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Presented plan and revised materials to DLT</td>
<td>• Collected information about proposed observation tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attended, observed, and participated in the Closing the Achievement Gaps</td>
<td>• Developed understanding of PTHVP protocols and goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiative Convensing in Columbus, OH</td>
<td>• Collected information about principals and ILTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Observed PTHVP Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attended and Observed Coaches Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Began Coaches and Principal Interviews: Tom O’Brien; Mary Chamberlain and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frances Cameron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2011-</td>
<td>• Principal Interviews: Mary Worthy, Rhonda Stowell-Lewis, Lisa Bakowski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2012</td>
<td>• ILT Observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coaches Interviews: Dennis and Cathy; Marge and Fran;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Met with Sam Stephens about alignment with T/R/S! evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attended DeBerry Parent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| February-March 2012 | • Finalized collaboration rubric  
• Attended SCC resource team and DLT meetings  
• Assisted with planning for Site Visit  
• Attended Rennie Center event about Springfield Research  
• Attended Site Visit  
• Quarterly Report Submitted at Site Visit  
• Observed IBB meetings  
• IBB Formative Report Submitted | • Observations  
• Meeting notes from “what is collaboration” meeting                                                                                   |
| April-May 2012   | • Developed surveys and interview protocols for ILTs and PTHVP participants  
• Gathered Data Sets: MCAS, attendance  
• Observed IBB meetings  
• Quarterly Report Submitted  
• Adapted NEAF questionnaire for teacher survey  
• IBB Formative Report Submitted | • ILT web based survey  
• PTHVP protocols  
• Observations                                                                                                                         |
| June-July 2012   | • Conducted group interviews at DeBerry and Dorman  
• Observed final ILT meetings  
• Gathered ILT meeting notes  
• Interviews: Tom O’Brien, Dan Warwick, Rhonda Stowell-Lewis, Peter Reese  
• ILT survey conducted  
• PTHVP Log Data Set from District  
• Final Report Submitted | • Interviews  
• ILT Meeting Notes  
• Survey Results  
• Teacher Survey  
• PTHVP Dataset  
• KEYS Dataset                                                                                                                             |
The evaluation’s intended uses were:

- **Formative** to provide feedback directly to the SCC leadership and to maintain focus and fidelity to grant activities; and
- **Summative** to assist in end of year documenting achievements for SCC leadership and other participants and to inform the final report to the NEAF.

A November, 2011 phone communication with NEAF confirmed the Foundation’s approval of our aim to produce analyses and reports deemed most useful for the local management and labor leadership. The scope of work did not include collection and analyses of data on student and teacher indicators (e.g., student and teacher attendance, expulsion rates) as the district owns and has access to these data.

**Background**

CEP has been providing evaluation services to SPS since 2005, including a case study of the use of KEYS. During fall 2009, CEP assisted SPS in writing the proposal for the SCC grant, which was awarded in winter of 2010. According to The NEA Foundation Closing the Achievement Gaps Initiative Local Project Design Guidelines, 2011-12, this initiative is an effort to accelerate the achievement rate for under-achieving low income and minority students. This research-based strategy argues that “developing and strengthening partnerships among local unions, school districts and community organizations creates a powerful force for improving student performance and a vehicle for systemic reform by:

- primarily helping educators improve their practice so students can increase their academic achievement and develop 21st century skills;
- increasing the ability of school districts, local unions, and communities to work together to boost achievement for all students; and
- giving educators tools to reclaim their voice in shaping public education, helping them to, among other strategies, expand the scope of bargaining agreements to include a greater focus on teaching and learning.”

The NEA Foundation firmly believes that “systemic change resulting in higher achievement for underachieving student populations can be achieved through strong collaboration between the local association and the school district.” The guidelines encourage utilization of Foundation resources to support data-driven levers for increasing teaching effectiveness and student learning in target schools and alignment of goals and activities with district strategic or other improvement plan. The guidelines recognize the importance of the NEAF investment “within the greater framework of the district’s improvement efforts”.

Grounded in these guidelines, the original SCC proposal to the NEA Foundation, January 2010 stated:

“The vision of the Springfield Collaboration for Change is to engage the many adults who share responsibility for SPS students – parents, teachers, principals, school system administrators, leaders of community based organizations – in the deliberate co-
construction of a new way of working together. We envision a time when all Springfield public schools will make highly effective use of student and other significant data and apply high quality teaching practices that are responsive to the needs of students. We are committed to making this vision reality: that Springfield educators, families, community leaders and students alike regularly meet these common goals—high academic achievement for all; shared responsibility for results; and pride in our high standards, work quality, and documented, sustained achievements.”

Given this clear vision and purpose for the Initiative, we (the CEP evaluators) understood the SCC as a jointly sponsored effort to integrate the multiple activities in the district aimed at increasing student learning. Over time, we have come to realize that the funder’s changes in personnel have led to shifting priorities for implementation. For example, the original grant proposal had a significant component focused on community engagement and partnerships. This past year, it was communicated to the SCC and us that the focus should instead be concentrated on changes in teaching and learning. Another idea from the original grant that appears to have fallen by the wayside is empowering teams at the district and school levels to examine the multitude of interventions occurring within the system—sometimes, at cross purposes. We recognize that while it is impossible for one relatively small initiative to accomplish all things, we still feel they bear some importance in the question of the achievement gaps in Springfield.

This report presents data analyses regarding: Student Achievement; District Leadership; IBB; ILT/Coaches; and the PTHVP. We also situate findings in an organizational context in line with our aim to provide useful feedback for project and district improvement. In this introduction, we discuss some challenges we have experienced in conducting the evaluation that are related to Initiative implementation and success.

Challenges Encountered

We see the two key functions of evaluation – accountability and learning – as complementary (Feinstein, 2012, Rallis & Rossman, 2000). Evaluation feedback encourages stakeholders to reflect systematically on what worked and what did not work – and to draw lessons for improvement. However, “as evaluated interventions operate within a complex context, with several factors in play, it is essential to avoid taking a naive approach to attribution, that is, one that fails to recognize the existence of other contextual factors besides the intervention itself” (Feinstein, 2012, p, 111). We know from previous conversations with Springfield administrators that there are a variety of contextual factors at play in the classrooms of SPS. While the SCC initiatives have been underway, changes in curriculum, formative testing systems, and policies have occurred—in a system known for its relatively high mobility rates for students and with higher rates of English Language Learners than other Massachusetts Districts.

Therefore, we have placed low emphasis on outcome measures that are influenced by multiple factors in the district and schools; our evaluation efforts have been aimed to describe activities and events that
are expected to contribute to student outcomes. Our efforts have been challenged to place greater emphasis on accountability than on learning and on attribution than on contribution.

**Attribution vs. Contribution in SCC Schools**

Before attributing testing gains or losses to the activities of the SCC initiative, we first must address if the activities are occurring with fidelity to program planning and goals. First, we must ask, “Did it happen to begin with?”

We have data which support the success of the ILTs in meeting initial benchmarks in the SCC schools. However, the PTHVP is in its beginning stages, and a couple areas of concern arise in our analysis. Interest Based Bargaining, in the SCC’s second attempt, once again failed to rise to success. Of the three areas of focus, fidelity to the program is occurring in one with some consistency. In the cases where the program goals did occur as intended, we still witness many other contextual factors that may contribute as much to the learning outcomes in SPS as the SCC program (if not more), including policy conflicts, alternative programs, budget conflicts, or multiple interventions.

Moreover, the term accountability implies an acceptance of responsibility for both results and improvement; true professionals see themselves as being accountable, not being held accountable. “To be accountable means to be obligated to understand and explain one’s actions. Accountability relies on feedback; it links performance with results. Thus accountability in schools is not only about results but also about every aspect of teachers’ actions. . . . Put simply, practitioners who are accountable evaluate their own practice and then use the information to improve. Accountability is the foundation of successful practice because it entails knowing what we do and learning from that knowledge” (Rallis & MacMullen, 2000, p. 769). To be accountable requires ownership of the practice.

Unfortunately, most accountability approaches pay scant attention either to the internal capacities required to carry them out or to the will of practitioners to accept the responsibility. Indeed, the lack of will to own and of capacity to learn has been a major challenge to the implementation of the SCC initiative in the Springfield Public Schools. As evaluators we understood the Initiative as a joint union-management effort; however, our data provide evidence that the Initiative is viewed as union-driven. As a result, this lack of will and joint ownership of the project negatively affected both implementation and evaluation. District leadership tended to see the SCC as one of many external projects, and we were seen as being biased, that is, the “union’s evaluators”, not as external evaluators who would offer a balanced perspective on activities. Thus, our access to data and activities was hindered, challenging our ability to conduct a complete and trustworthy evaluation.

Despite these challenges, we collected rich and varied sets of data that inform the following sections that report our findings. The evaluation report begins with analysis of Student Achievement measures.
Section I

Student Achievement in SCC Schools

This section discusses some of the achievement gaps as outlined by MCAS results over the past five years, including three years before the SCC initiatives began in earnest in the schools. While the MCAS results are descriptive of the challenges facing Springfield Public School Students and are representative of a variety of achievement gaps, we would caution against attributing either positive or negative testing data to the SCC initiatives themselves. As previously discussed, too many confounding variables are at play in SPS schools to attribute positive or negative effects to any one thing.

MCAS Results: 2007-2012

The following charts show differences in achievement data between the original four SCC schools (Dorman, DeBerry, Boland, and Sumner) and the State averages. The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education School Profiles, located at http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/, was the source for the following data. School and State results for English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics (Math) were calculated by averaging the third through fifth grade results. The Science and Technology test is only administered in fifth grade at the elementary level.

ELA: Percentage of Students testing Proficient or Above

At the state level, students in grades 3-5 have had moderate, yet consistent increases in the number of students testing as proficient or above. In SCC schools, the results have been mixed. Dorman, for example, saw significant gains in 2009-2010—the year before entering the SCC initiative. In the next year, far fewer Dorman students tested as proficient or
above. DeBerry's students historically have had very few students test as proficient or above—currently, they may be on a positive trend, but there is too little information to assert this claim. Boland's achievement levels in ELA appear to be stagnant, while Sumner has been showing an overall pattern of gain.

Math: Percentage of students testing as Proficient or Above

Again, at the state level in Math, the number of students achieving proficient or above has experienced modest, but consistent growth over the past five years. At the same time, the pattern at Dorman and Boland appears to be in a slight decline. Sumner and DeBerry appear as if they may be making some gains over past performance.

Science and Technology: Percentage of Students testing as Proficient or Above

Historically, the Science and Technology MCAS has been a challenge for the students now participating in the SCC. In 2008 and 2009, only one school scored as high as 20%
proficient or above with the SCC community—the others had far fewer students achieving at this level. Boland, as a school, has made consistently good improvement in this area of the MCAS. Dorman made great gains in 2010, but lost some ground in 2011. DeBerry has also tended to trend higher since 2009, but is still struggling to reach at level of 20% proficient or above. Sumner’s pattern, although not dramatic, appears to be moving consistently in the right direction.

Proficiency or Above Gap: Deviation from State Averages

The following chart compares the differences between the state and school averages of students scoring proficient or above. Because the percentage of students scoring as proficient and above at the State level is considerably higher than the SPS students, the numbers are negative, indicated how much below the state average the performance of each school is. A smaller negative number indicates a greater increase in performance. The larger negative number indicates a decrease in student achievement compared with state averages. Large increases in this gap indicator (5 to 10% or more) or consistent negative patterns are indicated in red. Possible negative movement is indicated in yellow. What appear to be significant gains (5-10% or more) in this area of achievement are indicated in green.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ELA (Grades 3-5)</th>
<th>Math (Grades 3-5)</th>
<th>Science (Grade 5 Only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dorman</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>-34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>-24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 (SCC)</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 (SCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeBerry</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-44%</td>
<td>-39%</td>
<td>-36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>-46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-44%</td>
<td>-39%</td>
<td>-39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 (SCC)</td>
<td>-41%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>-36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 (SCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boland</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>-31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>-33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>-32%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 (SCC)</td>
<td>-34%</td>
<td>-34%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 (SCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>-32%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-34%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-39%</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>-33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 (SCC)</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>-26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 (SCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the most part, the achievement gap as measured by this indicator has remained fairly stable. Sumner appears to be experiencing a pattern of growth in ELA and Science, while having a slightly negative pattern in Math when compared to the state. DeBerry School, although performing at a fairly consistent lower level, appears to be making gains in Math. Boland School has achieved a remarkable gain in Science and Technology, while remaining fairly stagnant in ELA and possibly backsliding in Math. Dorman, at this point, appears to be experiencing a negative pattern in all three testing areas.

*Warning Gap: Deviation from State Averages*

Another indicator of the achievement gaps is the difference in those testing in the “Warning” level on the MCAS—the lowest performance indicator of the test. If the Warning group shows growth, this is an indicator that students are falling out of the “needs improvement” or even the “proficient” indicator—the middle. State averages are around 10-15% in “Warning” at these grade levels. In this case, a positive number indicates regression from the goal. The larger the percentage difference, the more students are testing in the warning category. Smaller numbers indicate closure of the achievement gap. Again, significant negative movement (more than 5% increase or a consistent pattern of gain) is indicated in red. Positive movement of 5% decrease or a consistent pattern is indicated in green.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ELA (Grades 3-5)</th>
<th>Math (Grades 3-5)</th>
<th>Science (Grade 5 Only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dorman</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>+17%</td>
<td>+15%</td>
<td>+26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>+21%</td>
<td>+15%</td>
<td>+40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>+19%</td>
<td>+20%</td>
<td>+17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 (SCC)</td>
<td>+18%</td>
<td>+20%</td>
<td>+29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 (SCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeBerry</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>+21%</td>
<td>+17%</td>
<td>+26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>+8%</td>
<td>+15%</td>
<td>+27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>+21%</td>
<td>+26%</td>
<td>+18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 (SCC)</td>
<td>+23%</td>
<td>+18%</td>
<td>+28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 (SCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boland</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>+20%</td>
<td>+24%</td>
<td>+16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>+17%</td>
<td>+18%</td>
<td>+24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>+17%</td>
<td>+17%</td>
<td>+11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 (SCC)</td>
<td>+16%</td>
<td>+21%</td>
<td>+6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 (SCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>+20%</td>
<td>+19%</td>
<td>+7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>+15%</td>
<td>+13%</td>
<td>+19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>+12%</td>
<td>+17%</td>
<td>+12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 (SCC)</td>
<td>+14%</td>
<td>+12%</td>
<td>+15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 (SCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this metric, Sumner Ave appears to be experiencing a positive pattern of closing the achievement gaps from the Warning level of the test, with some setbacks in 2009 in Science. Boland School also appears to be closing this end of the gap in ELA and Science, while having some setbacks in Mathematics. DeBerry School appears to have experienced mostly negative growth in ELA and Science achievement, but experience some positive gains in Mathematics. Dorman appears to have some negative growth happening in Math and Science in the Warning category of Science and Math MCAS achievement.

**ELA Proficient and Above with Warning Gaps Comparison**

Because differences in the Proficient and Above categories and the Warning categories when compared to state averages both indicate an achievement gap that exceeds state norms, moderate gains in the P and A can mask losses in the warning area: if a few students gain in the P an A area but many are added in the Warning are, the gap is getting worse. it can be difficult to tell if the number of students gained or lost in the proficient and above category outpaces the effects of growth or loss in the Warning area. A significant lowering of the number of students in “Warning” can indicate some gap closure as they move into the higher level of “Needs Improvement”. Growth in both the Proficient and Above areas and the Warning area can indicate that the internal gap within a school is growing compared to the state. Because both numbers indicate some deviation from the state norms, in this number we have converted both numbers to decimals and added them together to determine an overall “Gap Effect”. In essence, the Gap Effect indicates the total deviation from State Norms. The higher the Gap Effect points, the broader the achievement gap is at a school when compared with the state. The lower the number, the smaller the gap is.

The following shows the gap effect in ELA test scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Proficient and Above* (compared to state aveages)</th>
<th>Warning (compared to state aveages)</th>
<th>Gap Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dorman</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>+17%</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>+21%</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>+19%</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 (SCC)</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>+18%</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 (SCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeBerry</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-44%</td>
<td>+21%</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>+8%</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-44%</td>
<td>+21%</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 (SCC)</td>
<td>-41%</td>
<td>+23%</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 (SCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>+20%</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Proficient and Above</td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>Gap Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boland</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>+17%</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>+17%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2011 (SCC)</strong></td>
<td>-34%</td>
<td>+16%</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2012 (SCC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>+20%</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-34%</td>
<td>+15%</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-39%</td>
<td>+12%</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2011 (SCC)</strong></td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>+14%</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2012 (SCC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*this number indicates the percentage fewer SPS students who make P&A than the state average.

Using this metric, it appears that while Sumner Avenue students averaged modest gains in ELA when compared with the state averages, Dorman and DeBerry may be experiencing a negative pattern. Boland may be on a slightly positive pattern, benefiting from a slight decrease in the number of students in Warning compared to state levels.

**Math Proficient and Above with Warning Gaps Comparison**

As above, this metric aims to quantify the overall gap between SCC schools and the state averages in Mathematics.

*Schools have been anonymized for privacy.*
In Math, DeBerry appears to be making the largest gains when compared with their past performance and the state, although this pattern is inconsistent. Dorman appears, by this metric, to be losing ground in Mathematics when compared with past performance against state averages. Boland and Sumner experienced their best years in 2009 by this measure—they both appear to have lost some ground and then remained stagnant since that time.

**Science Proficient and Above with Warning Gaps Comparison**

Again, this chart uses the Gap Effect metric to examine differences in performance within the schools over time compared with state averages. Because Springfield students have historically found this test challenging at the 5th grade level when compared with their peers statewide, it is more difficult to ascertain patterns of growth or loss on this test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Proficient and Above</th>
<th>Warning</th>
<th>Total Gap Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dorman</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-34%</td>
<td>+26%</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-43%</td>
<td>+40%</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>+17%</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 (SCC)</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>+29%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 (SCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeBerry</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>+26%</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-46%</td>
<td>+27%</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-39%</td>
<td>+18%</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 (SCC)</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>+28%</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 (SCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boland</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>+16%</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>+24%</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>+11%</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 (SCC)</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>+6%</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 (SCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>+7%</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>+19%</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>+12%</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 (SCC)</td>
<td>-26%</td>
<td>+15%</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 (SCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this chart, it is clear that Boland has made significant gains in Science and Technology over the past five years. In the other schools, the numbers range from vague stagnation to sporadic performance, making it difficult to determine any pattern. Of the four schools, Boland appears to be making consistent gains in closing the Science and Technology achievement gap with the state.
Cohort Progress: Proficient and Above vs. Warning

The next set of charts discusses the performance of the cohorts of the various schools on the MCAS. Most of school assessment graphics compare the performance of one year’s third graders to another year’s third graders to examine growth or loss in test performance. Here, we look at the performance of the cohorts over their time at each school. The cohort is designated by the year they would have been expected to enter Kindergarten. The parenthesis after indicate what years the testing occurred in, in order. Finally, years which were included in the SCC grant initiative are indicated in bold.

In addition, we have indicated the gap movement within these cohorts, comparing each year’s results with the previous. If the gap appears to widen, with few students achieving proficient or above or more students in warning, it is labeled “Expanding”. If the number of students achieving proficient grows and/or the number of students in warning is falling, it is labeled “closing”. This is a measure of the internal achievement gap within the cohorts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindergarten Cohort (MCAS Years)</th>
<th>MCAS Level</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006 (2010, 2011, 2012)</strong></td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005 (2009, 2010, 2011)</strong></td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td>Minor Closing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2004 (2008, 2009, 2010)</strong></td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td>Closing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this metric, it appears that the internal gap in student achievement in ELA within Dorman School experiences some setbacks as indicated by the Grade 4 MCAS. Performance at the proficient or above level falls dramatically in each year, while the numbers testing as warning grows. It appears that some of this is corrected by grade 5, as evidenced by the 2004 and 2005 kindergarten cohorts’ performances.
## Dorman: Cohort Progress, Math

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindergarten Cohort (MCAS Years)</th>
<th>MCAS Level</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006 (2010, 2011, 2012)</strong></td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005 (2009, 2010, 2011)</strong></td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td>Stagnant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2004 (2008, 2009, 2010)</strong></td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Mathematics, Dorman also appears to experience some gap increase at grade 4, without experiencing growth again in grade 5. In this case, the gap is created by both a fall in proficiency and a rise in warning levels.

## DeBerry: Cohort Progress, ELA Proficient or Above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindergarten Cohort (MCAS Years)</th>
<th>MCAS Level</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006 (2010, 2011, 2012)</strong></td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005 (2009, 2010, 2011)</strong></td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2004 (2008, 2009, 2010)</strong></td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DeBerry students are challenged by the ELA MCAS from the very beginning. Of all of the schools in the SCC community, they have the greatest proportion of students in Warning from the onset. In addition, they have the fewest students scoring as proficient or above.
One cohort (2004) stands out for having made gains from third to fourth grade, with significantly fewer students in Warning and a few more students meeting proficiency.

**DeBerry: Cohort Progress, Math Proficient or Above**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindergarten Cohort (MCAS Years)</th>
<th>MCAS Level</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006 (2010, 2011, 2012)</td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 (2009, 2010, 2011)</td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Minor Closure</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 (2008, 2009, 2010)</td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Minor Closure</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast to the students at Dorman who start out very strong in third grade math when compared with district peers, DeBerry students start the MCAS testing with some significant deficits. This metric shows a significant decrease in the number of students in “Warning” in the fourth grade year. However, some proficiency is also lost. This means that the average student is gravitating to what functions as the middle level of achievement in Springfield—Needs Improvement. For some, this is improvement: for others, it is loss. When this occurs, the internal gap in achievement grows.

**Boland: Cohort Progress, ELA Proficient or Above**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindergarten Cohort (MCAS Years)</th>
<th>MCAS Level</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In most years, Boland students experience some loss of achievement between grades 3 and 4, with the exception of the 2004 cohort. Between grades 4 and 5, there is a mix of expansion and closure of the achievement gap. Boland’s numbers do not move as dramatically as the two peers listed above, indicating a more consistent level of achievement.

**Boland: Cohort Progress, Math Proficient or Above**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindergarten Cohort (MCAS Years)</th>
<th>MCAS Level</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006 (2010, 2011, 2012)</strong></td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005 (2009, 2010, 2011)</strong></td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2004 (2008, 2009, 2010)</strong></td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Small Closure</td>
<td>Small Expansion</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Boland students seem to have small, but consistent losses in math achievement from year to year. Most of the loss occurs in the number of students scoring as proficient or above. Warning levels remain stagnant. This means that the “needs improvement” level is growing from the ranks of those who were once proficient or above.

**Sumner: Cohort Progress, ELA Proficient or Above**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindergarten Cohort (MCAS Years)</th>
<th>MCAS Level</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006 (2010, 2011, 2012)</strong></td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Small Closure</td>
<td>Small Closure</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005 (2009, 2010, 2011)</strong></td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2004 (2008, 2009, 2010)</strong></td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Stagnant</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>Stagnant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sumner’s ELA scores reflect that the gulf between those who are reaching proficiency and above and those in Warning is expanding. This may indicate that some instructional techniques used between grades 3 and 4 MCAS work to help moves some into a higher level of proficiency, while doing the opposite for others—moving them from “needs improvement” into the Warning category. The gains in proficiency between grades 3 and 4 for all cohorts are significant, with the gains in the proficient categories slightly outpacing the growth of Warning. Nonetheless, this is a potential warning of an internal gap.

**Sumner: Cohort Progress, Math Proficient or Above**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindergarten Cohort (MCAS Years)</th>
<th>MCAS Level</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006 (2010, 2011, 2012)</strong></td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005 (2009, 2010, 2011)</strong></td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2004 (2008, 2009, 2010)</strong></td>
<td>Proficient or Above</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Movement</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the most part, Sumner appears to be making gains in Math proficiency between grades 3 and 4, only to lose some of this gain between grades 4 and 5. The 2005 cohort is one exception—showing large movement towards an internal gap at grade 5. The 2006 cohort moved a significant number of students out of warning—it will be interesting to see what happens when the 2012 MCAS is released to see if the pattern holds, remains stagnant, or is reversed like in 2004.

*Is the % of students testing as “Warning” falling?*

The next series of charts provide a visualization of the differences between warning and proficient. The first chart in each series is the state averages for these grade levels. The images following show the SCC schools.

**State Averages, Grades 3-5: ELA**
The State averages in ELA show what the “normal” pattern for the MCAS ratings in the state are. The first characteristic is that the category of proficient or above is high on the chart, beginning at 55% in 2008 and rising to 60% by 2010. The normal pattern is for the red line (Warning) to be far below the blue line (Proficient or Above). In the following charts, if the lines are close together or the red goes above the blue, this is an indication of a great number of students falling into the gap.

**Dorman Averages, Grades 3-5: ELA**

In Dorman Schools in 2008, the number of students scoring proficient or above and warning was about equal. In the following years, the number of students in warning outpaced the number of students in proficient or above twice. 2011 shows a significant deviation from the state pattern.

**DeBerry Averages, Grades 3-5: ELA**
DeBerry School had one year in which the proficient or above category outpaced the warning category in ELA. Since 2010, the pattern of Warning significantly outpacing the proficient categories has grown considerably.

**Boland Averages, Grades 3-5: ELA**

Boland's achievement levels tend to remain more stable than Dorman or DeBerry’s in ELA. The Warning level appears to be falling over time, with Proficient or above making modest gains over time. They may be on an appropriate pattern of course correction, according to this chart.

**Sumner Averages, Grades 3-5: ELA**
2011 brings hope for the Sumner Ave. School’s achievement pattern, although there is no established pattern. In this chart, the blue line starts to pass and separate from the red line, coming slightly closer to the normal pattern by 2011. 2012 MCAS results, when they become available may show whether or not this hopeful indicator is becoming a pattern or not.

**State Averages, Grades 3-5: Math**

Statewide, the gulf between the proficient or above and warning levels for Mathematics is expanding. The number of students achieving proficient or above is approaching 60%, with a consistent pattern of gain. The number of students in warning is approaching 10%. Once again, the blue line is far above the red line in the normal achievement scenario.
Dorman began MCAS testing with the blue line over the red line—a highly desirable place to be for a school seeking to improve. However, this pattern is starting to fade, with the red line and blue line starting to meet. This has happened because the level of proficient or above has fallen with the number of students testing in Warning growing.

The DeBerry level of math achievement, although still not to the point where the blue line is above the red, appears to be going in the right direction. Significant gains in the category proficient or above have occurred between 2010 and 2011, with an equally impressive drop back to 30% in those testing as warning. This may represent gains if the pattern holds with the 2012 test results.
Boland’s math achievement appears to be fairly consistent, but may be on a slightly downward trend. Note that the gap between the red and the blue expands in 2011 after running parallel for two years.

In this representation, Sumner again appears to potentially be making gains. The blue line becomes the upper line in 2011—not the overall upward trend over time. In addition, the warning level appears to have a downward trend over time. Once again, the 2012 MCAS results will help to confirm whether or not a pattern exists.
Other School Level Indicators

Throughout this report, we, as the evaluators, have cautioned against drawing conclusions about connecting student achievement gains or losses directly to the SCC initiatives, due to a variety of confounding factors. This section explores some of those potential factors within the schools.

Student Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Student Attendance</th>
<th>Difference from State Average in Attendance</th>
<th>Student Mobility (Churn)</th>
<th>Student Stability Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dorman</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeBerry</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>-.8%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boland</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several of the factors listed above have been proposed as potential indicators of whether or not students and their schools are likely to succeed. One of those factors is attendance. Dorman student attendance matches the state average—however, from the preceding information, their achievement clearly does not. In fact, of all the schools, they appear to be experiencing the most dramatic losses. The churn rate (the overturn of students) and the stability rates are relatively stable for this district for Dorman. This again does not appear to be a significant factor at this school. Dorman school received relatively generous support from the SCC, with the highest percentage increase in per-pupil expenditure. It is likely some other factors are at play in this school which are inhibiting student achievement.

DeBerry School, on the other hand, only has a slightly lower attendance rate than state average. However, the churn rate is extremely high, an issue also raised by DeBerry teachers. In one group interview (June 2012), a teacher reported, “I’m lucky if 6 of the kids I start in my (early elementary grade) remain by the time they reach fifth”. The stability rate is low, reflecting their “transitional” neighborhood. The DeBerry neighborhood has been described by the Principal as a place where nobody owns their home. However, they are making some modest gains in the area of Math. Considering this school has a high immigrant population and behavior management classrooms, the attendance number and the math gains may represent an accomplishment.

Boland and Sumner Ave. Schools have comparable attendance, churn, and stability rates with each other. Both schools, overall, seem to have some stability in their student achievement rates with modest gains over time. They are also the two largest schools in
the SCC community, and as such, received the smallest per-pupil percentage in spending increase. Boland School benefits from an additional community resource located in the housing projects which feed into their school, called Talk/Read/Succeed! (as does Dorman), along with other long term community based education investments. Sumner Ave. has had an active parent-teacher home visit program that predated the SCC initiative. It would be impossible to tie student achievement in these schools to any factor particular to the SCC funding.

**Instructional Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Licensed in Teaching Assignment</th>
<th>Difference from State Average</th>
<th>% of Core Classes taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</th>
<th>Difference from State Average</th>
<th>Student-Teacher Ratio (State Average 14 to 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dorman</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+2.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+2.3%</td>
<td>14 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeBerry</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+2.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+2.3%</td>
<td>10 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boland</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+2.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+2.3%</td>
<td>13 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+2.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+2.3%</td>
<td>12 to 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, we will examine some characteristics of the classrooms and instruction, often viewed as potential factors in student achievement. Across all SCC schools, 100% of the teaching force is licensed in their teaching assignment—a slightly higher percentage than at the state level. As a result, 100% of the core classes in these schools are taught by highly qualified teachers, as defined by NCLB. Therefore, the core classes are taught by teachers with more than three years classroom experience. Again, this is slightly higher than the state average. The student to teacher ratio in the SCC schools is consistent with state averages, with one school—DeBerry—having a particularly low number of students to teachers. If these factors are influential in student performance, one could only surmise that performance may be lower if the same students were placed with less qualified staff.
Section II

Per Pupil Expenditure and the SCC Grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>General Budget</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Budget Per Pupil</th>
<th>SCC Grant</th>
<th>SCC Increase Per Pupil</th>
<th>% Budget Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dorman</td>
<td>$1,474,858.38</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>$4,949.19</td>
<td>$28,250.00</td>
<td>$ 94.80</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeBerry</td>
<td>$2,019,000.97</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>$7,477.78</td>
<td>$29,000.00</td>
<td>$107.41</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner</td>
<td>$3,513,631.39</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>$6,506.72</td>
<td>$25,250.00</td>
<td>$ 46.78</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boland</td>
<td>$3,961,564.27</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>$5,296.21</td>
<td>$23,500.00</td>
<td>$ 31.42</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Michael Eaton, SPS; Nancy deProsse, SCC; SPS School Data Sheets)

The General Budget

The general budgets provided by Springfield Public Schools (SPS) as a measure of per pupil expenditure represent the instructional costs designated to each school. This includes employee salaries, instructional materials, additional pay to support professional development, and supplies. The SCC grant outlay to each school supports similar budgetary items, including supplemental pay for professional development and afterschool meetings.

According to www.GreatSchools.net, the average per pupil expenditure in Springfield Public Schools is $15,026. The average per pupil expenditure in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is $13,413 (2012). Obviously, examining the general budget of each school does not tell the complete financial picture: however, it was recommended by SPS officials as the best way of getting an approximate comparison of per pupil expenditure at each school.

SCC Fund Distribution Priorities

Inclusion in the SCC grant provided the following financial benefits to the schools:

1. A $20,000 grant to be used on Professional Development and after-hours teacher compensation.
2. A teacher and principal coach, at the rate of $50/hour.
3. Parent Teacher Home Visit Program Participation—not included in the above amount, but sent separately to the district (deProsse, personal communication).

As shown in the table above, two schools (Dorman and DeBerry) received significantly more coaching than their peers. The coaches for these two schools perceived that a higher need for change existed in the relationship between principals and staff than at other buildings. Therefore, two coaches (Mary Chamberlain at Dorman and Dennis Vogel at DeBerry) logged over 100 hours each, working with the principals and teaching force.
Financial Impact of SCC Monies

The increase in spending at the SCC schools provided by the grant is modest, ranging from 1.9% at the highest to .6% at the lowest. One school, which received substantially more coaching than the other while having comparatively low operating costs, Dorman, saw a nearly 2% increase in revenue from the SCC grant. In comparison, Boland School, a school which entered the program with a relatively well-established number of collaborative teams, saw the smallest financial impact, with a .6% increase in expenditures. Boland’s coaches, staff, and principals, saw little role for the coaches in their system. Dorman’s principal and staff, however, are working to overcome negativity and hostility in their environment and establish well-functioning teams.

Some confusion regarding the purpose of the $20,000 grant to schools was expressed by SCC school participants. Two schools, Boland and DeBerry appeared to focus much of their effort on Parent and Community Engagement, instead of on teacher professional development or after-school hours to work with teams. Boland and DeBerry hosted family-night events, intended on creating a welcoming environment for parents and extended family in the schools. Professional development and team building was the focus at Dorman School, where the money was used to support consultants and outside support to examine and discuss issues of instruction and the collaborative environment in the school.

Students who received home visits supported by SCC funds would have an average of $50-75 additional resources added to their budget. This is a limited number of students, generally between 3-5 students in participating classrooms (in some schools, the participation rate of classroom teachers is below 50%), so this expenditure does not add significantly to the average per-pupil rate in SCC schools.

In conclusion, the financial impact of the SCC monies at the per-pupil level is fairly modest. Studies which support the idea of higher per-pupil expenditure increase paralleling improved test score results (Greenwald, Hedges & Laine, 1996), although contested (Hanushek, 1989), generally expect to see score improvement with larger investments. The SCC, in creating the grant initiative, sought out high-leverage strategies, such as coaching, data analysis teams, and home visits, intended to make the highest impact with very little spending increase. Therefore, fidelity of implementation remains the most important marker of the potential success of the various SCC initiatives.
Section III

District Level Collaboration

Introduction

The SCC District Leadership Team (DLT) was designed to include SEA leadership, school based administrators, community members, and labor representatives for the purpose of leading the district’s effort at supporting the improvement of teaching and learning. With the intent of meeting bi-weekly, the DLT was to make data-driven decisions about the district’s instructional program and to support, lead, and monitor the implementation of the Springfield Improvement Framework. To assess and evaluate work of the DLT, we use the logic model for District (policy-making) Level Labor-Management Collaboration (designed jointly between evaluators and project management) as follows. Our data sources included: Observations and documentation of DLT meetings; other communication documents; policy documents; and interviews. A survey was distributed, but results are not yet available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Theory/Goal</th>
<th>Program Theory/Intended Outcomes</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Analysis Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representatives of teachers and school based administrators are included in district level policy making meetings; leaders understand and participate in collaborative decision making</td>
<td>Model the SCC definition of collaboration to the schools and other levels of administration; Schools follow the model and make data informed decisions Empower those closest to the work to be the architects of reform Include people who work directly with children in discussions of policies which affect their work Team trust is developed resulting in frank discussions</td>
<td>Regular meetings Interactions outside of meetings, such as phone calls, emails, and other forms of communication</td>
<td>How often do the meetings occur? Is the representation of a variety of constituents? What policy changes occur? How did the process inform them? Do they meet the collaborative goals decided upon by the SCC, as detailed in a rubric?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Office makes decisions that consider school level impact, in consultation with school ILT teams and coaches on collaboration.</td>
<td>Fidelity of implementation improves Communication to and from schools occurs and is consistent.</td>
<td>Leaders are trained in, coached in and use Study, Plan, Do, Act protocol</td>
<td>How are the school level points of view manifested in policies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC collaborative leadership team will analyze</td>
<td>Team develops a feedback loop to ensure two way</td>
<td>OHI administration</td>
<td>Is the data analysis performed a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
perception and student data and propose needed changes, and learn to facilitate collaborative discussions.

communications with all stakeholders.
SCC Team develops monitoring system to gauge implementation of change.

and data analysis
KEYS 2.0 administration and data analysis
Student data analysis
Creation and dissemination of findings through facilitated discussions

recognized method?
Are the findings appropriate?
Do the proposed changes match the findings?
Are the conversations collaborative as defined by the SCC?

- While the DLT meets periodically, data that indicate what actions result from team meetings are weak. The degree to which this group has power to influence district decision-making is unclear.

  - Several DLT meetings were canceled and never rescheduled. Representatives of the evaluation attended every session for which we have been notified (October, February, March).
  - Members in attendance regularly included superintendent, several high level district administrators, union representatives, as well as community foundation representatives (e.g., Davis, United Way). At one meeting (the NEAF visit), two school principals were present.
  - Agenda generally covered the following format (after welcome and agenda review): updates; school selection; resource development; event planning, and follow-up issues. One meeting included a SWOT analysis. Meetings were capably facilitated by Andrew Bundy of the Rennie Center.
  - Data were not actively part of district level meetings. We have not seen DLT agenda or observed meetings where OHI, KEYS, or other school level data were discussed.
  - Active commitment towards defining mutual goals is not always clear. The superintendent has reminded the group that “this is one of many district priorities”. The deputy superintendent stated that the SCC was a union initiative that had the potential to distract from other district priorities.
  - Early in the school year, Andrew Bundy led this team through a discussion of collaboration that led to the drafting in January 2012 of a document entitled: What We Mean by Collaboration in Springfield: How it Works and Why it Matters. While written by Andrew Bundy the document is reflective of three groups: union, DLT, and para-professionals. Dissemination and action plans have been discussed.
  - Teacher Evaluation Subcommittee consists of union representation and administrators and is meeting; evaluators have not been included. The union has applauded the presence of building-based voices at this table - teachers and principals and district administrators.
  - District Level Instructional Leadership Team (consisting of the superintendent and deputy and upper level union leadership) has stopped meeting and has not been replaced with another structure. This team was an attempt to solve problems in informal ways before moving to formal procedures (e.g., grievances)
No functioning and enduring infrastructure operates in SPS; such infrastructure is critical to maintaining collaborative practices throughout leadership changes.

1. Absence of a functional and enduring mid-level management structure is evident in the difficulty Springfield has experienced with transitions in the past leadership changes (nb: in the seven years we have worked with SPS in some capacity, we have seen three people in the superintendent role).
2. Some of the initiatives run by Kate Fenton, the Chief School Redesigns Officer, hold promise of creating a functioning middle level. For example, the committee that came together to address teacher evaluation in the school district has been hailed by both sides as a resounding collaborative success. At one point, the superintendent had recommended that she be the key contact person in the district for the SCC. On one hand, this is an excellent idea, due to the potential overlap of the SCC initiatives and school improvement plans. On the other hand, the job of leading school redesigns is one that requires much time and dedication; she may become overloaded. Nonetheless, we find her contributions to the collaborative structures a promising start.
3. As an example of such an enduring structure, Tom Payzant in Boston established a Principal Council that consisted of representative principals and that held a mid-level decision-making authority.
4. Consider where the “tribal history” of the district’s success and failures is held; this shared and understood history can provide consistency of practices as superintendents come and go.
5. Examples of other successful collaborative ventures (SEIS/DESE) have strong middle level personnel who navigate and communicate the collaborative efforts from the Policy level down to the sites and the site level up to the policy. District has some personnel/committees that can fill this need, but how can this incorporate a “middle level” from the union?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Theory/Goal</th>
<th>Program Theory/Intended Outcomes</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Analysis Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCC team includes members of the business, philanthropic, and cultural community.</td>
<td>Community organizations understand the needs of the city’s schools and develop and enhance programs to meet those needs in collaboration with the SCC. Community organizations become advocates for gap closing work in the schools.</td>
<td>Leadership team meets to oversee work of SCC. Leadership team members help SCC raise funds to support work. Leadership team plans for sustainability of community collaboration.</td>
<td>Are the additional members adding the desired representation? Do they feel their work is positive and needed? Are additional revenue, programs for alignment, and appropriate ideas identified?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prior to DLT meetings we attended, Andrew Bundy facilitated Resource development sessions that were summarized and reported on during the general DLT meeting.

Union noted the growth in participation of and commonality of focus on community partners

**Expressed Challenges**

During year 2 the evaluation team in conjunction with the union and some district leadership articulated a rubric to evaluate the collaboration among the stakeholders in the SCC Initiative. Drawing on comments documented during meetings and interviews, we note that challenges exist to full collaboration. The blue text indicates our ratings as best as data allow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Compromising</th>
<th>Accommodating / competing</th>
<th>Avoidance/ hostility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
<td>Everyone involved senses or feels that they are architects of the work. They can point to the places in the process that allow this feeling of ownership to be developed and be sustained. Everyone states that they can live and thrive with a decision even though they may not totally agree with it.</td>
<td>Ownership of decisions is a consideration. Decisions often represent diverse voices, but not consistently. 25-50% of the time the educator sees that their own ideas are represented and in decisions. While disagreement about final actions and decisions can persist, all parties feel themselves represented, respected, and accounted for.</td>
<td>Inclusion and communication is among a privileged few. Most educators don’t feel they have a voice and either go along out of a sense of it is best for the students. Educators may not pay close attention to fidelity of plan implementation or be slow to action, because of a sense of it being created by somebody outside of their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision making</strong></td>
<td>All parties contribute to decision-making based on their expertise and knowledge. Structures are in place so that many parties are active in all major decisions. Educators work together to find commonalities that lead to shared decisions that are mutually affirming and beneficial. Trusting relationship allow parties to work effortlessly through honest disagreements, difficult challenges and regular discussions. Work to reach agreement on issues. sometimes I win, sometimes I lose. Decisions are acceptable. Positions of the parties are carved out separately, but trusting relationships allow parties to work through difficult challenges and discussions. Most parties contribute to decision making in some way.</td>
<td>Decisions are made in which the party with power, information and/or opportunity wins all the time and the other party loses. Decisions remain controversial, but are considered a fait-accompli.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>Understand role in decision. Explicit acceptance of responsibility. Full transparency. Willing to take credit for role in success and failure and Critically examine self and role in decisions. Lack of clarity or understanding of role in decision-making. Some transparency exists, Sometimes take responsibility and sometimes cast blame. Inconsistent examination of self and role in decisions.</td>
<td>Those who are in charge make the decision. Little attention paid to transparency. Each party believes it is the other’s responsibility. Inconsistent examination of self and role in decisions or environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decisions and directives are met with evading and confrontational behaviors, because they are perceived as not being inclusive of affected constituencies. Decisions are ignored or worked around. Positions of the parties are carved out separately, and adhered to rigidly. Relationships are Intimidating, antagonistic, and unreceptive.
The SCC is viewed as primarily the union's project; in fact, some documents produced by school leadership are so labeled—the "Springfield Education Association Collaboration for Change". We attribute the lack of a body of project decisions at the district level to this lack of ownership and unclear purpose. Acceptance of role and responsibilities by district leadership is not clear; similarly shared understandings and purposes of SCC do not exist across all groups.

Regarding decision-making, we wonder what district level decisions have been made and implemented? Data do not reveal sufficient decisions made at district level regarding the project to make a judgment.

The union has noted that a unique set of skills is needed to collaborate, but that those skills have not been openly and jointly identified. Union leadership has asked: "How do we get those skills and institutionalize them?" (3.5.12 meeting). Union leadership questions whether shared trust and transparency exists.

Several parties have expressed concern that any sense of urgency toward change competes with an acceptance of the status quo. Both the superintendent and a Foundation representative note that “this is a slow process that is not lending itself to a sense of urgency. The process and movement is thick”. However, all acknowledge that “kids can't wait” (3.5.12 meeting).

Positive aspects that all agree on include recognition of efforts to involve a wider scope of stakeholders in decision-making and problem solving. Members of the DLT report that capacity building across sectors means input from all players. Data indicate perceived diminishing of silos; more alignment; engagement of community; and more hearing each other’s voices. One administrator stated: "We are not just talking about collaboration as a human resource problem, but for student achievement. We are challenging assumptions about what unions do for the benefit of the students. This is not just collaboration for its own sake."
Section IV

Interest Based Bargaining

Introduction
CEP evaluators observed thirteen negotiation sessions and conducted interviews with the facilitator and four members of the negotiation team—two from each side. We have shared our formative feedback with the negotiation team through two memos on Feb. 10 and May 21, 2012 (see appendix). In this section, we will describe our findings and explain some issues that have influenced the negotiation process.

Interested Based negotiation began in November, 2011, within the context of the Springfield Collaboration for Change (SCC) initiative. The negotiation team examined four key issues (extended time for ILS; effective use of time and resources; Improve teacher attendance; attracting and retaining qualified licensed teachers) and their possible solutions (see appendix). However, the team decided to shift to the positional negotiation on May 8, 2012. The contract is yet to be settled as of this report, as the proposed package was rejected by the SEA membership in a vote.

As mentioned in the ground rules document signed by both parties, the goal of Springfield collaborative bargaining was to strengthen trust and respect between the parties while reaching agreements that are mutually acceptable, broadly supported, and which can be implemented. IBB was chosen as a model for their collaborative negotiation, and both parties expressed their commitment to this model.

Despite the fact that doing IBB did not result in a settlement of the contract, it provided opportunities for both parties to identify and examine each other’s interests and perspectives on the issues. It also helped the members develop personal relationships with one another. As one interview participant related, “camaraderie was good once we were away from the tables”. Moreover, they have reached agreements on a couple of issues during the process that can be incorporated into the new contract. The interview participants also expressed their willingness to apply this model in the next round of contract negotiations, at least to begin with it or incorporate aspects of it into future negotiations.

Interest-based bargaining works where there is understanding and acceptance of the process by all participants and their constituents, mutual trust, willingness of the parties to share relevant information, willingness to forgo power as the sole method of “winning,” and sufficient time (FMCS, 1997). Despite two years of less than optimal outcomes with IBB in Springfield, we believe it holds promise and opportunity for improvement. This improvement is more likely to develop as a truly collaborative relationship develops and infrastructures to support IBB as an ongoing, living process are developed in Springfield Schools.

Potential Barriers
Our data indicate that not all members of the negotiation team were involved in the decision to adopt IBB. Some were invited to join after the decision to do IBB was made. We also have evidence that not all members understood or embraced the concept of IBB. As a key negotiator said, “IBB was chosen because it was recommended by the Rennie Center” (July 2012). Another negotiator said, “in the back of our mind, we knew we were heading to the positional bargaining...” or another one during a negotiation session humorously said, “Leave [this issue] for now. We will discuss it
when we get to positional bargaining in a few weeks." These examples indicate that some members did not believe that the IBB would work in this case and that it was clear to the members that not all at the table had fully embraced the process.

Another negotiator believed that IBB was a style of working together that might not work for all issues. Some confusion about whether or how to apply the IBB model on financial issues was present. A recurring theme over the past two years is that IBB does not work for negotiating over salary. District leadership has stated that it is important “not to show all your cards” when negotiating salary and benefits. The IBB approach to negotiating salary would be to share what the true bottom line of salary and benefits is, and then work together to create a package that solves mutually decided upon problems. It is not impossible to accomplish—in fact, holding salary as a “trump card” at the end of bargaining is likely to undermine trust built through successful IBB negotiated areas.

Size and composition of the negotiation team

In the same vein, we have not seen enough open joint discussions and reflections on the process along the way. Successful implementation of IBB requires adapting the IBB process and principles to the specific context of negotiation, which in turn requires making joint decisions about the process at the beginning and also throughout the process. We had hoped that our feedback memos could help in this regard and trigger discussions and reflections on the process, but our comments were not discussed during the joint meetings. Instead, the sides used formal memos to address their concerns to each other and us as the evaluators.

The size and composition of negotiation teams are critical factors in the IBB process. Although optimal size of bargaining teams depends on specific contexts, the recommended size is five or six members per side, and this must include principal decision makers (Klingel & NEA, 2003). The administration leaders believed that the size of the union negotiation team (13 people) was too large, which slowed down the process. One of their negotiators stated that “It is very difficult to do IBB with a group as large as [the union] brings to the table.” It is clear that increasing the size of the negotiation team will lengthen the process, but at the same time broadens participation and increase the acceptability of agreements. This is an example of a process decision that needed more deliberation and joint discussion. In addition, true collaboration occurs when each party recognizes and values the contributions that the other members at the table bring. Reaching agreement on a number of people per side might help expedite the process of mutual understanding.

Although the parties tried to have a fair representative of their constituencies, concerns were raised in regard to the composition of the teams. The administration team believed that the union negotiators were mostly veteran teachers who might not be good representatives of younger teachers. In their view, this problem was a reason that the union rejected their proposed package. On the other side, a member of the union negotiation team believed that lack of presence of the superintendent in the meetings was a problem. Some concerns were raised in regard to the role that the representative of city hall played in the discussion. The union accepts that there should be a representative from city hall in the negotiation table, but his role and responsibilities should become clear.

Attitudes and skills

The attitude of negotiators can be a major challenge to the success of IBB. We observed that negotiation was mostly perceived as ‘give and take’ rather than collaborative problem solving with the aim of findings solutions that satisfy the interests of both parties. A union negotiator, as an
example, referred us to the opening statement of administration team: "we recognize that to improve [children's] lives, the adults involved in this process will have to give more to make the school system an even better place..." In his view, this shows an attitude that might be appropriate and necessary for traditional bargaining, but not for IBB.

Administrators' attitudes toward the teachers' role in decision making also had an impact on the whole process of collaborative negotiation. The fact that "shared decision making and increasing teachers' voice" was not considered an acceptable option for addressing the issue of attracting and retaining teachers might indicate a top-down attitude toward teachers – not viewing teachers as legitimate partners in educational policy making.

Collaborative bargaining requires a different set of skills than is usually found in the traditional bargaining processes, such as listening, dialogue, and inquiry skills. It is not enough just to follow the steps of IBB, it also requires the negotiators to learn to listen and understand the other sides' interests and perspectives, to go beyond their assumptions, and to look for the root causes of problems. The IBB skills have been overlooked by some of the negotiators; for example one of them said "IBB is not rocket science...the facilitator has laid out the process...I think this number of adults can sit down and work that out step by step." The team needs to develop the required skills; otherwise they will continue using traditional bargaining

*Use of data, information, and knowledge in this process*

A key principle of IBB is joint gathering, sharing, and analysis of data in order to understand the nature of issues and evaluate the root causes of problems and alternatives for addressing it. As we mentioned in our first feedback memo, the IBB process is a process of “action research” based on shared information and mutual inquiry. It appears from our observations that sufficient data were not made available to the team in a timely manner, and available data were not utilized as was expected. As an example, data on teacher attendance were provided late in the process and looking at root causes of teachers’ absence was not accepted as valid option by the administration. This could be seen as a political move on the part of the administration—to take a strong position that teacher absences need to be reduced without understanding the root of the problem might be appealing to those in the public who currently believe that public workers receive too many perks or benefits. Again, it points back to the statement at the opening of the negotiations by the deputy superintendent that “the adults will have to give more”. We ask: is this consistent with the precepts of IBB?

*Involvement of school committee*

Research indicates that direct communication between negotiation team and school committee will expedite the negotiation process and reduce possible misunderstandings (see Klingel & NEA, 2003). As suggested by a union negotiator, direct communication with the committee through shared meetings or phone calls in critical moment could have been helpful. Our data also indicate that the communication between the negotiation team and the committee could be an issue. For example, the administration shared apparently new school committee expectations during the salary subcommittee meeting on May 8th, only one week before the expected end of IBB process and the return to positional bargaining.

*Lack of clarity in agreements*

One month before official shift to the positional bargaining on May 8th, both parties agreed to expedite the negotiation process. However, it was not clear whether and how the group would use
the IBB approach. The union appeared to believe that they were still using the IBB approach. However, during the second salary subcommittee on May 8th, the administration said that they had been operating under a positional bargaining mindset since April 11th, in order to expedite the process. As another example of a lack of clarity, we found out that the negotiators had different understandings of the role and responsibilities of subcommittees, whether they are decision making sessions or only for drafting languages that will be decided in the whole group.

**Conclusion**

To evaluate the success on IBB by a standard created from documents and language within the district, we benchmark this attempt at IBB using the SCC Collaboration Rubric, developed jointly by Nancy deProesse and the CEP using the report “What we mean by Collaboration” by Andrew Bundy. Although this rubric was originally intended for evaluating the collaborative atmosphere (or lack thereof) at the school level, it holds merit for assessing interactions at the district level. As indicated in this rubric, this process was in columns in between authentic and robust collaboration and a hostile environment. Compromising and Accommodating/Competing are two ways in which collaboration is attempted, but missed.

We believe the process holds promise. As the relationship and authentic trust develops, and the traditions of positional bargaining become less familiar and easy to revert to, we believe that Springfield public Schools and the SEA can develop the skills and temperament to complete the process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Compromising</th>
<th>Accommodating / competing</th>
<th>Avoidance/ hostility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
<td>Everyone involved senses or feels that they are architects of the work.</td>
<td>Ownership of decisions is a consideration. Decisions often represent diverse voices, but not consistently. 25-50% of the time the educator sees that their own ideas are represented and in decisions.</td>
<td>Inclusion and communication is among a privileged few. Most educators don’t feel they have a voice and either go along out of a sense of it is best for the students. Educators may not pay close attention to fidelity of plan implementation or be slow to action, because of a sense of it being created by somebody outside of their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision making</strong></td>
<td>All parties contribute to decision-making based on their expertise and knowledge. Structures are in place so that many parties are active in all major decisions. Educators work together to find commonalities that lead to shared decisions that are mutually affirming and beneficial. Trusting relationship allow parties to work effortlessly through honest disagreements, difficult</td>
<td>Work to reach agreement on issues. sometimes I win, sometimes I lose. Decisions are acceptable. Positions of the parties are carved out separately, but trusting relationships allow parties to work through difficult challenges and discussions.</td>
<td>Decisions are made in which the party with power, information and/or opportunity wins all the time and the other party loses. Decisions remain controversial, but are considered a fait-accompli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Decision making** | | | People feel powerless to change and rely on a sense that “this too shall pass”. |

| **Decision making** | | | Decisions and directives are met with evading and confrontational behaviors. Because they are perceived as not being inclusive of affected constituencies. |
| **Decision making** | | | Decisions are ignored or worked around. |
| **Decision making** | | | Positions of the parties are carved out separately, and adhered to rigidly. Relationships are Intimidating, antagonistic, and unreceptive. |
challenges and regular discussions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Lack of clarity or understanding of role in decision-making.</th>
<th>Those who are in charge make the decision. Little attention paid to transparency.</th>
<th>Unwilling to take responsibility. No transparency or sense of need for transparency. Only blames powers outside of their control. Unwilling to take part in critical analysis of their role. Defensive about role or actions without reflection.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand role in decision. Explicit acceptance of responsibility.</td>
<td>Full transparency. Willing to take credit for role in success and failure and critically examine self and role in decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of clarity or understanding of role in decision-making.</td>
<td>Those who are in charge make the decision. Little attention paid to transparency.</td>
<td>Unwilling to take responsibility. No transparency or sense of need for transparency. Only blames powers outside of their control. Unwilling to take part in critical analysis of their role. Defensive about role or actions without reflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some transparency exists, Sometimes take responsibility and sometimes cast blame.</td>
<td>Each party believes it is the other’s responsibility. Inconsistent examination of self and role in decisions or environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inconsistent examination of self and role in decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All parties understand and take into consideration each others constituents’ needs. Everyone shares sense of belonging in the community and feels the community needs all of its members to succeed. Conflicts are discussed candidly and parties admit mistakes, reaffirm commitment to work together and move on.</td>
<td>The lines between “us” and “them” are becoming less clear through intentional actions designed to create community. Conflicts are occasionally confrontational and open, but there is a sense of shared interest that helps guide decision making to solutions.</td>
<td>Individuals in the group only see their own needs. No sense of belonging to the community and/or animosity towards it. Conflicts are avoided or the environment is openly hostile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared understanding / community / interest</td>
<td>Sense of “us” and “them” is still clear within this community, but there an understanding of shared constituency. Conflicts are either simmering below the surface or are openly confrontational.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section V

SCC Schools and the Parent Teacher Home Visit Program (PTHVP)

Introduction

The Sacramento model Parent Teacher Home Visit Project was an initiative underway in Springfield Public Schools before the implementation of the SCC grant. It was chosen because it is perceived to be a low cost way to increase family engagement in their children’s educational process. According to the PTHVP national website, “the increased communication, trust, and support between families and teachers via home visits result in increased student attendance rates, increased student test scores, decreased suspension and expulsion rates, and decreased vandalism at schools”. Key research and evaluation conducted on the Sacramento PTHVP has supported an increase in student achievement levels and positive behavioral changes (Cohen, 2001; EMT Associates, 2003; Tuss, 2007).

PTHVP was originally selected for implementation in Springfield by an interfaith, community based organization called the Pioneer Valley Project, which continues to raise funds and support for the home visit project in SPS. Several schools within the SCC community had initiated some form of home visit as part of their strategy prior to receiving SCC funding. It is functionally new in two of the original four SCC schools.

Program Logic for Parent Teacher Home Visit Project

The following logic model is color coded by the time range in which we expect these questions can be answered. Green indicates that they are short-range goals and outcomes; Peach indicates a medium range, while the Red indicates a goal to be assessed at the end of the project. This evaluation only collected data regarding the green area goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Theory/Goal</th>
<th>Intended Outcomes</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Measure/Data Sources</th>
<th>Analysis Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are trained in the Sacramento model</td>
<td>Teachers attend training; training is state of the art and effective - meets national standards</td>
<td>Trainings occur in Springfield</td>
<td>Observations Interviews Training records</td>
<td>Did state of the art training occur? Did appropriate and sufficient teachers attend? Fidelity to the national model? When and how is it adapted or changed, and is it appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers learn and use the skills and knowledge in their interactions with parents</td>
<td>Teachers approach parents non-confrontationally and begin to build dialogic relationship</td>
<td>Teachers schedule home visits. Teachers attend home visits</td>
<td>Visits- Visit logs Focus groups and surveys of teachers</td>
<td># of visits Are home visits consistent with the intended model? Another visit scheduled?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' greater understanding of child's circumstances will improve their classroom instruction.</td>
<td>Teachers interact with parents about their child's work. They identify family needs and connect them with community resources.</td>
<td>Teachers' home visits will increase parental and community involvement in student's education.</td>
<td>Needs identified: Resources-connected-did parents use? Teachers and parents become more effective partners in their children's education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' home visits will increase parental and community involvement in student's education.</td>
<td>Teachers will make the school seem accessible and relevant. Some interactions at home may show change—activities at home. Parents become more involved partners in children’s education.</td>
<td>Lesson plans Classroom observations/ Teacher documentation.</td>
<td>Changes in classroom strategies to match culture and student needs (specifics to be developed).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students learning will increase.</td>
<td>Achievement gap reduced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key sources of data for this section include the recently developed SPS database to track the home visit logs of teachers. Consisting of 2041 entries detailing the home visits for the district for this year and around 32 columns of coded and open ended responses detailing home visits, the database was sorted to identify SCC schools. Thematic analysis of the open ended columns “Comments” and “HVL Notes” revealed the nature of many of the visits. Coded responses regarding the purpose of the visit and reported parental views were counted and analyzed. The district provided training for the home visits was observed twice this year, to provide a basis for understanding the guidelines and expectations of the program. Finally, group interviews of teachers and other staff members who participated in the visits at two schools provide valuable insight into both the accomplishments and the challenges of implementing such a program.

A well-established program with a long history, the Sacramento Model shows promising results through previous research. However, it is important to bear in mind that, for many SCC schools, implementation of this program is in its early stages, and as such, has idiosyncrasies and issues to be worked out over time. Home Visits, in this case, are not likely yet to influence student test scores because many teachers are still in the learning stages of implementation and the number of students receiving visits is not yet significant.
284 visits occurred in SCC schools this year, including the two new additions to the program, Bowles and Walsh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Total Visits</th>
<th>Total Staff Submitting Information*</th>
<th>Average Number of Visits per Staff Member Reporting**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boland</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeBerry</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorman</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowles*</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh*</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCC Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>284</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: SPS Home Visit Log Database)

*This number was reached by counting the individual id numbers of the persons submitting the reports to the SPS database. Two staff members go on every home visit. One submits a log of the visit.

**The average number of visits per staff member reporting represents the average number of visits per individual staff ID number. There is no way to assess from the system what the number of visits for those in the accompanying/support role is under the current database.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School (Population)</th>
<th>Students Visited</th>
<th>Average Meetings Per Student Visited</th>
<th>Percentage of Student Population Visited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boland (768)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeBerry (281)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorman (278)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner (528)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowles* (315)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh* (301)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCC Total (2471)</strong></td>
<td><strong>205</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As stated in the introduction, this program impacts a limited number of students at each school. Of the original SCC schools, Dorman staff have visited the highest percentage of their population. However, the number of visits per student at Dorman is closer to an average of one than two. Teachers expressed frustration at the difficulty of getting parents to welcome them into their home. One teacher stated, “Of the first five that I selected, because I thought they were the ones who really needed it, none of them would answer the phone or return calls” (June 2012). As a result, teachers would then select additional students, until they found willing participants. Dorman teachers expressed a firm belief
that this would improve over time, as word spread throughout the community that this was not a “risky” undertaking for the parents.

DeBerry School also had a high percentage of students visited from their population. It is important to note that DeBerry’s average number of visits per student was two. DeBerry teachers manage to complete the two visits in a population known for its high overturn and low stability rate. It is equally important to note that DeBerry has an established history of home visits. A DeBerry Staff Member reports, “we started visiting kids at home before there was such a thing in the district” (June 2012). “When the home visit project became available to us, we jumped on board”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Instances of Single Visits (Corresponding Percentage)</th>
<th>Instances of More than 2 Visits (Corresponding Percentage)</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Receiving Target Number of Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boland</td>
<td>40 (83%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeBerry</td>
<td>6 (22%)</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorman</td>
<td>24 (77%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner</td>
<td>9 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowles*</td>
<td>32 (97%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh*</td>
<td>38 (79%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC Total</td>
<td>149 (73%)</td>
<td>15 (7%)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This year, the number of students receiving single visits was high, according to available log data. 73% of the visits were single instances, according to what was recorded in the SPS Home Visit Log. Two school stand out as having the highest rates of students receiving the target number of visits (2) or above: DeBerry and Sumner. As stated above, DeBerry’s program is well established. Sumner Ave. also had early involvement with the Pioneer Valley Project PTHVP. This is one possible explanation on why they may be more able to meet their goals. Not only are the teachers and staff more accustomed to the requirements of the home visits, but the community is much more familiar than in the neighborhoods where it has been recently initiated.

In schools and communities where the incidence of single visits is high, problems with program fidelity may provide a possible explanation. Specifically, open ended responses from the database reveal that visits from teachers in some schools covered topics not consistent with the visit protocol. For example, the Walsh logs record very few instances of relationship building conversations (in protocol) and record multiple instances where the key topic of the conversation is a child’s profound behavioral issues (outside the protocol).

Dorman teachers raised two areas that may cause either some hesitation of parents to participate. First, they report a case in which they were compelled to act as mandated
reporters (a legal requirement of the profession) following a visit to a parent’s house. The program theory espouses that the visits are to be “non-judgmental” in nature, but legal and ethical responsibilities required that the teachers say something about a long-standing danger to a student’s health. In addition, they referenced not being able to get on board the parents of “kids who really needed visits”. One of the ideas raised in training, but probably needing reinforcement, is that home visits should be spread throughout the demographics of a classroom. Targeting high needs children exclusively leads to a perception in the community that “if my kid is selected for a home visit, there’s something wrong”. Again, this may lead to the community interpreting the visits as a potential negative.

**Recorded Purpose of Visits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School (Response Rate)</th>
<th>Initiate Relationship</th>
<th>Invitation: School Function</th>
<th>Invitation: Participate in decision making group</th>
<th>Establish system of communication</th>
<th>To better understand concerns and problems</th>
<th>To identify character and educational goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boland</strong> (22%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DeBerry</strong> (30%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dorman</strong> (37%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sumner</strong> (41%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bowles</strong> (88%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walsh</strong> (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCC Total</strong> (31%)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the areas SPS tracks through a series of drop-down boxes on the Home Visit Logs is the purpose of the visits. Each potential characteristic is assigned a number, and multiple characteristics can be applied to each visit. Overall, the response rate on this portion of the Log is low, with an average of 31% across SCC schools. Bowles teachers were the most likely to complete this section of the form, so their responses may be the most representative of their meeting purposes. The most popular response from all those that were complete was “to better understand concerns and problems”—consistent with the overall program theory of PTHVP.
Recorded Family Areas of Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Family Traditions</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Love</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boland</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 (Safety)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeBerry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 (Behavior)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorman</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 (Summer Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (Obtaining Proper Services for Child)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowles*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(56%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, teachers are asked to note what characteristics families mention as important during the visits. The response rate on this portion of the log is yet lower than that of the purpose, discussed above. In this case, the two areas identified most frequently were “education” and “respect”. Outside of the context of a meeting with a teacher, it would be interesting to see if a parent, given this list, would select the same characteristics. These are values highly reinforced in the general culture as likely to be important when talking with a teacher.

Potential Challenges to Program Fidelity

Several issues were raised over the course of the group interviews at Dorman and DeBerry Schools. Each school is in a different stage of development with the home visit project, and one may be prepared to help the other in some areas of concern.

- Potential targeting of students, or perceived targeting of students. Teachers at Dorman indicated that the first students they selected, the “ones who really needed it” were unlikely to accept. The principal, in an interview, made a similar statement about the
challenges of reaching those who “really need it”. An essential element of the training indicates that student selection should not be “targeting” high need students alone, but selected across demographics in the classroom.

• Challenges getting second visits. At DeBerry, which had a greater success rate for second visits, a common complaint was that the students they were originally visiting were highly likely to move. At Dorman, scheduling was often highlighted as the issue. Within this, one must ask the question about the nature of the first visits. While no evidence of straying from “relationship building” occurred at Dorman, the bulk of the information recorded at one other school (Walsh) is of an academic or behavioral topic.

• Culture clash. One of the ideas expressed by Dorman teachers was that they didn’t understand why parents who didn’t have curtains in their homes would have 52” TVs, among a few other areas. Although difficult to teach, this is a common difference between those living in poverty and those in the middle and upper classes. While this was an issue at Dorman, DeBerry teachers strongly expressed that it is important to identify where they commonalities between themselves and the parents were, and to try to understand where the parents are coming from. DeBerry teachers have more experience with this aspect of the program—they may be able to provide assistance to others in cross-cultural communication.

• Mandated Reporting. One of the precepts of the PTHVP model is that the visits are about building relationships and are to be non-judgmental in nature. This can, and has, become an issue when the conditions that the teachers are invited into are not fit for human dwelling, are obviously abusive or neglectful, or the teacher sees evidence of potential harm. Not only are they ethically compelled to say something, teachers are legal compelled to report these incidents. Although there is no obvious solution to this dilemma, it is important to realize that this tension can be a very real issue and stressor for both teachers and parents

• Building Parental interest in program. Both sets of teachers asked for support from the program for building interest in “being visited” in the communities. Without the consent of the parents/guardians, no visits can occur. To this end, they asked if representatives from the program and/or parents who had positive results in the program could come to speak at school open-houses or fairs.

The potential for the parent home visit project positively affecting academic outcomes is limited by the number of families served and issues with program fidelity. To address the issues created by mandated reporting and the potential clash of cultures, further training or revision of training may be merited. Finally, it is essential to continue to build support in the communities. Not only must program fidelity be present to ensure that the families’ experiences are positive, it is essential to program growth.
The Collaboration Rubric follows. Like other elements of the SCC, the PTHVP is in a developing stage toward collaboration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Compromising</th>
<th>Accommodating / competing</th>
<th>Avoidance/ hostility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
<td>Ownership of decisions is a consideration. Decisions often represent diverse voices, but not consistently. 25-50% of the time the educator sees that their own ideas are represented and in decisions.</td>
<td>Include communication and understanding are among a privileged few. Most educators don’t feel they have a voice and either go along out of a sense of it is best for the students.</td>
<td>Decisions are the province of administrators or a small cadre of their “trusted” allies. Directives are met with evading behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone involved senses or feels that they are architects of the work. They can point to the places in the process that allow this feeling of ownership to be developed and be sustained. Everyone states that they can live and thrive with a decision even though they may not totally agree with it.</td>
<td>While disagreement about final actions and decisions can persist, all parties feel themselves represented, respected, and accounted for.</td>
<td>Educators may not pay close attention to fidelity of plan implementation or be slow to action, because of a sense of it being created by somebody outside of their work.</td>
<td>People feel powerless to change and rely on a sense that “this too shall pass”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision making</strong></td>
<td>All parties contribute to decision-making based on their expertise and knowledge. Structures are in place so that many parties are active in all major decisions. Educators work together to find commonalities that lead to shared decisions that are mutually affirming and beneficial. Trusting relationship allow parties to work effortlessly through honest disagreements, difficult challenges and regular discussions.</td>
<td>Work to reach agreement on issues. Sometimes I win, sometimes I lose. Decisions are acceptable.</td>
<td>Decisions are made in which the party with power, information and/or opportunity wins all the time and the other party loses. Decisions remain controversial, but are considered a fait-accompli.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ insufficient data on decision-making to rate/</td>
<td>Positions of the parties are carved our separately, but trusting relationships allow parties to work through difficult challenges and discussions. Most parties contribute to decision making in some way.</td>
<td>Little attention paid to transparency, inhabitance/avoidance.</td>
<td>People feel powerless to change and rely on a sense that “this too shall pass”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>Understand role in decision. Explicit acceptance of responsibility. Full transparency. Willing to take credit for role in success and failure and Critically examine self and role in decisions.</td>
<td>Lack of clarity or understanding of role in decision-making. Some transparency exists, sometimes take responsibility and sometimes cast blame. Inconsistent examination of self and role in decisions.</td>
<td>Those who are in charge make the decision. Little attention paid to transparency,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared understanding / community / interest</strong></td>
<td>All parties understand and take into consideration each others constituents’ needs. Everyone shares sense of belonging in the community and feels the community needs all of its members to succeed. Conflicts are discussed candidly and parties admit mistakes, reaffirm commitment to work together and move on.</td>
<td>The lines between “us” and “them” are becoming less clear through intentional actions designed to create community. Conflicts are occasionally confrontational and open, but there is a sense of shared interest that helps guide decision making to solutions.</td>
<td>Sense of “us” and “them” is still clear within this community, but there an understanding of shared constituency. Conflicts are either simmering below the surface or are openly confrontational.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Section VI

Instructional Leadership Teams (ILT) in the SCC Schools

Of the SCC initiatives, the ILTs have had the most success at covering the goals and plans spelled out in the SCC Logic Models. The teams met frequently (most more than twice a month) throughout the school year, and some of the teams (or subset of the teams) are already preparing for next year and planning the professional development for their teachers’ return in August. Because the ILT are a pre-existing structure within SPS, and they all receive common training around the Springfield Improvement Framework, a common understanding regarding the goals, priorities, and expectations for the ILT seems to exist in the SCC schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Theory/Intended Outcome</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Measure/ Data Sources</th>
<th>Analysis Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILTs will be formed and will meet regularly</td>
<td>Elections, Selections, Scheduling of meetings, Holding of meetings</td>
<td>Who is elected and selected? How often do the meetings occur? Meeting logs</td>
<td>Appropriate representation, Regularity of meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches will train teams to analyze and interpret student and school climate data</td>
<td>Training of teams, Coaching of teams</td>
<td>Interviews, Team Records, content and design of training, possibly interviews</td>
<td>Evidence of training has occurred and that teachers have learned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILTs effectively analyze data in order to create appropriate course of action</td>
<td>Meetings themselves, Analysis and interpretation of data</td>
<td>Meeting records, observations, some interviews, What evidence that they use data?</td>
<td>Are the data used “reputable” sources? How often is the conversation “data-driven”? What does “data-driven” look like in this context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILTs create appropriate course of data-driven action</td>
<td>Development of plans, Create site level theory of action/program logic/model, Detail how plan will be</td>
<td>Documents from created course of action, Documents created for teachers, Do plans meet the</td>
<td>Do the plans appear to match site needs? Does the logic work for this setting? Are the plans supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ILTs assist with implementation and dissemination</th>
<th>disseminated</th>
<th>determined needs?</th>
<th>by the literature?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create plan for implementation</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Does implementation happen as planned?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow plan for implementation</td>
<td>Questionnaires/Surveys</td>
<td>Do teachers receive a “faithful” message?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check-in for continued implementation</td>
<td>Do follow-ups occur? If so, by whom? How is it a team/collaborative effort</td>
<td>Do follow ups assure fidelity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One way in which the SCC ILT was intended to differ from SPS was in the make-up of its membership. To join the SCC, principals were asked to have half of the member consist of people they had selected for participation (most SPS schools are entirely principal selected) and half elected from the teaching force by the teachers. From the survey results, compliance with this requirement may be mixed. However, some of the teams without elected members appear to be very effective at creating plans and leading their school instructional focus.

The following sections detail the work of the ILTs over the past school years, as reported by their members through a web survey, conducted by CEP for the purposes of this evaluation. In addition, we have conducted a document analysis of the meeting minutes from the 2011-2012 school year from the Boland and Dorman ILTs, which support and affirm many of the assertions made in the survey. The following are descriptions of the work of Boland, DeBerry, Dorman, and Sumner Ave. Schools. Although Walsh and Bowles were invited to participate, they did not respond with a critical number of participants. Walsh had three respondents, all of whom were on the ILT as part of their job role. Bowles had no participants.

**Boland School**

At Boland, 7 of the 9 team members responded to survey. According to the participants, they met more than twice per month. Meeting records support these survey results. The Boland ILT has no elected membership—a conscious choice of the Principal, Tom O’Brien, who states that the SCC is aware of his decision. Instead of election, O’Brien selects his membership from a pool of teachers who have actively applied for leadership positions of some sort within the school or district.

- Responding to the survey were 4 members selected by Principal: 2 Instructional Leadership Specialists (ILS) and 1 Principal also responded
• 72% of members reported attending 95% or more of all meetings. One member reported making 85% of the meetings and one only 25%

According to the ILT members, coaches attended meetings some of the time. 86% of the members reported that the role of the coaches was to observe the meeting. 43% responded that the role of the coaches was unclear. At the final meeting of the ILT for the school year, the current coaches discussed with O’Brien the possibility of their re-assignment to a school with greater need. The coaches expressed strong feelings that the Boland team functions well, meeting regularly, with a focus on data and planning. They stated that they believed that schools with greater need are joining the SCC.

Team members report using data at meetings most to all of the time. Sources of data reported were:

- ANet (formative test intended to track to MCAS)
- Fontas and Pinnell
- Springfield Improvement Framework
- LEADS 21
- MCAS
- Teacher prepared data
- Science Data (DBAs)
- District Report Cards
- Classroom assessments for re-teach plans
- OHI Survey Results

We asked if any other sources of information were used to inform the meetings. Additional sources of information included:

- District Mandates
- Best Practice Resources
- Focus on Results Directives
- Goals and Results of Tests
- Articles from Focus on Results Meetings
- District-provided information
- Books

Evidence indicates that the Boland ILT frequently consults outside resources to aid in the decision making process for the school.

We asked about the number of actionable plans created by the ILT. Boland ILT responded overwhelmingly (100%) that they had produced over three plans. These plans include:

- Surveys
- Walk throughs looking for best practices
- Uniform classroom materials
- Reteaching plans as developed by teachers to direct instruction, based on ANet results
- ILTs monitoring best practices
- Springfield Improvement Framework plans and updates
- Extended Day Schedule
- Professional Development Schedule

Plans were fully implemented school-wide, according to 100% of respondents. Following implementation of plans, the following actions occurred:

- Following walk throughs and other plan implementations, discussions with grade level teams. Feedback provided to team members following review.
- Teachers reported increase in ANet scores after implementing reteaching plans, after students' areas of need were defined.
- Plans by ILT were acted upon during grade level team meetings.
- ILTs gave feedback on reteaching plans as they were being developed.
- Progress of plans was monitored by ILT members
- Plans were introduced at extended day and communicated through minutes
- ILT surveyed teachers about implementation when necessary.

The plans appear to be useful: 83% of the respondents reported that the plans helped "a good deal in the way they thought they would"; 17% stated that they helped a little bit as anticipated. Nobody responded that they did not work.

Overall, the plans were perceived by the ILT as moderately well received by the teaching force at Boland. The team followed up on plan implementation by creating and implementing surveys, having Grade Level teams discuss concerns and criticisms of plans and implementation, using Extended Days to have teachers share successes and “what
worked” in reteaching plans, Administrator Observations, and reports at ILT meetings of grade level discussions.

DeBerry School

At DeBerry School, the ILT had a lower response rate than at Boland. Out of the team of 7, four responded. According to respondents, they met twice a month or more. Of the people who responded, three were selected by the principal. Only one person who was on the ILT due to job role responded. Of the people who responded, most (75%) attended 95-100% of the meetings. One person reported attending half.

SCC Coaches attended “some of the time” according to respondents. It has been established through the coaches’ logs and through analysis of the SCC budget that DeBerry received more coaching time than any other school in the district, although Dorman is a close second. Much of this was due to a perception on the part of the coach that the principal and staff were willing and able to make needed changes to help improve data analysis, planning, and collaboration.

The role selected most frequently as describing the coaches was “facilitator of data use” and “observer of meetings”. This is closely followed by “facilitator of decision making” and “Instructor on Data Analysis”. Responses under the “other” choice include: offering expertise and advice as needed, with roles varying dependent on our needs and “Dennis [the coach] played a full part in the meetings he was able to attend”. Dennis was dedicated to helping DeBerry School improve both data analysis and decision making within the organization, as evidenced by the considerable time and effort he expended this year.

DeBerry ILT members had less agreement on how much time was spent on data use at this school, but still indicated that this was positive. 50% felt it was used all of the time, and 25% responded “some of the time” and “most of the time”. Sources of data indentified include:

- DBAs
- Fontas and Pinnell Reading Levels
- Math District Tests
- MCAS
- Classroom Assessments
- Intervention Assessments
- Surveys
- Kindergarten Reading and Math Assessments
When asked about other sources of information used during the meetings, the following were identified:

- Research Articles
- Chapters from Books
- Guest Speakers
- Information from workshops attended by others
- ANet consultant (DeBerry is considering adopting the ANet system)

Respondents indicated that 3 or more actionable plans resulted from their efforts, including:

- School Improvement Plan
- Action Plans
- Protocols for conferring with students on Problem Solving across curriculum
- Interventions needed
- Standards for displaying student work
- Standard Operating Procedures to connect focus goals across the curriculum
- DeBerry Framework
- After School Program
- All Day Parent Conferences
- August Professional Development

100% of the team respondents perceived their plans as “partially implemented” school wide. After the plans were created, they implemented them by:

- Sharing with the teachers to get feedback before implementation
- Rolling out during extended days and grade level meetings
- Using them to create and support professional development plans
- Holding an After school program from December through May.
- Holding Parent conferences as planned in April, which they are planning to do early next year as well.
- Having Teachers use standardized conferring sheets (not monitored at this point.)
- Changing Bulletin boards and other classroom displays as a result of guidelines

Of the respondents, 100% felt that the plans helped “a little bit” or more in the way they anticipated they would. One respondent stated that they believed the plans were moderately to well-received, and that the acceptance was due to allowing time and training to embrace new initiatives
The follow up from the ILT following implementation has consisted of the following:

- Continued revisiting of action plans
- Providing continual feedback to and from staff from surveys, discussions at extended days, and grade level meetings
- Staff feedback was gathered from the onset of the plans’ creation, through surveys and grade level meetings.
- Standard Operating Procedures will involve ongoing meetings for full implementation over the next year.

DeBerry School is peopled with teachers and staff who seem to really understand and sympathize with their students and the hardships they face. DeBerry has the least stable student population of any in the SCC district, and has the additional challenges of a large number of English Language Learners and Behavior Management Classrooms. The needs at this school are complex, challenging, and very real. Although it might be easier to tackle one issue at a time, student performance at DeBerry is so low that it is hard for a team to prioritize any one thing. Under these conditions, the team has done an admirable job at attempting to maintain staff feedback into their planning and create standards of operation in the school. This focus may allow them the opportunity to seek a more direct academic plan of action over the upcoming years.

Dorman School

From the 6 members of the Dorman ILT, we had 5 respondents to the survey. According to the participants, this team met 1 or 2 times per month. This is supported by the meeting documents. The ILSs and Principal responded to the survey, as did 2 members selected by the principal. At this school, no elected members participated in the survey. 100% of the respondents reported attending all of the meetings.

According to respondents, SCC coaches attended meetings most of the time. The most popular way of identifying the coaches’ role was as “Facilitator of Data Use”, followed by “Observer of Meetings”. They were also defined as “facilitator of decision making”, “instructor on data analysis”, and “leader of professional development events”. One respondent noted that coaches were “involved in all aspects of the meeting. Highly engaged and committed”. Another noted that the coaches’ roles varied from facilitators to observers, depending on needs. Dorman received the second highest amount of coaching time in the district, according to the coaches’ logs and analysis of spending in the SCC.

Data were used “most of the time” in meetings, according to respondents, including:

- MCAS
DBAs (District Based Assessments)
Teacher Provided Data
Learning Walk Data
Fontas and Pinnell
OHI
KEYS
School Stat

Other sources of information included:

- Excerpts of “Teach Like a Champion”
- Information from Focus on Results
- Books
- Articles
- Teacher Surveys

The team perceived 1-3 actionable plans resulting from the meetings, including:

- A Large Action plan, ready at the end of the school year, built from several smaller plans created throughout the year.
- An action plan resulting from OHI and KEYs data
- Plans to include whole faculty in decision making
- “Digging Deep into Data” sessions in extended day, with a school wide focus on questioning as a skill.

According to participants, the plans were fully to partially implemented schoolwide, although one of the major plans was ready by the end of the school year.

- Following plan creation the following happened:
  - Plans were presented to staff for their input
  - Ongoing implementation and assessment
  - Grade level teams met to analyze data and develop plans around strengths and weaknesses.
  - Standardized rubric and feedback forms were used by staff members

The team perceived the plans as helping “a good deal” in the way they thought it would (60%). They also indicated a belief that the plans were moderately well received by the staff (80%). Follow up at the school is ongoing, as is implementation, through conversations at extended day. The Dorman team seems to be taking the concept of the feedback loop seriously. We note that this collaborative behavior does not always lead to efficiency or smoothness in plan implementation. For example, one of the issues revealed in the OHI data was that morale and camaraderie at the school is particularly low, with
teachers placing much blame on the administrator and each other for the failures of the school. To help address these issues, a consultant was called in and the ILT used some of its focus on analyzing these problems within the school. Under these circumstances, the ILT may have difficulty developing a clear focus or plan that is singularly focused on student achievement.

Sumner Ave

The Sumner Ave. ILT had a relatively high number of respondents with 7 of 9 participating in the survey. According to team members, the team met twice a month. Of the respondents, 2 were elected members, 1 was selected by school leadership, and 4 were there because of job role (Perhaps two ILSs and two administrators). The respondents indicated that they attended nearly 100% of the meetings.

The Sumner Ave. ILT reported that SCC coaches were in attendance most of the time (72%), although Sumner received fewer coaching hours than DeBerry or Dorman. Because of a somewhat traumatic change in principal in the middle of the year—the coaches had been her teachers when this principal went through school in the district—there was some upheaval in the middle of the school year. The coaches’ role was described primarily as “Observer of Meetings”. The next most popular choice was “facilitator of data use”. One team member responded that they were “instructors of data analysis” and “Leaders of professional development events”.

Respondents indicated that data played a role in their meetings “most of the time” (72%), including the following sources:

- KEYS
- MCAS
- DBA
- Fontas and Pinnell
- District Assessments
- OHI
- Staff Surveys
- PBIS data

Another source of information used during the meetings was the book “Teach Like a Champion”. Sumner Ave. School was unique in that only one additional resource was mentioned. A CEP evaluator was present at the meeting in which this book was proposed for a school wide book study. At this meeting, the team broke into several small groups and read an assigned chapter. When finished, the group reported back interesting points.
within the book. At the conclusion of the meeting, enthusiasm about the book led to its approval as a guide to improvement at Sumner.

The respondents stated that 2 or more actionable plans were created, including:

- Professional development based on “Teach Like a Champion”.
- Techniques used in “Teach Like a Champion”
- Professional Development

Evidence indicates that the book helped Sumner Ave. develop a common focus for improvement this year. In many respects, the answers on the survey and the meeting observation support that this ILT had a clearer single focus than many of the others. Whether or not this has a positive or negative impact on the school environment or learning outcomes for students is not certain at this point, but the potential seems positive.

According to 72% of respondents, the plans were fully implemented school wide—a relatively strong assertion compared to other schools in this survey. Again, implementation may have been supported because of the clear single focus—it is easier to propose one set of changes than many diffuse changes. Following implementation of the plans, they had staff come together to discuss how things went and follow up with concerns about implementation. The teams then debriefed on the subject and follow ups occurred during professional development days.

72% of respondents felt the plans helped “a little bit” in the way they thought they would, and they also perceived the plans as “moderately well received” by the teachers. They later followed up with staff members about the plans through the use of a Survey. They also discussed the results at staff meetings, and were encouraged to be open about what they thought was positive and negative. They reviewed staff feedback during the ILT meetings.

Summary:

Although “elected membership” has been a criteria for the SCC ILTs, evidence does not support an assertion that this criterion has an across-the-board effect of “increasing collaboration” in a school or on a team. For example, Boland School has one of the best functioning teams in terms of frequency of meetings, a collaborative environment, and effectively planning—yet they lack elected membership. The principal seems to believe that elected membership may jeopardize the functioning of his team. After all, he has selected membership through a process that, so far, has developed a team that is collaborative which each other and other teachers, has a variety of voices represented, and is skilled at data use and planning.
On the other hand, Sumner Ave. has elected membership. This team also appears to have functioned well as the year has gone on, as indicated by the lower number of coaching hours required and by the positive remarks on their surveys. In addition, Sumner Ave. appears to be in slight, but consistent upward trend in student achievement, which was occurring before the change in leadership or to the structure of the team. In fact, a disagreement about the constitution of the team and what would be an appropriate approach to collaboration led to the principal leaving this school.

This leads to a cautionary note: democratic principles do not guarantee collaborative actions or relationships. Part of collaboration is understanding what each team member brings to the table and respecting each team members’ contributions. Elections do not guarantee this level of respect for what each other brings to the table. Consider the current state of the US Congress, for example.

Next, the teams appear to be largely influenced by the training provided around the Springfield Improvement Framework (SIF). Coaching seems to be most important when the school is facing challenges particularly to their context that make it difficult to develop a singular focus. For example, Dorman school is facing much internal strife and low morale. DeBerry school has a population that is facing many challenges, both in and out of school. Stability within the school may have some bearing on whether or not the ILT is able to complete the work set out in the SIF without assistance from coaches.

Stability in the leadership positions may also have something to do with team effectiveness. Rhonda Stowell-Lewis, at Dorman, expressed some concern that Dorman had a pattern of receiving a new principal every three years. She had just completed her third year, and she had reviewed her preliminary 2012 MCAS Scores, which were looking negative. As a result, she was concerned that she might also follow in that three year pattern. With the current climate at the school, it is important that they have a year to work through the tensions collaboratively and improve the climate—which would then allow them the space to create a clearer academic focus.

Finally, it was only a few years ago that the idea of teachers working together on school data to determine a course of action for themselves was novel. In Springfield, data use to inform instruction appears to truly be coming to life through the work of the ILTs. Whatever the composition of the teams, encouraging continued data use is critical to choices for improving instruction. Evidence suggests that teachers can be the architects of rather than the objects of reform.
Conclusions and Recommendations

Despite challenges, collaboration is occurring and growing. In Springfield, collaboration is growing in an environment traditionally hostile to open and trusting working relationships—between the union and management. The path to an authentic and natural collaborative relationship from relationships that have traditionally existed between labor and management is neither a straight path nor is it so complex that it becomes impossible to achieve. Through reflective evaluation on the roles and actions of actors within the system, collaboration should continue to improve over time and flourish.

The following are some recommendations, drawn from the data presented within this report, to assist the SCC in further development of their collaborative practices:

• Continue to strive to create middle-level infrastructures that can facilitate interaction between the district and the union. For the union, this may involve the recruitment of members to work with middle level management from the district on broader policy-making teams.
• Revisit the concept of “ownership” of the SCC within the organization. The belief that this is a “union-driven” project is more pervasive than the designers of the program would have pictured it to be. What are some ways that each stakeholder in the SCC can claim a level of ownership and responsibility for collaboration for the purpose of improving student learning?
• At the school level, revisiting the meaning and reality of “trust” within the framework of collaboration might be an important step, especially toward empowering School Leaders to make decisions about the membership of their teams. Do elected members necessarily have the skills and commitment levels necessary to create well-functioning teams? How much can the leadership at the school be trusted in making that call? Is the same level of trust being extended to each building leader?
• Encourage cross-pollination between the SCC schools. The interviews around the PTHVP revealed strengths and weaknesses at various schools. Schools that have issues around cultural competence could benefit from those with more experience in the homes.
• Place student achievement in perspective. The achievement gaps do exist within SPS and do not appear to be improving overall at this time. Functionally, this is the second full year of the initiative, and both the schools and the greater SCC organization have needed some time to establish and refine expectations for the program. In addition, so many variables that influence achievement scores are at play within the schools that it is difficult to discern what can be attributed to the program and what may be due to other factors. Genuine collaboration between teachers and management with a focus on improvement can be nothing but a positive effort over time.
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MEMORANDUM

To: Springfield Interest-Based Bargaining Participants
From: UMass Evaluation Team – Javad Ahmadi, Andrew Churchill, Rachael Lawrence, Sharon Rallis
Re: Formative Feedback on IBB Process
Date: February 10, 2012

UMass Amherst evaluation team members Andy Churchill and Javad Ahmadi have attended three sessions of IBB negotiations and one subcommittee meeting and have conducted a brief interview with the IBB facilitator. As neutral parties charged with providing feedback to help improve the process, we offer the following observations.

1. **SPS and SEA have a history of building their collaboration around mutual analysis of data.** Having previously written a case study on the implementation of the NEA KEYS survey in Springfield, the evaluators would like to remind the parties that building trust through agreed-upon data was an integral part of the Joint Labor-Management Initiative (JLMI) through which SPS and SEA began working together in 2004, despite very difficult fiscal and political circumstances. Under the JLMI, after agreeing upon a definition of a successful school, the parties then used the NEA KEYS survey to generate school climate data. SEA and SPS then came together to analyze the data and agree upon key district and school priorities. This process laid the foundation for the Springfield Collaboration for Change, of which the IBB is a part.

2. **The IBB process is designed to be a process of “action research,” based on shared information and mutual inquiry.** According to Klingel (2003), the general steps are: (1) describe bargaining issues in problem statements; (2) share all information relevant to the issue; (3) discuss the parties’ shared and separate interests on the issue; (4) brainstorm a variety of options for resolving the issue; (5) narrow options with jointly developed criteria or standards; and (6) use consensus to agree on the options that best satisfy the parties’ interests.

3. **Collect, share, and agree upon the relevant data for each issue to be discussed, to jointly define the problem before discussing options for resolving it.** As an example, in the “improving teacher attendance” discussion, the specifics of the problem – the exact pattern of teacher absences – were not available and agreed-upon by all members of the negotiating committee, which resulted in lots of going back and forth during the discussions and hindered reaching agreement. We suggest that, before brainstorming possible solutions to any issue, the parties should develop a shared definition of the problem, based on joint analysis of the data relevant to that issue. With the parties getting clear on the nature of the problem up front, options for solving it are likely to be better-targeted, and therefore the process of resolution should be more efficient. As of now, the group has made a list of issues to be discussed; data collection should be underway on all of them, so that as each issue comes up, the data needed to jointly define the problem will be ready.
4. **Minimize actions that may lead to distrust, such as separating into long caucuses and changing language without mutual discussion.** The IBB process is designed to build trust through mutual inquiry and transparency of intent. Caucuses separate the parties and can fuel adversarial behavior; our understanding is that they should be infrequent and generally last for under five minutes. We have observed caucuses lasting a half-hour or more, often subsuming the dinner break. We suggest allocating a time for the break separate from caucus time – breaks together provide opportunities for informal chat that can be very productive. In addition, one individual’s changing draft language of an agreement without further discussion and mutual assent served as a source of distrust. Openly discussing concerns together and documenting resolutions in the main meeting, or if necessary delegating language-drafting to a joint subcommittee rather than a single individual, will help improve mutual trust.

5. **Empower the mediator.** The mediator’s role in the IBB process is essential to the group’s success. Mr. Dubin’s knowledge of the IBB process, his facilitation skills, and his patience are admirable. However, it is clear that he feels the parties are not following the IBB process. We suggest that both parties in the negotiation empower the mediator to take a more active role in making them stick to the ground rules and the principles of IBB (such as using data, limiting caucusing, and focusing on interests rather than positions).

6. **Celebrate successes.** While the process may at times have been painful, it is clear that progress has been made in several important areas, in ways that both parties recognize are in their interest. It is important to recognize this progress.

We trust you will find this feedback helpful, and we would be happy to discuss these issues with you in further detail.
MEMORANDUM

To: Springfield Interest-Based Bargaining Participants
From: UMass Evaluation Team – Javad Ahmadi, Andrew Churchill, Rachael Lawrence, Sharon Rallis
Re: Further Formative Feedback on IBB Process
Date: May 21, 2012

UMass Amherst evaluation team members Javad Ahmadi and Andy Churchill have attended numerous sessions of IBB negotiations, and the entire UMass evaluation team has participated in project planning meetings and reviewed notes from the negotiating sessions. As neutral parties charged with providing feedback to help improve the process, we are following up on our previous memorandum of February 10 with some additional observations.

In this memo, we focus specifically on the process surrounding the May 8 decision to revert to positional bargaining and cease using IBB. Our goal is to help the parties to reflect upon the process, so that future decisions about negotiations can be as intentional and productive as possible.

**Why was IBB chosen in the first place?** Contract negotiation takes place within the context of the Springfield Collaboration for Change (SCC) effort, which in turn is part of labor-management collaboration efforts that have been going on for years. As part of the grant-funded SCC process, a rubric for collaboration was developed, which identifies elements such as transparency, openness, and information-sharing as being fundamental to collaboration and trust-building. IBB applies these elements of collaboration to the contract negotiation process.

It is important to note that Springfield did not choose IBB for the sake of IBB. Springfield chose IBB for the sake of (1) continued trust-building between SPS and SEA and (2) producing a contract that is based on mutual interests, is feasible to implement, and ultimately supports improved student learning. As evaluators, therefore, we encourage the parties to ask the following overarching questions: To what extent has the negotiation process been collaborative; has trust been built? Has the evolution of the process been reasonable and intentional? Has the process enabled each of the parties to achieve desired results? How could the process be improved in terms of both efficiency and effectiveness?

**The May 8th decision to revert to positional bargaining.** The parties’ decision to revert to the positional approach on May 8, 2012 offers a useful case study of the IBB process in Springfield. The decision raises a number of useful questions for the parties to reflect upon: Why was this decision made? Was the decision made collaboratively? How did it affect the trust and the quality of agreements between the parties? Does this decision mean that the IBB model did not work in this case? We offer the following observations and questions for participants to consider.
1. **Lack of shared understanding about when the IBB process was abandoned.** During the last month, feeling time pressure, both parties agreed to expedite the negotiation process. However, it was not clear whether and how the group would use the IBB approach. At the first meeting of the salary subcommittee, the members did not discuss how they would use IBB principles and techniques for negotiating salary and benefits. The union appeared to believe that they were still using the IBB approach. However, during the second salary subcommittee on May 8th, the administration said that they had been operating under a positional bargaining mindset since April 11th in order to expedite the process.

**Questions:**
- Why did the administration and the union not have a shared understanding of whether they were operating under IBB or positional bargaining?
- What effect did this misunderstanding have on trust-building and outcomes?

2. **Lack of shared understanding of financial information:** One of the most critical principles of collaborative bargaining is open sharing of information. It helps the group come up with mutually workable solutions, and it helps reduce suspicion. As an example, sharing of attendance data by the administration helped the group jointly address solutions to attendance challenges. In contrast, financial information did not appear to be as openly shared, and assumptions about financial negotiations seemed to be positional from the start. Under IBB, it could be possible for the parties to review financial data and assumptions and agree upon the pool of available funds as a starting point for negotiations on salaries and benefits. This did not happen in Springfield.

**Questions:**
- Was this positional approach to salaries and other financial aspects intentional?
- Was this positional approach to salaries and other financial aspects shared by the parties?
- Was this positional approach felt to be more efficient? More effective?
- Could open sharing of financial data and using this to work together on the new salary scale improve the process? If so, how could this be done feasibly?

3. **Apparent changes to prior, mutual agreements.** During the regular IBB meeting on April 11, the parties agreed to work only on those options that had already been identified as feasible, beneficial, and acceptable in order to be able to finish the process by mid-May. However, according to union leadership, the administration’s May 8 proposal included changes that had not been previously agreed upon, such as withdrawing two litigations and changing the language that allows teachers to leave buildings during the day.

**Questions:**
- Was this a violation of the previous agreements by the administration team – or was it simply due to a miscommunication?
- How did this incident affect the trust between the parties?

4. **Unclear involvement of school committee.** It is not clear to us the degree to which the school committee, a major constituent, has been involved in the negotiating process. For example, the administration shared apparently new school committee expectations during the
salary subcommittee meeting on May 8th, only one week before the expected end of process. Generally, school committee and administration interests are worked out prior to negotiations and these two entities are engaged throughout negotiations as a single party.

**Questions:**
- How has the school committee been involved in negotiations, and in the selection of IBB as a process for those negotiations?
- Should the school committee have the power/authority to unilaterally change the negotiation team’s agreements?

5. **The decision to revert to positional bargaining does not necessarily mean the parties have failed to collaborate.** The shift to IBB takes time, effort, and patience. The parties may have simply looked at the amount of time available and the types of issues to be settled and collaboratively decided to “cut to the chase” in a way with which they were familiar. If this decision was mutual, then abandoning IBB could actually be a trust-building event in this case, rather than an indicator of a breakdown in trust.

**Questions:**
- Was the decision to revert to positional bargaining a mutual decision?
- Did it “make sense” under the circumstances?
- Would net benefits be greater if IBB could be used for financial decisions?
- If so, how could the process be designed to allow this to happen?

Collaborative bargaining requires different mental models/mindsets (such as openness and inquiry-mindedness) than traditional positional bargaining, in which competitive sides each seek to “win”. It is not an easy transition to make. We hope that consideration of the questions above can provide an opportunity for reflection and continuous improvement of the process.
Appendix C: IBB Issues & Options

See separate attachment
Appendix D

Home Visit Log notes for each school:

Boland Comments and Home Visit Log Notes:

Parental Concerns for Child

- Father concerned with 6 year old’s behavior. Reassured that she is acting developmentally appropriate
- Parent believed child had IEP at other school, but doesn’t appear to be so
- Child gets frustrated and cries when work is hard. Misses other parent.
- Child’s progress slow despite many interventions. Parent requests retention.
- Sad and tearful day about child’s self-harm and sibling issues.
- Hoping child could attend summer school
- Preparing for new sibling’s arrival
- Parent wants Child to remain in IEP-pull out for next year.
- Child telling Grandparent that Child doesn’t have homework when Child does.
- Concerned about Child’s reading—Child excels in math.

Parental Information Requests

- After School Care
- Conferences after suspensions
- What to do for learning over the summer/Access to Summer Sports Opportunities
- Bullying situation at school
- Therapy referrals
- Enrolling other child in pre-school
- Summer Camps and Sports information
- Summer Activities
- Keeping Child busy in summer.
- Not able to understand report card published in English
- Summer tutoring options
- Put in contact with parent facilitator to help brainstorm programs for family.

Academics

- Recommended use of flash-cards
• Child would benefit from more reading at home: Child could read to relatives
• Recommend use of library for summer reading program and read-alouds
• Child has trouble sitting and shouting out words
• Brought sight-words for the child so parents could work on them with him.
• Child showing progress
• Parent sent letter to attend 504 meeting.
• Mutual concern about child’s slow progress. Requested another intervention program.
• Concern over lack of progress
• Progress for grade level
• Child selected to participate in Bell Program.
• Programs to reinforce skills learned in school year over the summer at Library
• Child’s behavior at school. Parent started incentive program that seems to be working. Child following directions at home, which wasn’t present at last visit.
• Gave Parent strategies to help Child with areas of need on assignments.
• Discussed upcoming IEP meeting.
• Recommend that Child read more at home.
• Discussed Child’s current report card. Keep practicing multiplication facts during the summer
• Informed Grandparent to expect homework Monday-Thursday for Child.
• Practice sight-words.
• Recommended Child write to Sibling in College to work on writing skills
• Discussed Grading policy
• Academic and Speech Concerns

Warm Welcomes

• Child’s family was kind and welcoming! Met entire family
• Parent was grateful for our visit!
• Second meeting at this household—very nice!
• Very caring parent who reported enjoying the home visit project.
• Second Visit with this family—we had an awesome time! All gathered in the dining room and we talked about many things.
• Family loves being part of Boland Family—enjoyed the HVP!
• Second visit-this family loves being part of the HVP.
• Went to the library with Child and family
• Parent expressed appreciation for program, as it allowed this person more time with child, even as non-custodial parent.
• First visit—we enjoyed a nice meal and discussed vacation plans.
• First home visit. We discussed family’s value on education. Parent was welcoming and kind.

Family Needs Identified

• Child still wearing winter boots in Spring, due to lack of sneakers—soles falling off. Parent was “waiting for check”. Recommended Salvation Army, but mother resisted. Lent Child pair of shoes to wear while at school. Both Children in home need shoes.
• Guardian paperwork needs to be filled out by Grandparent. Currently listed as Emergency contact but not as the Child’s guardian.
• Discussed Home Routines, as Child is having hard time in the morning. Set up system to communicate how child is doing in order to reward success.
• Discussed inconsistency of behavior at home and school. Perhaps related to visits with biological parents.

Scheduling Issues

• Second home visits cancelled due to schedule conflicts
• Called Parent to sign release for visit. Release sent with Child.
• Several phone conferences—additional calls by the assistant principal
• Visit did not take place—conflict with time and schedule.

DeBerry Comments and Home Visit Log Notes

Parent Concerns for Child

• Middle school transition/Middle Schools
• Not sure Child can succeed in next grade level due to academic difficulties
• Parent unaware that Child’s IEP had been terminated in Kindergarten.
• Child’s behavior at home worse than at school
• Child not able to get along with other students in class.
• Concern about Child’s behavior and time out of classroom.
• Child not enjoying after school program
• Child repeating grade due to lack of progress

Parent Information Request
• Sign up for after school program
• Summer School
• Community resources for Summer
• Community resources
• Resources for younger siblings
• Summer Academy
• Calming down strategies posters

Academics
• Reading progress, and Child's need for self-control
• Child struggling in Math
• Student progress
• Activities to do with Child at home over summer to support learning
• Child showing responsibility in school work
• Student making better choices about respecting others
• Discussed progress of younger sibling in different grade.
• Child not making adequate progress for next grade level. Parent agrees.
• Poor attendance and tardiness contributing to lack of progress.
• Worked on homework together to model expectations.
• Self-control at school, home, and extracurriculars.
• Behavior and 504 plan
• SPED retesting, reviewed previous IEP

Invitations to School
• Families invited to Pot Luck.

Family Needs Identified
• Child new to school—support needed at school and home.
• Translator needed for all contact with Parents.
• Child receiving therapy outside of school
• Changes in family dynamics affecting Child's behavior and performance.

Scheduling Issues
• I waited 2 hours for Parent to come home from work. I rang the bell and waited some more, but nobody came to the door. I called the house and left several
messages. I followed up a week later, and the Parent claimed to not know what happened that night. Parent has had no other contact with me.

Dorman Comments and Home Visit Log Notes

Parent Concerns for Child

- Child being bullied, but no contact from school on what to do about it.
- Parent had concerns about homework. Provided her with classroom policy.
- Child coming home stating that other students are bothering her. Child does not report problems until a few days later. Parent and teacher agreed to send each other progress reports on problem.
- Child afraid to go out to recess for fear of bullying. Child reports being hit by three other students consistently. Also afraid to wear glasses or go to lunch because of bullying. Child comes home with bruises on legs and side. Teacher has concern that Child may be bullying party. School investigation did not support bullying claims. Parent very distraught.
- Parent concerned about Child being ready for next year.
- Child starting medication. Family needs to know what works best from Teacher.

Parent Information Requests

- Parent wants to be alerted by note when Child comes to school clean. We stated that we cannot do this every time s/he comes to school clean. Parent stated that s/he would contact school department to get school to send notes.
- Mentoring Program
- Y after school program
- Wants to know what to do help support student learning over the summer.

Academics

- Progress and Summer Learning Plans
- Child likely to be retained this year
- Discussed academics at follow up visit, as well as MCAS ALT
- Reviewed and signed MCAS ALT.
- Discussed Child’s success
- Possible change of setting for next grade level.
Family Needs Identified

- Grandparent needs to be aware that we can only discuss some matters directly with Parents.
- Parents undergoing nasty divorce.
- Parent needed legal support about family’s homelessness. Detailed letter sent to court and other support offered
- Need translator when talking to family.

Scheduling Issues

- Parent sent letter stating she wanted meeting but was unable to attend and wanted to reschedule. Parent was only available on Mondays. Next week was school vacation, so I let her know it would be 2 weeks before I could meet with her unless she could find another day. Parent said s/he would get back to us.
- Sent letter requesting conference.
- Parent requested visit while Teacher was on medical leave. Attempted to reschedule when teacher returned, but parent did not return calls.
- Parent cancelled and did not reschedule
- Parent was not at home for scheduled meeting. Contacted again in May to remind Parent.
- No one home.

Sumner Comments and Home Visit Log Notes

Parent Concerns for Child

- Worried about Child being “too friendly” with strangers.
- Concerned with afterschool program, as older and bigger children have been teasing Child.
- Child perceives bullying at school.

Parent Information Requests

- Information about the MCAS
- After school care for child
- How to help child with homework frustrations.
**Academics**

- Happy with Child’s progress
- Child’s readiness for next grade.
- Child’s behavior and speech issues at school.

**Warm Welcomes**

- Learned about Child’s family, and that all of her siblings will be in Sumner next year.
- Parent felt program was very worthwhile. Child’s participation and academics increased throughout year. Liked open communication between school and family, and will participate in future.
- Helped keep lines of communication open between parents and school and helped improve student behaviors.
- Parent welcomed the program in home and hopes to meet with all of Children’s teachers. Talked about reinforcing school rules at home.
- Program helped to build student confidence and positive relationships at school.

**Family Needs Identified**

- Discussed incentive chart for Child to encourage positive behavior at home and decrease negative behaviors not observed at school.

**Scheduling Issues**

- Home visit cancelled due to death in the family.
- Second visit cancelled because Parent was unable to change work schedule.
- Home visit cancelled due to Family packing and moving.
- Home visit scheduled when parent picked up child from school.
- Family had only two visits because they entered the program late.

**Bowles Comments and Home Visit Log Notes**

**Parent Concerns for Child**

- Concerned about grades
- Concerned about Child’s work habits
Parent Information Requests

- Send additional work to help Child practice English
- Would like summer program information
- Summer school information
- Information on getting into Bowles’ reading program.
- YMCA summer programs
- Boys and Girls club

Academics

- Encouraged Children to participate in School sponsored Math and ELA program to prepare better for next year.
- Discussed academics of all three children who attend Bowles.
- Letters about retention possibility.
- Discussed recent report card.
- Math MCAS in May
- Child could benefit from additional work on multiplication tables.
- Behavior and academic performance have picked up with home visits.
- Summer language packets for English Language Learners.
- SPED needs and placement
- Negative Child behavior adversely affecting all academics.

Warm Welcomes

- Parent became PTO president following first visit, and does volunteer read alouds with children. Always helps with programs when asked.
- Child really responded to having the teacher come to visit.

Invitations extended

- Invited to Family Book Night
- Invited to School Carnival
- Summer School
- Field trips
- Summer Math and ELA programs at School
- MOB—Men on Board Initiative
Family Needs Identified

- Addressed housing issues.
- Family spends summer in Puerto Rico.
- Need help with Child’s sleeping habits.
- Parent has limited English proficiency. Children translated for parents.
- Transportation to summer programs.
- Translator for several parents.

Scheduling Issues

- Was unable to complete due to domestic situation at time of visit.

Walsh Comments and Home Visit Log Notes

Parent Concerns for Child

- Bullying incidents
- Parent wants child to do his/her best in school.
- Concerned if child is behaving well in class.
- Concern about impact of disability on social aspect of school
- Family unsure how to motivate Child
- Concerns about Middle School transition.
- Concerns about student’s homework.

Parent Information Requests

- More contact with Teachers
- Bark for Books Program
- Math Workbooks
- Parent seeking alternatives to medication for child’s ADHD.
- Parent wants to learn English
- Information about difference between Charter and Public Schools
- Reading comprehension and sight word strategies.
- Summer programs
- Reduced rate internet providers and helpful websites
Academics

- Child not making gains despite previous retention at grade level.
- Encouraged family English-language read-alouds.
- Child having difficulty maintaining personal safety in classroom. Child has high energy level, doing flips, running, and spinning among other unsafe activities.
- Child's behavior escalating.
- Misbehavior at Graduation Rehearsal leading to lack of participation.
- Child's ELA and Math skills are at level.
- Child doing well academically, reading above grade level and with high math skills. Child is having issues socially in the classroom.
- Child engaging in unsafe behavior in intervention room and physically assaulting peers; not completing work.
- Child running through halls when placed in the time out room. Pushed staff to try to escape and was placed in a hold. Engaged in multiple unsafe behaviors and was again restrained.
- Another child was running through the halls. This child stated that the pharmacy did not have his medicine and is not taking any.
- Child intentionally tore own clothing during school day.
- Talked with parent about obtaining ADHD meds for child.
- Child doing well academically.
- Informed parent of ELA interventions being used for child.
- Created plan to help child get one on one help in reading.
- Discussed recent report card.
- Middle school transition and goals
- IEP progress and goals
- Child working harder and improving.
- Need for improved work habits.
- Numerous bathroom trips taking away from on-task time.

Warm Welcomes

- Parent made us food for the second visit.
- Child doing well in school—parent very happy we came.
- Visited the family’s restaurant.
- Went to family’s new martial arts business and watched them practice.
Family Needs Identified

• Parent reads to Children several times per week, but in Spanish. Teachers have sent English language books home. Will provide appropriate grade level books for Children to Keep.
• Children will be in Puerto Rico for summer. No family members speak English there.
• Transportation to school an issue for parents.
• Divorce in Student’s family
• New baby due in 2 weeks.
• Child referred for hospitalization due to extreme behavioral issues at school.
• Child troubled by Parent’s military deployment abroad.
• Child having bladder control issues at school.

Invitations Extended

• Invitation to STAT

Scheduling Issues

• Home visit scheduled, but on arrival, Parent could not meet with us.
• No responses to several communications home about scheduling a home visit.
• Went to house to find that family had left for the day, according to neighbor.
• Sent letter requesting visit. No response.
• Parent sick and unable to attend second meeting.
• Was asked by district to cancel when parents needed a translator but none was available.
• No answer at the door for home visit. Contacted parent via telephone, who reported forgetting the visit. Rescheduled for later.
• Visited with Grandfather when mother was unavailable.