

NYC SLC Cohort 10 Objectives and Evaluation Design

The proposed project will have the following objectives. **Objectives for Performance**

Indicators 1-3: By the end of each project year, at each project school, for the total population and for each NCLB subgroup: **1.1.** the percentage of students scoring at the Proficient and Advanced Levels on the NYS ELA and math tests will increase 5%. **1.2.** the graduation rate will increase by 2%; **1.3.** the percentage of graduates who enroll in postsecondary education in the semester following high school graduation will increase by 3%.

Project-Specific Objectives - Student Outcomes: **By the end of each project year, at each project school:** **2.1.** the number of students enrolled in at least one AP or other college level course will increase by 5% **2.2.** the attendance rate will increase by 2%. **School Restructuring:** Each school will achieve its target for the number of SLCs and the amount of common planning time (CPT) scheduled for SLC teachers during the regular school day. Currently no school has SLCs (as defined by NYC DOE *SLC Framework*) or CPT. Complete school restructuring will create new SLCs as summarized on the table below. Every SLC teacher will have 1 period (45minutes) of common planning time per day or 225 minutes per week. As the number of SLCs increases, the number of teachers with CPT increases. **3.1 – 3.5 By the end of each project year, each school** (3.1. Richmond Hill; 3.2 Washington Irving; 3.3 Port Richmond; 3.4 Long Island City; 3.5 Boys and Girls) **will reach the target for the number of SLCs.** **3.6-3.10 By the end of each project year, each school** (3.6 Richmond Hill; 3.7 Washington Irving; 3.8 Port Richmond; 3.9 Long Island City; 3.10 Boys and Girls) **will reach the target for the amount of common planning time for SLC teachers.** (See table below.)

<i>The Number of Smaller Learning Communities and Amount of Common Planning Time in Minutes per Week (min/wk) per SLC Teacher -- Baseline Year and Each Project Year</i>								
	2009-10 Baseline		2010-11 Year 1		2011-12 Year 2		2012-15 Yrs. 3-5	
	#SLCs	CPT min/wk	#SLCs	CPT min/wk	#SLCs	CPT Min/wk	#SLCs	CPT min/wk
Richmond Hill	0	0	1	225	8	225	8	225
Washington Irv	0	0	5	225	5	225	5	225
Port Richmond	0	0	7	225	7	225	7	225
Long Islnd Cty	0	0	1	225	8	225	8	225
Boys and Girls	0	0	5	225	5	225	5	225

3.11 By the end of project year 2, all students will be enrolled in SLCs in all project schools.

3.12 By the end of project year 2, all SLC teachers will have 225 minutes of CPT each week.

Professional Development: By the end of each project year, at each project school: SLC

teachers will receive at least 15 hours of professional development in each of the following

areas: **4.1. use of common planning time** (e.g., identifying academic interventions, structured

examination of student work and outcome data, curriculum development). **4.2.** SLC structures

and curricula, and the implementation of the NYC SLC framework including thematic,

interdisciplinary instruction. **Thematic Instruction : 5.1 By the end of project year 2, at each**

project school, all 9th and 10th grade SLC students will be enrolled in at least one class (at least

3,240 minutes a year) and all 11th and 12th grade SLC students will be enrolled in at least two

classes (each class at least 3,240 minutes a year) that are other than core academic subjects (i.e.,

English, mathematics, science, social studies) and are clearly related to their academy theme.

SLC Implementation: Each year, the degree of SLC implementation will increase according to

the *SLC Framework* Rubric. (Please see project evaluation.) The annual targets, on the table

below, refer to levels of implementation. Level 1 is the lowest. Level 4 is the highest. Each year,

the number of Level 3 and 4 items will increase and the number level 1 and 2 items will

decrease.

Implementation Targets: The Number of Items at Each Implementation Level of the SLC Framework Rubric. Level 1 and 2 targets are maximums. Level 3 and 4 targets are minimums. Level 3 is a high level of implementation. The total number of items is 20.				
	Level 1-Beginning	Level 2-Developing	Level 3-Deepening	Level 4-Systemic
Year 1	0	15	5	0
Year 2	0	11	7	2
Year 3	0	7	7	6
Year 4	0	3	5	12
Year 5	0	0	5	15

By the end of each project year, each school will reach the implementation targets above: **6.1**

Richmond Hill; **6.2.** Washington Irving; **6.3.** Port Richmond; **6.4.** Long Is. City; **6.5.** Boys/Girls.

Evaluation Plan: The NYC DOE is proposing to conduct an evaluation that supports the goals of the project and is necessary for the proper and efficient performance and administration of the grant. The evaluation contractor, American Education Solutions, Inc. (AES) has extensive, successful experience providing formative evaluations for SLC projects in NYC and in other parts of the country. (Please see the description of AES in the appendix.) AES will be a key partner in the project schools' transformation by expanding school staff's understanding and use of the *Framework for SLCs* as a tool for assessing program implementation and fidelity to the NYC SLC model. A recent study by OSR found that students attending high implementation SLC schools – schools demonstrating strong fidelity to the NYC SLC model – have higher attendance and 4 year graduation rates and greater credit accumulation than students attending large high schools with similar demographics but without SLCs. The evaluation process, described below, will enable key project partners – school, project, OSR, and *Children First* network staff, and the project evaluator, to come together to have focused discussions on project activities and outcomes to improve grant program performance.

AES will aid in the continual improvement of the project through formative evaluation,

an examination of the implementation that returns information to project, school and network staff to help them improve performance. Formative evaluation includes the study of program fidelity (the degree to which the program is implemented as designed) and reach (the proportion of the target group that participates). Components of fidelity include: ► adherence—the degree to which the program adheres to goals, activities, timeline; ► dosage—the amount of program delivered; ► quality of activities.

Newly implemented SLC and common planning time (CPT) structures combined with the professional development (PD) described earlier will facilitate significant changes in curriculum and instruction and student support that, in turn, will improve outcomes (e.g., the percentage of students proficient in reading and math, graduation rates, etc.). Benchmarks to monitor progress throughout the school year include SLC enrollments; CPT, PD and academy course dosage and reach; and progress towards attaining SLC Framework rubric targets.

Data Collection: Although the evaluator will develop data collection instruments (e.g., walkthrough and interview protocols), extant data will be used, when possible, to lessen the burden on schools. Extant data will include enrollments (school, SLC, academy and AP classes), student achievement (NYS reading and math tests), attendance and graduation data, PD and common planning time dosage and reach (i.e., number of hours, % of all teachers) the SLC Framework Rubric, school Quality Reviews, and Learning Environment Surveys.

The *Framework's* 4 domains and 20 items, New York City's successful SLC model, are summarized below: 1. Facilitative and Distributive Leadership: Shared vision and purpose; 2. Dedicated Teaching, Learning and Support Team: Organizing teachers into SLCs, use of common planning time, creating personalized learning environments, communication with parents; 3. An Assessment-Derived, Data-Driven System of Accountability: The use of student

data and work to support students, make instructional decisions and improve teachers' practice;

4. A rigorous curriculum and instruction for all students, centered on a unifying focus: the rigor and coherence of curriculum and instruction, professional development.

Data will be collected and analyzed as available and recommendations discussed with the project and school staff throughout the year. Each year, there will be 5 reports and 2 site visits:

Baseline Implementation Report (October): Student enrollment data for SLCs and academy classes and baseline data for all rubric items will be collected to create an initial picture of the implementation. Recommendations for improvement will be included in this and all reports.

Midyear Update (February): will summarize the data related to the 20 *SLC Framework* items and the project objectives. The report will include discussions of adherence (e.g., SLC and CPT structures, academy courses implemented on schedule), dosage (e.g., the amount of time teachers receive professional development related to project objectives and participate in CPT, student exposure to academy curricula) and progress towards attainment of *SLC Framework Rubric* targets. Quality standards for SLC implementation are included in each framework domain.

Site visit reports (October and May): During each of 2 annual site visits, the AES evaluator will conduct a walkthrough, observe classes and CPT meetings, and interview teachers, administrators and students. A report summarizing findings will be submitted within 10 days of each visit.

End of Year Report (June): Summarizes the extent to which objectives are attained based on data for that year. Because this updates previous reports, dosage, adherence, quality and reach are discussed in the context of each school's Quality Review and Learning Environment Surveys.