Transforming Education in Rhode Island

The Race to the Top Opportunity

Johnston Race to the Top Implementation Update: School Year 2012-2013 (Year 3)

_____

The Annual Stocktaking provides both the state and the Local Education Agency (LEA) with an opportunity to review LEA accomplishments and challenges over the course of the Race to the Top (RTT) grant implementation period (i.e., from September 2010 to date). In this summary, RIDE has included relevant LEA-reported data as well as other evidence sources (e.g., training participation) for the purposes of reviewing programmatic successes. The contents of this report were developed under a Race to the Top grant from the U.S. Department of Education. However, those contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

This report also includes areas that LEAs self-identified as challenges in their ability to meet Race to the Top commitments. Additionally, Appendix A provides a summary of LEA progress against the student achievement targets set at the start of the grant.

LEA Self-Assessment of Year Three Performance

The table below shows Johnston self-reported status against the Year 3 Race to the Top projects. During Year 3, Johnston has fully participated in the following projects: Model Curriculum and Intensive Curriculum Alignment, the Instructional Management System, Data Use professional development, Educator Evaluation, and New Teacher Induction.

In the upcoming year, Johnston intends to fully implement the Formative Assessment professional development and the Interim Assessments. The district will also continue to deepen their engagement in the initiatives from Year 3 that are best suited to the unique needs of their students.

CURRICULUM ALIGNMENT				FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT PD				INTERIM ASSESSMENTS				INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM				DATA USE PD				EDUCATOR EVALUATION				NEW TEACHER INDUCTION			
Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
🟩	🟩	🟩	🟩	🟩	⬜	🟩	🟩	⬜	⬜	⬜	⬜	🟩	🟩	🟩	🟨	🟩	🟩	🟩	🟩	🟩	🟩	🟩	🟩	🟩	🟩	🟩	🟩

ON-TRACK		The majority of tasks from the prior quarter are complete, and tasks from the current quarter are on-track to be completed.
DELAYED		Some tasks from the prior quarter are complete, but others have yet to be completed, and/or the district may have difficulty completing the current tasks in the anticipated time frame.
OFF TRACK		The majority of tasks anticipated to date have not been completed and/or the LEA is having significant challenges with some tasks.
NOT APPLICABLE		The district elected not to participate in this project during the 2012-2013 school year.

Performance Management Participation

As you know, participation in the Collaborative Learning for Outcomes (CLO) process and the submission of the corresponding quarterly progress report is our method for monitoring LEA progress against implementing RTT. More importantly, though, we believe that quality implementation of RTT is best supported through peer-to-peer sharing and that the CLO meetings provide LEAs with an opportunity to gain insights on how to address specific challenges of capacity and practice.

During the 2012-2013 year, Johnston met the bar for participation in all four quarterly CLO meetings. All quarterly progress reports were submitted on time, and Johnston sent consistent participants to the quarterly meetings, representing appropriate levels of LEA leadership.

As we near the end of the grant, we hope that Johnston continues to participate at this exemplary level. We are looking forward to rich and meaningful conversation around implementation accomplishments and challenges, as well as the changes that LEAs will sustain beyond the grant period. With that in mind, we encourage you to be an active voice in shaping the focus of these meetings during

System of Support 1: Standards and Curriculum

Based on the quarterly progress reports submitted by Johnston, as well as participation in additional applicable activities through the end of the 2012-2013 school year, we have assessed the district as 'on track (green),' 'delayed (yellow),' 'off track/at risk (red)', or 'not applicable (grey) on each of the Year 3 System of Support 1 scope of work tasks for Race to the Top. This assessment is reflected in the table below. Please note that further description of these statuses can be found on page one of this report.

RIDE would like to commend Johnston on its efforts to expand and deepen educator and administrator knowledge of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). In its progress reports, Johnston noted that, during the 2012-2013 school year, they built on the beginning knowledge of the standards from Year 2. A team of teachers led this work, and provided more in-depth ELA and math professional development to teachers. Additionally, the district involved science and social studies teachers for the first time. Johnston also participated in supplemental RIDE professional development on key instructional shifts, such as academic vocabulary and text complexity. Johnston also proposed a public relations campaign to continually remind teachers, parents, and students about the transition to the CCSS and announcing the full implementation beginning in the 2013-2014 school year.

Johnston has made significant progress against implementing a guaranteed and viable curriculum aligned to the new Common Core State Standards. During the 2012-2013 school year, Johnston provided forums for teachers to meet with district consultants, department chairs, and literacy, math, and science coaches so that they could review and identify resources to assist with the implementation of the CCSS. All teachers began integrating the standards into their classroom practice, and student Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) were written for the 2013-2014 school year in alignment with the new standards.

RIDE would like to commend Johnston on their work in this area. The district has made marked progress over the course of the year, and we are happy to note the many ways that the district is including students, parents, and teachers in this effort. We look forward to hearing about additional opportunities that Johnston has created for further collaboration within their district and across their neighboring districts.

Intensive Curriculum Alignment and Model Curriculum Development	Year 3:SY12-13			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Develop and communicate a multi-year Transition Plan for the Common Core State Standards implementation, including clear expectations for school level transition benchmarks and a plan for developing a curriculum aligned to the CCSS in grades K-12	x	Modify as needed	Modify as needed	Modify as needed
Identify opportunities for educators to work collaboratively to deepen understanding of CCSS (e.g. Common Planning Time, grade level team, department meetings, faculty meetings)	x	Modify as needed	Modify as needed	Modify as needed
Create implementation plan, including the identification of aligned resources, to support roll out of new curricula	x	Modify as needed	Modify as needed	Modify as needed
Develop curriculum aligned to the Common Core State Standards, including participation in Dana Center curriculum writing and leadership sessions (if applicable)	x	x	x	x

Please note: the 'x' in the above table represents the anticipated completion timeline set by RIDE, not when the district completed the task. Additionally, for further clarification on the criteria used to select each status, consult the description on page one of this report.

System of Support 2: Instructional Improvement Systems

During the 2012-2013 school year, Johnston chose to implement two of the four Race to the Top projects in System of Support 2 (Interim Assessments, and the Instructional Management System). Based on the quarterly progress reports submitted by Johnston, as well as participation in additional applicable activities through the end of the 2012-2013 school year, we have assessed the district on each of the Year 3 scope of work tasks for those applicable projects.

Johnston has submitted all teacher-course-student data, and configured the Instructional Management System (IMS) to provide educator access to both Interim Assessments and the Formative Assessment PD modules. Although Johnston's Information Technology Director provided training to teachers and administrators on the IMS, the district has tentatively decided to use Aspen for their curriculum management needs moving forward.

During the 2012-2013 school year, two elementary schools, the Early Childhood Center, and the middle school participated in the Data Use professional development series. In the QPU reports, the district expressed that the teams found this training helpful and that the district will continue to have data days during the upcoming school year. The remaining three schools will participate in the PD series during the 2013-2014 school year.

Johnston indicated in their quarterly progress update report that the district intends to implement the formative assessment professional development modules during the 2013-2014 school year. In preparation, the district's curriculum mapping team viewed the first module. During the upcoming school year, the district intends to have the assistant superintendent, principals, and lead teachers facilitate the trainings. Additionally, Johnston has indicated that they will also implement the fixed-form Interim Assessments at select grade levels.

In the upcoming CLO sessions, we look forward to hearing about the Johnston's plans for implementing new initiatives, or deepening engagement in initiatives implemented during the 2012-2013 school year. Additionally, looking ahead towards the PARCC assessment, we hope to hear more from districts about how these initiatives are supporting their transition to the common core.

Instructional Management System (IMS)	Year 3:SY12-13			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Designate an LEA data steward to support decision making around data collections and systems implementation and to provide input and feedback on data initiatives through designated representatives	As needed	As needed	As needed	As needed
Maintain data quality standards of local student information systems and upload local assessment data and program information as required by RIDE in a timely manner	X	X	X	X
Following RIDE training, LEA Administrative Users and LEA Trainers configure the IMS for educator use and to provide end users with access and training needed to utilize the IMS for daily activities	X	X	X	X
Deepen the understanding and use of the IMS among all educators	X	X	X	X

'Data Use' Professional Development	Year 3:SY12-13			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
In coordination with RIDE, select 'Data Use' training dates for each cohort of schools, as applicable				Year 2
Identify and provide RIDE with the leadership team members from each school who will participate in Year 2 training cohorts, as applicable				Year 2
Following 'Data Use' professional development, identify district and school practices to sustain and deepen data use and collaboration	Year 1	Year 1	Year 1	Year 1

* Please note that, for this project, 'year 1' refers to cohort 1 taking place during the 2012-2013 school year, and 'Year 2' refers to cohort 2 taking place during the 2013-2014 school year.

Formative Assessment Professional Development Modules (accessed via the Instructional Management System)	Year 3:SY12-13			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Identify facilitators who will support the implementation of formative assessment practices in daily instruction				SY13-14
Coordinate participation of educators in training modules and communities of practice	SY12-13	SY12-13	SY12-13	SY13-14

Interim Assessments (accessed via the Instructional Management System)	Year 3:SY12-13			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Develop protocols or expectations regarding the use of interim assessment to inform instruction including timelines for administration and process for scoring and reporting results	X			
Send LEA-determined facilitators to RIDE provided training on both the Fixed-Form assessment tool and the test-building tool	Fixed Form	Test Builder		
Train of educators in the LEA on the administration and use of interim assessments utilizing RIDE-trained facilitators	X	X	X	X
Administration of Interim Assessments in selected grades and content area(s)	1st Fixed Form Test	2nd Fixed Form Test	3rd Fixed Form Test	

System of Support 3: Educator Effectiveness

During the 2012-2013 school year, Johnston fully implemented all components of System of Support 3 - the Rhode Island model for teacher and building administrator evaluations; and final effectiveness ratings for all teachers and building administrators have been submitted to RIDE using the Educator Performance and Support System. Based on the quarterly progress reports submitted by Johnston, as well as participation in additional applicable activities through the end of the 2012-2013 school year, we have assessed the district on each of the Year 3 scope of work tasks for Educator Evaluation.

Johnston has taken several steps to support the implementation of the educator evaluation process during the 2012-2013 school year. All Johnston evaluators attended the same training sessions on the evaluation model in order to maintain consistency in their implementation and messaging about the system. Additionally, the administration successfully renegotiated the district's collective bargaining agreement such that it included language of support for both the implementation of the Rhode Island model and the district's evaluation committee member selection. Finally, in the Collaborative Learning for Outcomes meeting, Johnston noted that, despite initial difficulties, they were able to utilize the Educator Performance and Support System (EPSS) to facilitate the evaluation process. The district's IT director, as well as the Intermediary Service Provider (ISP), made themselves available to support teachers and principals in their use of the system.

During the 2012-2013 school year, all applicable Johnston administrators attended teacher and building administrator evaluator trainings. RIDE is also pleased to note that teachers and evaluators within the district participated in supplemental activities, such as Student Learning Objective workshops and the FFTPS calibration videos. We hope that participants found these supports helpful in increasing comfort with the evaluation process. Additionally, district administrators have attended and/or registered for applicable summer 2013 training. Looking ahead, RIDE would like to remind the district of their responsibility to ensure that all personnel responsible for evaluating both teachers and building administrators participate in applicable training activities.

As we enter into the final year of the Race to the Top grant, RIDE encourages Johnston to continue to engage their CLO peers in thinking about continuous support for evaluation implementation, as well as how evaluation data is being used to identify professional development needs.

Educator Evaluation	Year 3:SY12-13			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Participate in educator evaluation model design, development and refinement feedback opportunities	x	x	x	x
Identify District Evaluation Committee members, responsible for monitoring the implementation of the system and providing recommendations to LEA leadership teams				x
Identify individuals who will serve as primary and, if applicable, secondary/complementary evaluators				x
Send all required evaluators to RIDE-provided evaluator training on model; Send evaluators and system administrators to training on the Educator Performance Support System (EPSS) data system			Mid-year half-day training	Mid-year half-day training
Examine LEA Policies and Contracts for Challenges; where applicable, consider memorandums of understanding or contract renewal language which will support district implementation of evaluations	x	x	x	x
Create a plan for the appropriate use of funds to support implementation of educator evaluation system				x
Complete required components of RI Model for educator and building administrator evaluations	SLOs and Goals	Midyear Conference	Midyear Conference	EOY Report & Summative rating
Submit evaluation data and documentation (e.g. component and summative level ratings, verified rosters); provide other requested information to support RIDE research and system improvement	x	x	x	x
Use Evaluation Data to identify individual and school/district-wide professional development needs and act on those needs			x	x

System of Support 4: Human Capital Development

During the 2012-2013 school year, Johnston participated fully in the Beginning Teacher Induction program. Based on the quarterly progress reports submitted by Johnston, as well as participation in additional applicable activities through the end of the 2012-2013 school year, we have assessed the district on each of the Year 3 scope of work tasks for Beginning Teacher Induction. Additionally, Johnston has continued their utilization of SchoolSpring for recruitment of staff on an as needed basis.

All of Johnston's applicable new teachers received induction support from a RIDE-trained coach during the 2012-2013 school year. The induction coach support was supplemented by the district's own mentors, which are provided to all first and second year teachers.

In the upcoming CLO sessions, RIDE looks forward to engaging in a deeper conversation around the revisions that Johnston and other LEAs have made to their hiring policies, timelines, and processes in order to support broader human capital initiatives including recruitment of highly qualified and diverse candidates and providing data-driven induction support to beginning teachers.

Beginning Teacher Induction	Year 3:SY12-13			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
If applicable, recommend potential Induction Coaches to RIDE				x
Review and revise hiring policies, timelines and processes in order to support appropriate and timely projections for anticipated hires requiring induction coach services			x	
Provide RIDE with list of beginning teachers who will receive Induction Coach support in a timely manner in order to ensure that all beginning teachers have coaching	x			x
Participate in RIDE-provided information opportunities in order to learn about induction coach program				x
Provide feedback to RIDE on the development and integration of existing mentorship programs into a sustainable, instructionally-focused state or district-wide Induction Coach model			x	x

Appendix A: Overall District Goals and Performance Measures

The table below contains each district's previously established performance measures. These measures provide the state and district with a baseline from which to monitor progress, be held accountable, and recognize success as we advance toward our goals. Please note: The RTT accountability goals set below are separate and performance against those goals does not have an impact on the state-wide accountability system. Additionally, since setting the goals, the US Department of Education has requested that the state revise its goals on college enrollment and college course completion. Therefore, at this time, we have not updated your progress towards these post-secondary goals. Each district has an opportunity to review their current data and revise the goals to better align with the state goals on these measures.

Johnston Performance Measures	2009-2010	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014		2014 2015
	Actual	Goal	Actual	Goal	Actual	Goal	Actual	Goal	Actual	Goal
Students entering the fourth grade will be proficient in reading on NECAP	71%	76%	66%	82%	69%	86%	71%	88%	-	90%
-The gap between white and black students will be cut in half	7	6.5	n/a*	6	n/a	5	n/a	4	-	3.5
-The gap between white and Hispanic students will be cut in half	6	5.5	10	-5	4	-4	13	-3.5	-	-3
-The gap between non-economically disadvantaged students and economically disadvantaged students will be cut in half	6	5.5	17	5	12	4.5	9	4	-	3
-The gap between students without IEPs and those with IEPs will be cut in half	52	47	55	42	49	36	36	30	-	26
Students entering the fourth grade will be proficient in mathematics on NECAP	66%	69%	55%	74%	65%	80%	60%	85%	-	90%
-The gap between white and black students will be cut in half	23	21	n/a	18	n/a	15	n/a	13	-	11.5
-The gap between white and Hispanic students will be cut in half	15	13	8	11	13	9	17	8	-	7.5
-The gap between non-economically disadvantaged students and economically disadvantaged students will be cut in half	13	12	22	10	21	9	7	7.5	-	6.5
-The gap between students without IEPs and those with IEPs will be cut in half	43	39	35	36	41	30	46	25	-	21.5
Students entering the eighth grade will be proficient in reading on NECAP	71%	76%	74%	82%	78%	86%	74%	88%	-	90%
-The gap between white and black students will be cut in half	12	11	n/a	-9	n/a	-7	n/a	-6.5	-	-6
-The gap between white and Hispanic students will be cut in half	31	28	16	25	0	22	-6	19	-	15.5
-The gap between non-economically disadvantaged students and economically disadvantaged students will be cut in half	22	20	15	18	4	15	16	13	-	11
-The gap between students without IEPs and those with IEPs will be cut in half	38	35	31	31	49	26	45	22	-	19
Students entering the eighth grade will be proficient in mathematics on NECAP	44%	50%	50%	57%	53%	64%	47%	70%	-	75%
-The gap between white and black students will be cut in half	25	23	n/a	21	n/a	18	n/a	15	-	12.5
-The gap between white and Hispanic students will be cut in half	20	18	17	16	12	14	-3	12	-	10
-The gap between non-economically disadvantaged students and economically disadvantaged students will be cut in half	10	9	23	8	17	7	19	6	-	5
-The gap between students without IEPs and those with IEPs will be cut in half	47	45	41	40	44	36	45	27.5	-	23.5
85% of students who first entered 9th grade 4 years prior will graduate from high school	70%	76%	n/a	79%	82%	81%	82%	83%	-	85%
77% of students who graduate from high school will enroll in an institution of higher education (IHE) within 16 months of receiving a diploma	71%	72%	n/a	74%	64%	75%	n/a	76%	-	77%
70% of high school students who enroll in an IHE within 16 months of graduation will at least one year's worth of credit within two years of enrollment in the IHE	76%	78%	n/a	81%	n/a	84%	n/a	87%	-	90%

* n/a indicates that the data is not available, either because the n size is below 20 or because there are no students in that category.
Additionally, a hyphen (-) indicates that the LEA did not set a goal for the applicable performance measure.